



On-Street Parking and Curb Management Policy

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Summer 2023

The public engagement period for the draft On-Street Parking and Curb Management Policy focused on giving an overview on the City of Dallas’s proposed tools and strategies to improve management of the curb, and affording an opportunity for residents, visitors, businesses, and other stakeholders to give input on the tools and strategies in the draft policy.

Multiple opportunities to provide input were provided:

1. **Review and comment on the draft policy document:** Between Monday July 17, 2023, and Friday, August 25, 2023, the draft policy document was available on the Department of Transportation website for review. Those who had comments regarding the draft policy were able to leave a comment on the comment form linked on the website. The form received a total of 53 submittals.
2. **Attend a virtual public meeting.** Two public meetings were held virtually on the Microsoft Teams platform. The first meeting was held on Tuesday, July 25, 2023 followed by a second meeting on Tuesday, August 15, 2023.
3. **Request staff to present the policy to business or neighborhood groups.** Staff was available to meet with neighborhood groups on request to have more targeted discussions on the policy and how the policy could impact parking in their neighborhoods. Bishop Arts Merchants Association and the Deep Ellum Foundation requested meetings with staff. In addition, staff received emails and calls from residents and other stakeholders.

Figure 1: Project Website



Note: Initial public input deadline was Sunday, August 6, 2023, but was extended to Friday, August 25, 2023, following first public

Public Notification

There were several ways in which the public engagement opportunity was publicized. Flyers were created in English and Spanish for digital and physical distribution. The flyers were provided to the City’s Office of Communications, Outreach and Marketing, City Council Members, members of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee, Chambers of Commerce, and neighborhood groups to distribute through various channels including Nextdoor, Facebook, Twitter, email blasts, newsletters, etc.

Figure 2. Flyer for Public Meeting #1



Figure 3. Flyer for Public Meeting #2



General Consensus

Overall, the consensus was that the policy is going in the right direction. Many of the respondents' comments focused on priorities and personal experiences and concerns with parking in the City's business districts or in their own neighborhoods. The tools and strategies outlined in the policy document were recommended to address these same priorities and concerns. However, feedback also suggest some of the tools and strategies need additional consideration to ensure they are effective in addressing the issue for which they were intended, and the impact does not burden certain groups in favor of others. Some of these considerations will be addressed before adoption of the policy document, others will be addressed once implementation begins.

Throughout the public input process, several themes emerged that will inform the final draft of the policy document and will also influence future policy changes once implementation begins. The number and percentage of the comments that referenced each theme is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Themes Mentioned in Five or More Comments

Theme	# of Comments	% of Comments
Support for policy (note: it was not directly asked whether respondents supported policy or not)	12	20%
Loading/rideshare zones and issues	11	18%
Signs & Markings – complaints about signs or support for colored curb markings	10	17%
Residential Parking Permit Program-related	10	17%
Managed Parking Areas – support or oppose	8	13%
Support for alternative uses of on-street space	9	15%
Complaints about lack of enforcement/desire for more enforcement	7	12%
Issues with lack of access due to parking on both sides of street	6	10%
Complaints about valet	5	8%
Complaint about parking in Bishop Arts	5	8%
Comments related to parking code reform	5	8%

Policy Considerations

This section discusses changes to the policy document based on public feedback. The topics discussed in this section align with the chapters in the policy document. The discussion summarizes the key feedback received on the topic and any changes that will be made to the policy document in response to that feedback. For more detailed information, all comments and responses to those comments can be found in the following section.

Prioritizing and Allocating Curb Space

Support for alternative uses of on-street space accounted for 15% of the comments. Respondents indicated they would like to see more space along the curb allocated to multimodal infrastructure for bikes, pedestrians, and transit, even if that means reducing the amount of space allocated to parking motor vehicles.

“These areas need more pedestrianization and multi modal access like public transit, bikes, e-scooters. Not more parking.”

“Increasing cycling parking and infrastructure in favor of more parking would make Dallas more friendly to non-drivers and would make my life better.”

“Would like to see less cars parked in the street, in general. Whatever that looks like, I would welcome. Including extending outdoor restaurant space and food truck usage in those entertainment districts. It might require expansion of DART services which I would absolutely welcome”.

“It assumes the inevitability of the street as the domain of motor vehicles only. Use cases for pedestrians, bikes, strollers and other personal mobility means are ignored here, as is public transportation.”

Some comments also indicate parking needs to be restricted on narrow streets in business districts and denser neighborhoods to improve unsafe driving conditions.

“Concentrations of parking like the ones in Deep Ellum and Bishop Arts impede emergency vehicles from moving through easily. The reduction in street lane widths as well as the inability of the districts to control deliveries of goods. during peak service hours creates levels of chaos for patrons, business owners, and delivery services.”

“...I know the area needs parking - but having that much congestion on these small streets in a recipe for disaster...”

Response: The policy document provides the framework for allocating curb space by:

1. Establishing the curb functions: Mobility, Access, Activation, Greening, and Storage.
2. Establishing the process for allocating the space while ensuring safety
 - a. Step 1: Meet Mobility Goals required by plans and policies (i.e., Dallas Bike Plan)
 - b. Step 2: Prioritizing Remaining Curb Space by curb land use and street context as defined in the Street Design Manual.

Managed Parking Areas

Thirteen percent of the comments addressed Managed Parking Areas (MPAs). Feedback suggests more consideration is needed on the process to initiate and establish MPAs. There is a general concern of lack of transparency with an administrative approval process. There was concern by some that allowing neighborhood groups to initiate the process is placing a burden on residents to address the spillover parking from businesses.

"I dislike that regulations currently in code would be removed and relegated to an administrative entity which has less oversight from the public and less barriers to make changes that could adversely affect the public"

"p31 - 2nd column, top paragraph

"All existing Metered Parking Areas... should automatically become MPAs" ADD "with Council approval."

"The model of MPA puts too great a burden upon neighborhoods. It also pits the neighborhoods' interests against the adjacent businesses who no longer have the burden of providing sufficient parking. Surely there is a better model than this one."

"In areas where the business district is contiguous with a residential neighborhood (multifamily or single family), an MPA boundary should NOT be allowed."

The Bishop Arts business community expressed a strong opposition to the Managed Parking Area concept.

"MPA creation should only be initiated by local interests, not by the City alone. Similarly, while the draft policy makes clear that City Council approval is required to create a Parking Benefit District, it is not clear who approves an MPA. Bishop Arts' experience thus far demonstrates that City Hall cannot presume to know the priorities of MPA-candidate neighborhoods."

Response: The MPA framework will be removed from the policy document. The Paid (Metered) Parking Areas that are currently in the code will be retained in the code, along with the requirement that parking meters can only be installed in these areas.

Paid Parking

Twenty-three percent of the comments mentioned paid parking. Support has been shown for performance-based pricing to help increase parking turnover.

"Reduce the number of free parking spaces citywide. Fully support dynamic pricing for paid parking."

"... will support the City in a policy that allows flexible implementation of curb management to accommodate multiple uses, dynamic and transparent fee policy..."

"I like the overall idea of increasing meter prices to make parking more available."

Response: No changes to draft policy recommendation to modify Chapter 28 of the Dallas City Code to incorporate the rate adjustment policy.

Loading Zones

Commercial Loading Zones/Flex Loading Zones:

Eighteen percent of the comments submitted noted issues with deliveries. The timing of deliveries and location of loading zones obstruct travel lanes and conflict with bus operations.

"inability of the districts to control deliveries of goods during peak service hours creates levels of chaos for patrons, business owners, and delivery services."

"One thing to consider for high density area is the number of deliveries from online stores."

"...please make rideshare like Uber and Lyft and delivery trucks like Amazon, UPS, and FedEx pay a premium for blocking lanes of vehicular traffic."

"DART recommends designating loading zones on minor, side streets where there is minimal bus activity as opposed to on major roadways as to not interfere with speed and reliability of bus operations."

Response: The policy document recommends evaluating the permitting process for commercial loading, considering incentivizing off-peak loading hours, and amending Chapter 28 of the Dallas City Code as needed.

Flex Loading Zones:

Concerns were raised about the flex loading zones concept that is being introduced in the policy document.

“Flex zones are too complex to adequately police/monitor. Too many rules and differing times of day would be difficult for the city to enforce and relying on reports from people who have an issue doesn’t timely address inappropriate parking. Predictable rules that don’t change force regular visitors to learn and relies less on many individual people understanding something complex.”

Response: The Flex Loading Zones section of the document will be revised to provide an example of a more simplified flex loading zone. The document already recommends that flex loading zones be kept “fairly simple at first.” That recommendation will be strengthened by stating that only a small number of standardized types of flex loading zones should be created.

Valet Parking:

There were strong sentiments that valet stands take up too much curb space and are a nuisance.

“Valet parking: Oversaturation in Downtown Dallas must be addressed.”

“My concern is that significant street parking and certain open parking lots in and around Bishop Arts have been co-opted by commercial valet services.”

“Reduce valet parking...”

“DART welcomes a collaborative discussion regarding how existing valet operations are impacting our bus routes”

“Combined mid-block valet stands sound like an improvement, but valet operations right now in various areas such as Bishop Arts and the Design District operate without much concern for the

Response: The policy document recommendations address these comments and concerns.

New Development:

Rideshares and e-commerce deliveries obstruct travel lanes. Allocating curb space for these uses need to be addressed, especially for multifamily development.

“Code needs to be changed to require off-street loading for movers, incessant package delivery, and ride share for multifamily complexes. These complexes frequently have an entire lane of traffic blocked for this function that should be taking place off-street.”

Response: The policy document identifies the following potential changes to Chapter 51A of the City Code to better manage loading activities:

- a. Ensure the off-street loading requirements for hotels, restaurants and bars, and high-density residential account for the increasing use of rideshare and on-demand delivery in the provision and design of loading spaces.

- b. Require developers to prepare a loading operation plan for certain uses (e.g., hotels, bars, high-density multi-family residential).

Other:

More information needed on passenger loading zones. Band loading zones should be formalized. Allow temporary use of curb for moving trucks.

"There is not enough specific treatment in this plan of rideshare, how those programs work, how their loading locations are determined and how the City vs. private operators are involved."

"Deep Ellum established band loading zones. We followed the City's process and requirements, and signage and has been in place for some time now. These areas should not be precluded by this study.... For the issue of loading vehicles not able to park on the street or special cases like moving trucks - the city needs to implement a temporary parking ban for those areas. Most other cities I've lived in have a program where you can pay the city (typically 20-30 bucks) to get a permit to ban a small section of parking for a limited set of time on a day, where you can then post signage at the beginning and ending of these spots. I've found no such program here and often see giant trucks blocking some streets because there is nowhere to park, which is a worse issue. It would be hugely beneficial to try and implement something like this, as installed and has been in place for some time now. These areas should not be precluded by this study."

Response: Evaluating band loading zones and permits and permits for moving trucks was not included in the original scope of work for this effort. The comments have been noted and opportunities to address these items in the future will be evaluated as resources are available.

Parking for Special Users

Employee Parking:

Concerns have been expressed regarding employee parking and the need to accommodate service industry workers.

"..... for those of us that work past 4pm we have to pay \$20 to park in a parking garage which the cheapest is \$17 and if you work every day it's around 300-400 a month."

"...it is not workable to just start requiring employers to pay to park and all the burden be placed on them immediately. This is an equity issue driven by former decisions and policies providing benefits to various types of stakeholders and the City. Employees that are low paid service industry workers who work in parking constrained districts that Dallasites want to be walkable shouldn't bear the brunt of this policy change."

Response: Determining the best solution to address concerns about employee parking would require additional research and more meetings with business districts and employees in those

districts. Therefore, the policy document takes the initial step of identifying three options to address employee parking and recommending that staff convene a workshop with business district representatives to discuss strategies for employee parking.

Residential Parking:

Fifteen percent of the comments were related to parking in residential areas. Feedback suggests that resident only parking zones are needed but significant changes are needed to address the issues resulting from spillover parking into the City's existing Residential Parking Only zones. Residents from various neighborhoods feel the City is not doing enough to address spillover parking from nearby businesses. Residents residing in neighborhoods with designated Residential Parking Only zones are finding the zones to be ineffective due to inadequate signage and lack of enforcement. Feedback also suggests these zones should be located where they are actually needed. Improperly establishing these zones can create additional issues once installed.

"I disagree that only complete blocks of a residential street should be allowed to be RPO. Forcing neighborhoods to bear the burden and cost of spillover parking from adjacent businesses is not the answer. Its a recognition that the businesses will not provide the parking they need."

"...residential parking permit areas should absolutely stay unchanged. They exist for a reason, to prevent business needs from overshadowing the needs of residences in clearly residential areas..... residential areas, even if in close proximity to commercial areas, priority should absolutely be residential users at all times. Anything else is a giveaway to businesses who have ample revenue to provide appropriate parking through other needs..... Assuming residential property owners in dense districts can afford to add off-street parking on small lots is ridiculous as well. Businesses that need more parking have regular sources of revenue that can be used to acquire it, not from the residential property owners who make up the majority of the areas around these businesses. Residential parking should be protected at all costs."

"...would love to see more resident only parking in the Bishop arts district."

"I'm also starting to see a lot of Resident Permit only parking which is extremely strange considering that everywhere I've seen them, the residences all have parking spaces at their residence. I think these permitted areas should be looked into as it is just a thinly veiled way to deter parking in areas that are in the middle of the city for no good reason. Similarly, I think there is not really a good reason to discourage parking in single family neighborhoods. I have lived in areas that had parking in neighborhoods and it did not impact my life in any way to even the smallest degree. Unfortunately, if you're choosing to live in a city there's going to be other people crossing through where you live. Trying to zone and segment things so rigidly is only hurting our growth as a walkable and more dynamic city. Discouraging or eliminating those areas would only add to the issues at hand. If you want a prime example of this, just look at the chaos around Smoky Rose by White Rock. Plenty of areas to park but it's been banned almost everywhere but the parking lot of the building. This leads a lot of people to not want to go to these places. Unless we want to blight the city with even more parking lots/parking garages, I feel like this is inevitable part of living."

Response: The policy document recommends staff review and update the on-street residential permit and application process and consider replacing it or supplementing with a flexible on-street parking permit program. Staff will revise document to emphasize public input will be sought during the review process.

Signs and Markings

Concern with the City's ability to maintain adequate signage and markings had some respondents questioning the effectiveness of the proposed policy.

"By contrast, the City's efforts at parking management are illusory. Bike-lane and crosswalk paint wears off in a couple of years, never to be refreshed. Posted time limits are never enforced, nor are no-parking-on-this-side-of-street signs."

"...On the perimeter of popular entertainment areas like lower Greenville Avenue, there are lots of parking problems within the neighborhoods DESPITE the presence of No Parking Anytime signs. Illegal parking repeatedly occurs on Fridays and Saturdays, even when enforcement officers distribute violations weekly. The allowance of MORE SIGNAGE PER BLOCK could mitigate this problem..... "Many No Parking signs ARE CONFUSING. The phrase "No Parking from here to corner" doesn't make clear WHICH corner is being referred to."

"One of the biggest problems not really addressed or noted in here is how understaffed and overwhelmed the DDOT is. Signage and striping is backlogged months and in some cases years. Regardless of planning, without these key resources, success will continue to evade Dallas in curb management."

"...agree with the challenges identified. Another challenge should be added to indicate Bus Lanes are also improperly signed and marked"

Other feedback suggests colored curbs will be welcomed in areas where illegal curb use is common and frequently cited.

"Painting the curbs and phasing this is the best recommendation in here!"

"...agree with color curbs to make parking policies more visible"

Response: The policy recommends updating standard details for signs and markings. Staff will determine staffing and funding resources to implement policies.

Comments-Response Matrix

#	Comment	Response
1	<p>1) COMMENTS ON DRAFT DOC (text that could be integrated (edited) into the document)</p> <p>p7 second column, first paragraph, add to end This document therefore illustrates how curb management policies could be implemented in such a district, but is not prescriptive for a neighborhood. Each district must be evaluated individually for implementation.</p>	Comment noted. Changes incorporated.
	<p>2) p14 Bishop Arts - Add at end of section Bishop Arts is, however, unique in the City of Dallas as a Historically protected commercial district where PD regulations allow businesses to operate with special considerations for parking requirements in order to preserve the character of the district and discentivize teardowns to build parking lots.</p> <p>Additionally, the zoning in Bishop Arts distinctly requires smaller retail spaces, supporting a higher than usual number of small business operators rather than larger chain operators. Parking conflicts are therefore minimal and compromises are typically coordinated between stakeholders.</p>	Comment noted. No changes made.
	<p>3) p15 - Map of BA curbs Along Melba between Bishop and Madison, the green areas need No Parking signage installed. People often park along this travel lane curb, even though it prevents the street from operating as a two-way street. There need to be No-Parking signs here. Same along Madison between Melba and 8th (Need to add Madison St name) Parking on the street should not be allowed outside of the parallel parking spaces. It blocks the flow of traffic. This has been an issue since the street was redesigned. No Parking signs were not installed and people just started parking there, creating problems.</p>	Service request submitted to review need for additional signage for area.
	<p>4) Why not include the decision-making framework for prioritizing & evaluating curb use tradeoffs in this document? When will it realistically be tackled if not now? Or, if not detailed completely, could this Action item also list something like</p> <p>2.2a Include specific ways of reaching business owners to gain site-specific anecdotal usage information from stakeholders (eg-fliers hand delivered to businesses in the area in question)</p> <p>b Include at least one educational event explaining industry best practices and peer city examples to give stakeholders context to assist in evaluating tradeoffs.</p> <p>c In areas with 50% or more hispanic or Spanish speaking residents and business owners, a translator will attend all public meetings</p> <p>d public meetings will be both in-person and virtual</p>	Policy will serve as overarching framework for prioritizing curb uses. Specific Methods to be used to engage stakeholders like business owners are typically identified in the procedures that are created to implement policies.
	<p>5) p31 - 2nd column, top paragraph "All existing Metered Parking Areas... should automatically become MPAs" ADD "with Council approval." - 2nd column, last sentence Add text that Business owners must be consulted for appropriate locations because "it is expected that business owners would take an active role in promoting compliance...."</p>	<p>Staff has decided to not consider MPA as a parking strategy. Focus will be on areas with paid parking. Existing MPA's will be adopted as "Paid Parking Areas" with City Council's approval of code amendment.</p> <p>The section has been removed as a result of document revisions.</p>
	<p>6) p33 - Next to last bullet add text at end "and how other stakeholders will be notified of opportunities to participate in the initiative" - Add new paragraph at end of section "City-initiated MPAs will follow the same process of needs, goals, and stakeholder documentation for Council approval."</p>	An essential role of a stakeholder working group is to assist with outreach, including identifying effective strategies to inform and gather feedback from area stakeholders.

#	Comment	Response
	<p>7) p34 - flow chart, green circle to the right of "Issue spans multiple blocks" Include potential 2-4hour time limits on specific blocks Perhaps change wording to "Consider 15-30min or 2-4 hr time limits along businesses or blocks."</p>	<p>Flow chart has been removed as part of document revisions.</p>
	<p>8) p35 - third bullet last sentence "...and visitors <can help> inform the distance..." should be changed to "...and visitors <will be used to> inform the distance..."</p>	<p>Comment noted. Changes incorporated.</p>
	<p>9) p36 - Step 2, 2nd sentence "This includes documenting existing curb uses...." Add text "This includes collecting usage data and anecdotal evidence from existing businesses to document the existing curb uses...."</p>	<p>Anecdotal evidence from stakeholders (businesses; residents) provided as part of step 1.</p>
	<p>10) p37 - Step 4, add to last sentence "...to obtain Council approval for creating an MPA."</p>	<p>Staff has decided to not consider MPA as a parking strategy. Focus will be on areas with paid parking. Being designated as an "MPA" will not be required to implement parking/curb management tools, with the exception of parking meters. City Council Approval will be required before parking meters can be installed within an area.</p>
	<p>11) p75 - #2 Add at end of paragraph "No curb color assigned for No Parking curbs that are not Fire Lanes."</p>	<p>Adding this text would imply that curbs should be colored today. There is no existing City code, policy, or standard that authorizes the painting of curbs today, or makes colored curbs enforceable. Nevertheless, some curbs have been colored, and the document notes that this inconsistency is an issue.</p>
	<p>12) TYPOS / CLARITY EDITS p6 needs a title on the Map: What is this a map of exactly? Existing curb management programs currently in use?</p>	<p>Map was removed during document revisions.</p>
	<p>13) p8 Figure 1.3 description needs clarity: curb space that does not allow parking, neither free nor paid, because it is used for loading or other purposes such as bike racks or restaurant dining area. OR curb space that does not allow parking, though it would be free or paid, but is also used for loading and is also used for other purposes... (Hard to imagine a space used for all of these?)</p>	<p>No existing space accommodates all uses mentioned. Use of a space is dependent on the location. Some spaces are reserved for bike racks, some are reserved for the loading/unloading of freight, others are reserved for street seats (parklets)</p>
	<p>14) p22 Typo end of first paragraph " Land uses with large amounts or destinations benefit from..." should be "Land uses with many destinations together benefit from..." - Step 3, 1st sentence "the area would not be a candidate for an MPA and <change to BUT> other eligible strategies should be pursued"</p>	<p>Comment noted. Changes incorporated. Paragraph was removed during document revisions.</p>
	<p>15) p69 - 2nd column, second line Period missing after "...businesses" & before "It is recommended..." - No Next Steps listed..?</p>	<p>Comment noted. Changes incorporated. A short-term action item is to convene a workshop with business district representatives to discuss solutions to address employee parking. proceeding</p>

#	Comment	Response
		steps will be based on outcome of discussions.
2	<p>1) The Lower Greenville Neighborhood Association (LGNA) represents one of the most walkable and welcoming neighborhoods in Dallas. We have experienced significant population growth over the past ten years as many small, single-family bungalows have been replaced with multi-family units. In addition, we've seen two new apartment complexes, including an eight-story building, open in our neighborhood, and there is another site (at the corner of Ross and Greenville) that will likely be a multi-family development within the next couple of years. At the same time, Lower Greenville is a thriving business district with a growing number of restaurants, neighborhood services retailers, and stores. This also makes our neighborhood not just a place to live, dine and shop, but a regional destination. Again, we welcome visitors who are also attracted to our vibrant community. However, in Dallas, being a destination means cars. Lots of cars. We oppose the removal of parking minimums as currently proposed based on the following reasoning:</p>	Comment noted. Comment refers to parking reform. Comments have been transmitted to the parking reform team.
	<p>2) Commercial Encroachment We already have issues with commercial encroachment into the residential part of the neighborhood due to still existing delta credits and the general popularity of the area. With more cars parked in the residential area, it becomes an attractive nuisance to criminals. As the area has seen a big increase in activity and visitors (who are often not locals), we have seen a big increase in auto thefts and other property crimes. This is with the minimum parking in place. While we heartily support the further development of Dallas neighborhoods as walkable, pedestrian-friendly urban communities, we have significant concerns about plans to lower parking requirements for businesses, specifically businesses like restaurants, bars and other retail that are prevalent along the Greenville corridor. With a severe lack of public transportation in Dallas and a cultural norm of driving, the cars that people drive to reach Lower Greenville will not suddenly disappear simply because parking requirements are reduced. Instead, these vehicles will be pushed into our neighborhood. We will experience increased traffic in and through our residential streets, as well as our homes fronting onto a constant stream of parked cars or those seeking parking. Non-local vehicles parking in our neighborhood bring a host of problems - parking that blocks driveways, alleys and other forms of ingress/egress, additional trash left in yards, the streets and other public areas, additional noise (especially late at night), and the commission of certain crimes.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The comment pertains to parking reform initiatives. It has been forwarded to the parking reform team for consideration.</p> <p>The policy is based on the premise that the demand for on-street parking in many areas of the City is greater than the supply, and that the success of certain types of businesses and certain commercial districts depends on the public's ability to easily find short-term parking, and the demand for the use of the curb for other purposes in increasing.</p>
	<p>3) Based on Wishful Thinking The premise of this plan is that businesses will provide the parking they need to operate successfully and that people will be more likely to use alternative means such as walking, biking or public transportation. This is a fantasy. For several months per year, our weather does not allow walking and biking. Whether it's ice on the ground or sweltering 100+ weather, no one is walking to a 5-star restaurant in August, or July, or February. While ride sharing exists, it is not widespread. Most ride share users do so not because of parking, but because they intend to imbibe. This shouldn't be something we want to attract to our neighborhoods. And ridesharing is only routinely available to more affluent patrons, making reliance on this as a form of public transportation unequitable. Finally, this city does not have a functional mass transit system. DART has no plans in place to deal with getting people from bus routes to their final destination, there are no trains near Lowest Greenville or Ross in that part of town, and there is no trolley or other similar "connector" and no plans for any of this. Reliance on things like scooters and rental bikes is also pie-in-the-sky, as our current Council is outwardly hostile to them, putting as many hurdles to having them as possible. Until Dallas solves its "last mile" issue with public transportation, any attempt to eliminate parking minimums is wildly misguided and premature.</p>	Staff is also mindful that demand may increase should off-street parking minimums be eliminated and residential neighborhoods, in particular, will be impacted more than others. The tools highlighted in the document are designed to address the demand by working with neighborhood stakeholders to formulate a parking strategy customized to the specific needs of the neighborhood.
	<p>4) Disrupts the Balance of Businesses Lower Greenville is a huge success story, being transformed over just a little more than a decade from a late-night bar scene with frequent violent crime to a walkable, diverse and thriving family-friendly destination. The parking requirements for area businesses are a huge part of this success and enable critical regulation of activity and traffic in the area. By enforcing parking minimums, we are able to maintain the critical balance of retail and entertainment uses which prevents the neighborhood from returning to its crime riddled days where we had 38 liquor permits in 3 blocks. Removing parking minimums will take us back to the days where we had an over-saturation of bars and a dearth of</p>	

#	Comment	Response
	<p>retail, leaving the existing parking way under-utilized during the day and woefully deficient at night. That scenario gave us drive-by shootings and drug dealing that plagued the area. We don't want to return to that.</p>	
	<p>5) RPO is Not a Solution This area has dealt with the parking encroachment on our streets by adding RPO on many of the streets surrounding the commercial areas. This was done with a great deal of work and expense to our neighborhood residents. We have significant concerns about the verbiage regarding RPO's on page 70. The verbiage indicates the existing RPO zones do not meet the criteria of the code. The concern is that the RPO zones will be revoked. RPO's are important to our neighborhood to avoid the inundation of traffic from local businesses onto our residential streets. Prior to establishing RPO's, this inundation caused issues with residents not having a place to park in front of their homes, with safety concerns from bar goers returning to their cars late at night, and to the overall stagnation or reduction of property values. If the parking minimums are removed, we will be forced to add many more RPO zones at great expense to our residents. Unfortunately, RPO is almost never enforced by the city. It deters some who observe the signs, but it is only minimally helpful. Again, without a meaningful plan from the city to enforce RPO, this is just another unfunded idea without an action plan to create and enforce it.</p>	<p>Some RPO's do not meet current criteria. Particularly those that are located in multi-family neighborhoods. The program will be reviewed to ensure RPO's are serving their intended purposes. The review will include opportunities for public input.</p>
	<p>6) Parking Meters are Not a Solution. Like RPO, parking meters are not well enforced. And like ride-share, meters or "market rate" parking charges may well disincentivize people from driving but is often people of lesser economic means from communities not well served by public transit and/or public infrastructure investment, making meters unequitable. This is not to say that metered parking on the public streets in these areas is not warranted or even needed, but any notion that meters should be installed in neighborhoods like the conservation districts that surround Greenville should be immediately disregarded and banned. We have not spent 20 years fighting to preserve these historic neighborhoods so that they can now be littered with parking meters.</p>	<p>There are no intentions to install parking meters in single-family residential neighborhoods.</p>
	<p>7) Long Term Consequences Removing parking minimums will undoubtedly result in some of our parking being developed with new business use. This has a doubling effect by removing parking supply and adding parking demand. Once developed there is no chance that it will be removed and returned to parking. Once the city realizes this was a bad idea, the damage is done permanently and cannot be undone. The result? Back to delta credits. and possibly the loss of the right for the city to change its zoning once relied upon by the private sector.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The comment pertains to parking reform initiatives. It has been forwarded to the parking reform team for consideration.</p>
	<p>8) Right Problem, Wrong Solution Once again, we find the staff recommending a broad sweeping, one-size-fits-all solution where a more surgical approach is warranted. And again we find staff recommending a wild idea that has not been tested and vetted in our city. That staff suggests that all of these parking changes occur at once not only goes against the advice of consultants in this area, without any justification for doing so seems irresponsible or careless. We agree that parking requirements should definitely be revisited. We agree that parking requirements for strip centers and big box retailers are grossly out of date. But parking for restaurants and bars seems about right in general but could use some minor adjustments to deal with new types of businesses that combine retail and dining or restaurants that operate more as ghost kitchens. Finally, before pursuing any plan like this, we should test it out for a couple of years in an area that would welcome it. (Lower Greenville will not welcome it...) Rather than apply it to the whole city, it could be created as a zoning tool to be applied in areas where it could be welcomed, and not where it isn't welcomed.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The comment pertains to parking reform initiatives. It has been forwarded to the parking reform team for consideration.</p>
	<p>9) Better Solution We strongly believe that Parking Management Systems would be far more preferable than the current proposal. These have been tested and proven in Deep Ellum. We are having some preliminary discussions amongst neighborhood stakeholders about using that here in the Lower Greenville area. This would allow a surgical approach with the neighborhood involved in how it would like to implement a parking solution that works for them. Every neighborhood is unique in its challenges, infrastructure, preferences, and users. The parking solutions should take those things into account, and again, a one-size-fits-all approach is not the best approach. But if parking minimums are removed, there will be no incentive whatsoever for the business community to work with the neighborhood to develop a Parking</p>	<p>The City recognizes that a universal solution does not exist for addressing parking challenges. The policy document will outline a strategy to collaborate with neighborhoods in crafting a local parking and curb management plan tailored to meet the unique needs of each neighborhood.</p>

#	Comment	Response
	Management System. The city has an opportunity to provide more resources, tools and training to make those systems easier to implement.	
	10) In conclusion, we agree that the Dallas Parking Code is in need of updating and revision, but the current proposal to eliminate parking minimums is untenable and should be aborted promptly so that we can move toward a workable solution instead of wasting more time on an unrealistic solution.	Comment noted. The comment pertains to parking reform initiatives. It has been forwarded to the parking reform team for consideration.
3	Overall, GDPC supports the City of Dallas's efforts to codify, standardize, and modernize curb management policy within the City. GDPC recognizes that the current policy is limited in scope so some of these statements may not be directly applicable. 1) GDPC supports the City's mobility goals as identified in the plan, and appreciates the bolstered recommendations related to multi-modal options including bikes/e-bikes, scooters, and other shared-mobility services set forth in the policy.	Comment noted.
	2) GDPC supports the Policy's approach to Managed Parking Areas since these are key areas in the City where curb management and parking policy would be beneficial. GDPC believes that the implementation of the parking policy could be further improved by incorporating it into neighborhood planning processes and involving neighborhood residents and business owners in the code creation, to the extent feasible.	Comment noted.
	3) GDPC will support the City in a policy that allows flexible implementation of curb management to accommodate multiple uses, dynamic and transparent fee policy, and innovative incorporation of technologies.	Comment noted.
	4) GDPC supports the City's parking and curbside management policy with the CECAP goals of reducing GHG emissions and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) through the innovative use of curb space, including reduction of parking requirements, which GDPC recognizes is a separate pursuit of the City in amending the parking code.	Comment noted.
	5) GDPC believes it would be helpful to establish regular intervals to re-evaluate the On-Street parking and curbside management policy to ensure that the City is adaptable to ever-changing public demands and uses.	The policy document is intended to serve as a working document that will be updated as the program evolves.
	6) GDPC believes that it would also be helpful to strengthen the policy in a way that benefits pedestrian and bicycle safety through the improvement of sight lines, reduction of curb radii, consideration of transit stops, crosswalk locations, enhancement of lighting conditions, and, ultimately, through the reduction of parking at curbs.	First step in prioritizing curb space is to meet mobility goals, meaning city staff will consider pedestrian, bike, and transit plans and needs before allocating remain space for other uses. Safety of all users will be considered in each step of the process.
	7) GDPC (a hand selected group) also is interested in collaborating with the City on a future brainstorming workshop with representatives from several City departments to discuss the possible vision for a more integrated parking / land use policy beyond what is within the scope of the Curb Management Policy.	Comment noted.
	8) GDPC believes consideration should be given regarding cluttering of streetscapes with paint and signage, and/or providing users such as on-street valet operations with excessive space causing safety and operational issues. Additionally, the City should acknowledge its partnership with third-party vendor applications for metered parking spaces that will need to be updated as the parking locations/rates change.	The policy document highlights current issues with signage and valet operations and has outlined recommendations and actions to address these issues.
	9) As codification of guidelines slows the evolution and implementation of periodic changes to such policies via required City Council action, consideration should be given to remedying this potential bottleneck by implementing an administrative, staff level review and approval process.	The proposed code amendment will allow administrative approval within establish parameters approved by City Council. However, installing parking meters within an area will require city council approval.
4	"I am tired of non-residents parking in my resident-only parking area... 5700 block of Vickery Blvd. We also need a safe cross walk installed at Vickery and Greenville.	Comment noted. Evaluation for a Crosswalk and parking enforcement can be requested by submitting a 311 request.

#	Comment	Response
5	<p>1) We recently learned that people living in Justice 40 communities are spending upward of 54% of their income on Transportation costs. DART is working on enhancing the Customer Experience. One comment we consistently hear from riders is that we need to make transit faster and more reliable. An initiative underway is CORE, Corridor Optimization and Rider Experience, and the overarching goal is to prioritize transit. Traffic Regulations and Curb Management strategies fall in one of the categories of CORE improvements. Where dedicated bus lanes exist, please do not eliminate. Along the core frequent bus routes, consider dedicated lanes and prioritize transit over other uses specifically valet and loading zones.</p>	<p>There is no intention to remove existing dedicated bus lanes. Meeting mobility needs, including transit, is the highest priority when allocating curb space.</p>
	<p>2)The following comments regarding the On Street Parking and Curb Management Policy Document shared list the page number associated with the comment: Page 4 - we agree with the Driving Principles and believe all are important to elevate the role of transit priority specifically in areas like Downtown or other entertainment and/or busy districts.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>3)Page 5 - under Goals & Objectives, we recommend adding the following objective for On-Street Parking & Curb Management, "Designation, Signage and enforcement for transit stops/lanes".</p>	<p>Instead of objection an action item has been added to Chapter 8: Signage and Striping to designate bus only lanes with proper markings and signage.</p>
	<p>4) Page 7 - within the Existing Curb Use Inventory section, differentiate type of Travel Lane by creating an additional bullet to identify the type of travel lanes, such as auto/general purpose lanes or transit/bus lanes. This category includes bus lanes for bus operations and bus stops "</p>	<p>Text revised to note bus only lanes also fall under this category.</p>
	<p>5) Page 11 - After adding a Transit Lane category on page 7, Figure 1.4 should reflect the following on the Downtown Curb Use Map: oWB Elm Street (Olive to Harwood) should reflect as a bus lane only on map oA segment of Elm further west (Field to Market) should reflect as a bus-only on map oEB Commerce Street (Lamar to Field) should reflect bus-only lane on the map oPage 11 - Figure 1.5 Downtown Curb Use Length Percentages, include Bus-Only Lane and Valet Parking/Operations category in the circle chart oWB Elm Street (Akard to Field) should reflect that the curb lane is used for valet operations and should be noted on Figures 1.4 oAdd SB Akard (Pacific to Elm) should reflect that curb lane is used for valet operations and should be noted on Figure 1.4</p>	<p>Maps reflects inventory conducted in early spring 2021. A new inventory of curb uses will be conducted following adoption of policy document.</p>
	<p>6) Page 18 - under General Findings from a Curb Use Inventory, agree with the challenges identified. Another challenge should be added to indicate Bus Lanes are also improperly signed and marked</p>	<p>Comment noted. Inconsistency between signage and curb uses are Addressed in first bullet under, <i>General Findings from Curb Use Inventory</i>.</p>
	<p>7) Page 22 - Ensure the proposed locations of the micro-mobility vehicles do not restrict safe boarding and alighting at both the front and rear doors; preferably do not locate corrals inside of the 40' length of the buses.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>8) Page 29 - within Figure 2.4 Best Practices for Locating Curb Uses Along a Block, DART favors far-side stops for the safety reasons listed and would like text amended to include the following: "Placement of the bus stop on the far side of the intersection prevents right-turning vehicles to dangerously cut-off buses proceeding forward after their stop. improves operations when coupled with Transit Signal Priority and increases the visibility of passengers boarding and exiting as they cross the street and allows the bus to depart promptly."</p>	<p>Comment noted. Changes incorporated.</p>
	<p>9) Pages 60-63 - Loading Zones, DART recommends designating loading zones on minor, side streets where there is minimal bus activity as opposed to on major roadways as to not interfere with speed and reliability of bus operations.</p>	<p>Recommendation will be considered.</p>
	<p>10) Page 62 -Note that DART's morning peak bus volumes begin at 6:00 am and would like the flex loading zones adjusted to align</p>	<p>Transit operations will be considered when siting flex loading zones.</p>
	<p>11) Page 65 - DART welcomes a collaborative discussion regarding how existing valet operations are impacting our bus routes and welcome your expertise on how to implement effective solutions that minimize negative impacts to operations.</p>	<p>City will consult with DART on proposed changes to valet program to ensure impacts to transit operations are mitigated.</p>

#	Comment	Response
	12) Page 77 - Figure 8.1, FHWA has issued an Interim Approval to use the red lanes for transit. The interim approval requires municipalities to submit a written request for approval before use of the lanes. Please consider the use of red lanes for transit for higher visibility and use a different color for No Parking.	The use of red pavement or concrete serves as a clear signal to drivers that parking, and standing are not allowed. There is no anticipated ambiguity in employing the red color for both a transit-only lane and the curb.
6	<p>1) Pg 2 :: OVERLOOKED STAKEHOLDERS Residents who are not business leaders have NOT been included on your Advisory Committee. The issues faced by residents are distinctly different from issues faced by business leaders. The community organizations' representatives who are listed on your stakeholder advisory committee are clearly business leaders, not representatives of residents-at-large. For this planned proposal to fully represent the interests of all Dallas citizens, a group of residents needed to be included on your committee. Their exclusion means this planned proposal hasn't been fully vetted by those who are most affected: ordinary citizen residents.</p>	<p>Committee members selected for their capacity to impartially represent the interests of both businesses and residents in their respective districts.</p> <p>The needs of businesses were emphasized in the document due to their heavy reliance on curbs for access to customers and freight. Addressing business needs directly is an avenue to mitigating spillover parking into residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>The policy document acknowledges the burden business generated parking places upon nearby residents and recommends a review of residential parking programs with input from residents. to ensure their effectiveness. It also suggests developing a strategy tailored to meet the specific needs of both residents and businesses within a neighborhood.</p>
	<p>2) Pg 9 :: JEOPARDIZED SAFETY IN OLDER NEIGHBORHOODS Not mentioned in your policy draft is a widespread issue in the older inner city neighborhoods like the ones built in the 1920s that surround lower Greenville Avenue, where streets are often quite narrow. When cars are parked on both sides of these narrow streets, the travel lane is reduced to one lane only. In addition to impeding traffic flow in such cases, it most critically prevents those streets from being accessible by large emergency vehicles like fire trucks.</p>	Considerations for on-street parking restrictions for can be requested at any time by submitting a 311 request.
	<p>3) Pgs 10-17 :: OVERLOOKED DISTRICT: LOWER GREENVILLE AVENUE The districts included in your study are Downtown, Uptown, Bishop Arts and Deep Ellum. Not included in this list, despite being a busy entertainment district, is Lower Greenville Avenue. Neighborhood life is impacted to extremes by the proximity of this entertainment district. Parking is a massive problem-generator in our area, requiring far more engagement by code enforcement and police officers on weekends. Lower Greenville Avenue should've been included and studied for this proposal.</p>	A limited budget and brevity prompted the profiling of a few select areas to represent a range of neighborhoods and conditions. Bishop Arts was chosen to illustrate areas with a mix of restaurants, shops, and bars in a main street setting, surrounded by residential neighborhoods, similar to other areas facing comparable challenges like Lower Greenville.
	<p>4) Pg 18 :: CONFUSING SIGNAGE & PRIORITIZING CURB FUNCTIONS On the perimeter of popular entertainment areas like lower Greenville Avenue, there are lots of parking problems within the neighborhoods DESPITE the presence of No Parking Anytime signs. Illegal parking repeatedly occurs on Fridays and Saturdays, even when enforcement officers distribute violations weekly. The allowance of MORE</p>	An action item is to update signage standards to clearly communicate curb regulations.

#	Comment	Response
	<p>SIGNAGE PER BLOCK could mitigate this problem. Many No Parking signs ARE CONFUSING. The phrase “No Parking from here to corner” doesn’t make clear WHICH corner is being referred to. Example: the 5700 block of Oram St at its intersection with Greenville Avenue. This block should be posted No Parking Anytime (as it was for at least 50 years prior to 2022). When parking is allowed on that block (as the sign seems to suggest), the consequence of parked cars on this block is that travel is reduced to one lane, which complicates turning on and off this very busy intersection. This creates a significant safety risk and a conflict point every weekend.</p>	<p>An area can be evaluated for additional signage by submitting a 311 request.</p>
	<p>5) Pg 35 :: DEFINING THE MPA BOUNDARIES In areas where the business district is contiguous with a residential neighborhood (multifamily or single family), an MPA boundary should NOT be allowed. Example: Lower Greenville Avenue’s residential area has no separation from the business district. Residents of the blocks immediately adjacent to that area are besieged by illegal parking even when No Parking signs are posted on those blocks. These residents need help from the City of Dallas to keep the chaos off our blocks. Suggestion: Keep the MPA boundaries at least one block away from residential streets.</p>	<p>Staff has decided to not consider MPA as a parking strategy. Focus will be on areas with paid parking. However, areas without paid parking can still request assistance to address issues with on-street parking and curb management.</p>
	<p>6) Pg 78 :: EMPOWER CITIZENS TO ENGAGE TOW TRUCKS The city of Austin solves the majority of its illegal parking problems by empowering its citizens to place calls for tow trucks to remove illegally parked cars. The city of Austin then covers that towing expense. This is a far more efficient system than in Dallas, which requires the involvement of city staff (police or parking enforcement officers) for approval and direct involvement in towing illegally parked cars. Yet on weekends, when this service is most needed, there isn’t enough city staff available to deal with the overwhelming parking problems citywide. So this problem becomes increasingly embedded as drivers realize they can park anywhere with zero consequences.</p>	<p>Followed up for clarity. No response.</p>
7	<p>1) p. 13: I dislike that regulations currently in code would be removed and relegated to an administrative entity which has less oversight from the public and less barriers to make changes that could adversely affect the public</p>	<p>The proposal is to remove the block-specific meter zones, rates, and enforcement times from the code to allow flexibility to address the needs of an area.</p> <p>City Council will retain oversight by establishing the parameters in which administrative review and approval can be exercised. These parameters will be regulated in the code. City Council will also have authority to establish boundaries of areas in which parking meters can be installed.</p> <p>The policy document outlines provisions for stakeholder engagement and public notification requirements.</p>
	<p>2) p. 19: I have concerns about the improvement process only being initiated when a business district sees fit to submit an application. This should be a proactive process pushed forward by the city since the proposed improvements affect the city’s amenities.</p>	<p>The process to establish a parking benefit district may be initiated by a business district, neighborhood association, or a public improvement district.</p> <p>Managing Parking Benefit Districts requires a high level of commitment that requires personnel resources beyond what the city has to provide. Allowing other entities to initiate the process ensures there is community support and commitment to ensure the Parking Benefit District is successful.</p>

#	Comment	Response
		City staff will work with the districts to identify improvements and will be responsible for leading implementation of improvements.
	3) p. 19: Flex zones are too complex to adequately police/monitor. Too many rules and differing times of day would be difficult for the city to enforce, and relying on reports from people who have an issue doesn't timely address inappropriate parking. Predictable rules that don't change force regular visitors to learn and relies less on many individual people understanding something complex	The plan is to keep flex loading zones simple at first and monitor performance. Additional uses will only be added if/where feasible.
	4) p.24: residential parking permit areas should absolutely stay unchanged. They exist for a reason, to prevent business needs from overshadowing the needs of residences in clearly residential areas. Variable or increased pricing will only lead to fewer residential users, not because they lack a legitimate use, but because they may lack the funds. That is not a good enough reason to "give away" these spots to businesses and business users. In residential areas, even if in close proximity to commercial areas, priority should absolutely be residential users at all times. Anything else is a giveaway to businesses who have ample revenue to provide appropriate parking through other needs. Residential areas don't need more congestion via flexible policies, and the idea that residential permits subsidize off street parking is frankly ridiculous. Assuming residential property owners in dense districts can afford to add off-street parking on small lots is ridiculous as well. Businesses that need more parking have regular sources of revenue that can be used to acquire it, not from the residential property owners who make up the majority of the areas around these businesses. Residential parking should be protected at all costs. I am strongly against making residential parking permits more expensive or not having them or decreasing the number/areas where they are valid. The city should not subsidize business owner parking needs in predominantly residential areas. Full stop.	The residential parking programs will be reviewed to ensure the programs are serving their intended purposes. The review will include opportunities for public input.
	5) P.27 agree with color curbs to make parking policies more visible, but this contradicts the idea of flex zones and I think is a further argument for why flex zones are too complex to be implemented well.	Flex zones will primarily function as loading zones for passengers, deliveries, and freight and will be identified by yellow curbs.
8	1) page 20: Figure 2.1 identifies garbage and recycling collection as functions of curb use, but nowhere else in the document are these priorities preserved and addressed. This is particularly pertinent to the spillover effects of a reduction in parking requirements into neighborhoods. It is apparent that the group developing this proposal has not worked closely with the group developing the parking reform proposal. At this morning's ZOAC, Sarah May indicated that her group did not know this proposal well enough to talk about it. And yet, the proposals are supposed to be complementary. See p.82 (discussing parallel consideration).	To maintain brevity, the policy document focuses on select curb uses due to their high demand and their need for substantial space and resources to manage. Sanitation is a fundamental consideration when allocating space for curb use and is therefore not elaborated in detail. The primary focus of collaboration with the parking reform team has been on overlapping topics. The curb management policy is predicated on the belief that demand surpasses supply and will persist, irrespective of the decision to eliminate off-street parking requirements. This policy sets forth a framework for the city to effectively handle the current and future surge in demand.
	2) pages 31-37: The model of MPA puts too great a burden upon neighborhoods. It also pits the neighborhoods' interests against the adjacent businesses who no longer have the burden of providing sufficient parking. Surely there is a better model than this one. Also, the 85% threshold is arbitrary and is a vague standard insofar as its actual application.	Staff has decided to not consider MPA as a parking strategy. Focus will be on areas with paid parking.

#	Comment	Response
		<p>The concept known as the 85% rule, performance pricing, linked to expert Donald Shoup, proposes establishing parking meter prices to uphold approximately 15% parking availability. The goal is to strike a balance, avoiding both insufficient and excess parking spaces. Through price adjustments aligned with demand, this strategy seeks to optimize parking utilization, alleviate congestion, and improve mobility as a whole.</p>
	<p>3) Page 37: why does Action item 3.2 state that the conversation starts with local businesses? What about the other stakeholders? Don't they count? 4) Pages 52-56: same comments as with MPA. why is this burden being shifted to adjacent neighborhoods, forcing neighborhoods to actively address it and pitting them against the business interest?</p>	<p>Staff has decided to not consider MPA as a parking strategy. Focus will be on areas with paid parking. Action Item has been removed.</p> <p>Managing Parking Benefit Districts requires a high level of commitment that requires personnel resources beyond what the city has to provide. Allowing other entities to initiate the process ensures there is community support and commitment to ensure the Parking Benefit District is successful.</p>
	<p>5) Pages 70-7 How did we come to have so many RPO zones that do not meet code criteria for RPOs</p>	<p>Per City code, RPO zones are intended to serve streets abutting of single-family and duplex uses only. Some RPO's are located on streets with multi-family uses.</p>
	<p>6) I disagree that only complete blocks of a residential street should be allowed to be RPO. Forcing neighborhoods to bear the burden and cost of spillover parking from adjacent businesses is not the answer. Its a recognition that the businesses will not provide the parking they need. This is a complete disconnect with the representations being made in the meetings on parking minimums that businesses WILL provide that parking.</p>	<p>The policy is based on the premise that the demand for on-street parking in many areas of the City is greater than the supply and that demand will continue to increase, regardless of whether the City eliminates off-street parking requirements for new developments.</p> <p>Effectively managing curb space can incentivize businesses to offer adequate off-street parking and employ strategies to regulate demand. Businesses are motivated to provide adequate off-street parking when they understand that customers are aware of parking availability, crucial for their success.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>1) Prioritizing and Allocating Space starting p. 19 Prioritize complete streets and use on-street parking to buffer bike lines from vehicular traffic. Reduce minimum number of parking spaces required for a Certificate of Occupancy.</p>	<p>Priority curb functions aligns with the City's Complete Street Design Manual. This policy does not make a recommendation about off-street parking minimums.</p>

#	Comment	Response
	<p>2) Paid Parking starting p. 14 Reduce the number of free parking spaces citywide. Fully support dynamic pricing for paid parking.</p> <p>Loading Zones starting</p> <p>3) p. 60 Reduce valet parking and please make rideshare like Uber and Lyft and delivery trucks like Amazon, UPS, and FedEx pay a premium for blocking lanes of vehicular traffic.</p> <p>Parking for special users starting</p> <p>4) p. 67 Please increase public electric vehicle charging.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Chapter 6 "Loading Zones." Outlines recommendations to improve valet operations and accommodate e-commerce delivery by expanding the use of flexible loading zones.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
10	<p>1) Disagree and dispute merging RPP and RPO programs. I do not recall that this was discussed at any of our meetings with the consulting team as the discussion nesses always commercial focused (not this recommendation certainly). I am not sure how they devised a recommendation on a Deep Ellum-specific program without speaking with anyone from Deep Ellum on it first. The RPO program is designed for single family and not multifamily which Deep Ellum is primarily made up of. Also, the recommendations do not fully consider how to address existing RPPs if absorbed. There likely needs to be a grandfather clause. Also, it does not address pending requests (we have some that have stalled because no one can decipher the current code and staff has turned over). These pending requests shouldn't have to start anew due to this change in policy. Again, prefer we keep the RPP and clarify and clean it up to meet Deep Ellum's unique needs as intended esp. since so very different than typical RPO locations like Greenville which is single family dominated. If we do merge, the RPO programs needs to be broadened to better suite multi family and more urban areas. Some of our residents were told by staff that they couldn't be helped because multi family vs. single family due to the RPO code. This code doesn't work for Deep Ellum then at all.</p> <p>2) Disagree on not supporting/subsidizing employee parking. Second recommendation on this point should include not only on-street but also city owned lots. Deep Ellum employees could park on further afield current and future parking lots under the highway. If we want to continue to encourage infill development and not parking lots everywhere and since Deep Ellum already did this in its PD, it is not workable to just start requiring employees to pay to park and all the burden be placed on them immediately. This is an equity issue driven by former decisions and policies providing benefits to various types of stakeholders and the City. Employees that are low paid service industry workers who work in parking constrained districts that Dallasites want to be walkable shouldn't bear the brunt of this policy change.</p> <p>3) I do not recall the conversations or meetings regarding parking benefits districts where we agreed 40/60 split on benefits being optimal. When it states "stakeholders" agreed, who does this mean? At what meetings? This rate should be higher going back to the PBD. It will be more expensive to operate programs for a PBD than the parking meter operators. Those funds should be put to good use and a significantly higher percentage should go back to the districts. Why should any profit go back to the general fund? It should cover cost and then all the rest goes to those districts specifically. The likely candidates for PBD are very small operators as compared to the City and if expected to manage these programs with any success, they need to be resources appropriately. Especially as Dallas' use of meters is so uneven across the City, the broader City and general fund should not get such a high proportion of the benefit when the cost and burden is all born in the district.</p> <p>4) Affirm loading zone timing should be determined not through generalities of this study but needs of the district. For instance, in an entertainment district, food and bev deliveries happen later in the day/afternoon. So, to suggest loading only up until 7am is not workable. While evening delivery should be precluded, more flexibility in the timeframe during day should be allowed. For Deep Ellum's commerce street redo, it is set as rideshare loading at night and all other deliveries during the day.</p>	<p>The residential parking programs will be reviewed to ensure they are serving intended purposes. The review will have opportunities for public input before changes are finalized.</p> <p>Chapter 7 "Parking for Special Users" outlines potential strategies to address employee parking.</p> <p>A 60% reinvestment allowance for a Parking Benefit District (PBD) is relatively high compared to other cities such as Austin (51%), Portland (51%), and San Diego (45%).</p> <p>The policy document provides illustrative examples of strategies without intending to prescribe specific approaches. City staff acknowledges that to address loading needs the approach should be nuanced and location-specific to ensure practicality and effectiveness.</p>

#	Comment	Response
	5) Action items of meeting with "business districts" are not sufficient. This does not solve the issue on RPPs or Employee parking, for example. Action items should be more detailed such as "meet to discuss, devise and present equitable solutions within a specified timeline to City Council and Council shall have a specified timeline to adopt, amend or reject."	Various business districts and neighborhoods are facing similar issues, albeit at different scales. Due to differing resources, a specific timeline for solutions cannot be established until initial discussions take place.
	6) Painting the curbs and phasing this is the best recommendation in here!	Comment noted.
	7) There is not enough specific treatment in this plan of rideshare, how those programs work, how their loading locations are determined and how the City vs. private operators are involved. Valet has its own section. It is a big omission to not also more specifically consider rideshare.	More information regarding rideshare zones has been added to Chapter 6 "Loading Zones."
	8) Another big area I have mentioned before but is still missing in this report is consideration of how all this should be paid for and staffed and at what clip. More specifics on exactly how much implementing some of these recommendations should cost should be in here. Especially consideration and actual numbers on the required amount of staff to implement this study's recommendations should be in here in line with each recommendation. One of the biggest problems not really addressed or noted in here is how understaffed and overwhelmed the DDOT is. Signage and striping is backlogged months and in some cases years. Regardless of planning, without these key resources, success will continue to evade Dallas in curb management.	Staff is taking inventory of staffing and funding needs to implement the policy.
	9) Deep Ellum established band loading zones. We followed the City's process and requirements and signage was installed and has been in place for some time now. These areas should not be precluded by this study. The goal to minimize and streamline signage should be worked through in work sessions with staff and Deep Ellum since Deep Ellum is specifically called out on signage clutter vs. any other district.	Comment noted.
11	1)On p. 28, Arranging curb uses along a block, it goes on to say A key tenant. That should be tenet. Tenants are renters. Tenets are principles.	Comment noted. Changes incorporated.
	2)On p. 60, the text mentions 7 types of loading zones and then goes on to list 6--freight, passenger, commercial, taxi, musician, and valet. I'm assuming the 7th is flex. There is no further discussion of musician or taxi.	Musician loading zones can be found in Deep Ellum, however they are not regulated or enforced by City code. They are existing due to unique circumstances. Taxi stands are regulated by City code but there are no designated on-street taxi stands
	3)Would like some clarification as to proposed new No Parking signs that rely on arrows and symbols. Would not consider pay-and-display a good choice for parking meters. They are hard to detect and inconvenient to walk back and forth to get and then display a ticket. Should not go to pay-by-phone only.	For example, a standard for NO PARKING signs involves the phrase "NO PARKING from here to curb." However, this wording often leaves drivers uncertain about which curb the rule pertains to, leading to confusion and occasionally resulting in fines for parking violations. Adding arrows to signs will clarify where along the curb the regulation applies. The city will consider various meter options independently or in conjunction to guarantee accessibility for all users.
	4)Code needs to be changed to require off-street loading for movers, incessant package delivery, and ride share for multifamily complexes. These complexes frequently have an entire lane of traffic blocked for this function that should be taking place off-street.	Chapter 6 "loading zones" provides recommendations to address loading

#	Comment	Response
		zones for new multi-family and hotel development.
	<p>5)I don't think it is necessary to be consistent between parking districts as far as default time periods and amount charged. The City also needs to balance what they are going to collect through increased parking-meter revenue versus lost sales-tax revenue attributed to people avoiding an area because of parking. One example is downtown on Sundays. It is very annoying to go downtown on Sunday and see a ghost town with most parking metered spaces empty. If you want a vibrant downtown, make Sunday metered parking free on Sundays downtown the same way daytime metered parking is free in Deep Ellum during the weekdays in order to bring some business to an area that has most activity as an evening entertainment district. If people came downtown on Sundays and didn't have to hassle with having enough change and keeping track of time or having to pay a high fee to park in an empty surface parking lot, the area would experience more activity and the City would get more sales-tax revenue. Jefferson operates in an entirely different way. It needs low-cost, cash meters during the day, and the charges should stop at 6 pm in order to stimulate night-time activity. Free parking in Deep Ellum during the day gets more people there for lunch and frequenting businesses.</p> <p>If the text is suggesting 8 am to 8 pm Monday-Saturday as its initial proposal, does that mean free metered parking everywhere on Sunday? I'd say 8 pm is too late. Downtown and Jefferson are better at 6. Daytime activity is over, rush hour is over, and people need to be encouraged to come downtown. 8 am is not practical downtown because the rush goes until 9, and that parking lane is needed for traffic. 9 to 6 downtown M-Friday. Free on Sundays. Probably on Saturdays.</p> <p>The text says the prime purpose of paid parking is to provide turnover and increase access to shops and businesses. If that is the case, then there is no reason to have paid metered parking downtown on weekends because there is no competition for street parking. It is a ghost town where parking meters are concerned. If people are some of the few downtown on the weekend, they shouldn't be penalized by hassling with payment and time limits. The City would recoup the parking revenue with sales-tax revenue, activity, and vibrancy.</p>	Policy document recommends multiple tools for staff to consider with input from area stakeholders to meet the specific needs of that area.
	<p>6)Two-hour default might work fine if the area is attracting a lunch business or daytime shopping and errand business. It doesn't work for medical areas where appointments can take any amount of time or for dinner business or entertainment areas. It definitely should not be the case in areas such as downtown on weekends when people might want to go to museums, eat a meal, and see the sights and have to worry about a two-hour limit on a parking meter. Valet operations definitely need some changes. Combined mid-block valet stands sound like an improvement, but valet operations right now in various areas such as Bishop Arts and the Design District operate without much concern for the overall area. Lax parking enforcement out of downtown/Deep Ellum.</p>	The city will consider a tiered pricing model that eliminates the default two-hour parking limit, enabling visitors to stay longer without the need to relocate their vehicles or face citations. However, the pricing will incrementally increase for each hour beyond the initial two hours of parking.
12	<p>There is overuse of on street parallel parking in my neighborhood because some apartment dwellers park on street instead of in their off-street garage. Perhaps there should be a fee for these people to routinely park on the street.</p>	If the on-street parking is creating difficulty accessing your property, submit 311 request to have street evaluated for parking restrictions.
	<p>A high-rise office building by Crow Holdings located at 4024 Maple Ave. is under construction now. There appears to be 60-80 employees on this job every day. They all drive their personal vehicles to work. The GC, Henry C Beck Company provides a lot that is 2 blocks away that some use, but many park on the street, totally monopolizing the on-street parking every day but Sunday. In my view we need an ordinance for large construction projects, which prohibits construction workers from parking on the street, especially in built out areas such as Oak Lawn.</p>	An ordinance aimed at tackling illegal parking associated with construction activity is still under consideration. In the interim, individuals can seek parking enforcement by submitting a 311 request.
13	<p>Are the current Town Hall Budget meetings addressing the additional costs for parking management, signage, curb coloring?</p>	The Town Budget Hall Meetings will focus on the upcoming fiscal year's budget. While the policy is expected to minimally affect this year's upcoming budget, potential impacts are anticipated in future budgets.

#	Comment	Response
14	Cycling infrastructure and safe streets are very is very important to me. My preference would be to not have to drive everywhere if I don't have to and Dallas is a car-infatuated city. Increasing cycling parking and infrastructure in favor of more parking would make Dallas more friendly to non-drivers and would make my life better.	The initial step in allocating curb space involves aligning with mobility goals outlined in city plans, such as the Dallas Bike Plan. However, the possibility of coexistence between parking and bike lanes is possible if the street layout permits.
15	Downtown: I love the idea of less parking and giving the space to local businesses. One thing to consider for high density area is the number of deliveries from online stores. (not sure if they qualify under loading). One KEY element of the success is to plant trees in urban areas (and I dot mean parks) but on sidewalks. Every sidewalk, downtown uptown, Deep Ellum should have more trees. Not only to look to the future and curb "urban heat domes) but it is necessary if you have patios for businesses.	Policy document recommends expanding the use of flexible loading zones as a solution to meet the increasing demand for e-commerce delivery services. Greening (trees, shrubs, and planter boxes) is recognized as a core curb function and will be prioritized where feasible.
16	Every morning when I leave my apartment complex for work, there is parking on both sides of the street to where you can barely get one car through. One day I'm gonna get slammed by some arrogant, entitled, impatient sorry excuse for a human being and bleed out in the driver's seat all because two schucks in suits keep arguing about the cost of parking and "capitalism" so keep that in mind when making your decision.	Comment noted.
17	Forgot to mention another comment in my last response. For the issue of loading vehicles not able to park on the street or special cases like moving trucks - the city needs to implement a temporary parking ban for those areas. Most other cities I've lived in have a program where you can pay the city (typically 20-30 bucks) to get a permit to ban a small section of parking for a limited set of time on a day, where you can then post signage at the beginning and ending of these spots. I've found no such program here and often see giant trucks blocking some streets because there is nowhere to park, which is a worse issue. It would be hugely beneficial to try and implement something like this.	Staff will consider how to address the need to allocate space temporarily for special needs such as moving trucks.
18	GENERAL COMMENT: Concentrations of parking like the ones in Deep Ellum and Bishop Arts impede emergency vehicles from moving through easily. The reduction in street lane widths as well as the inability of the districts to control deliveries of goods during peak service hours creates levels of chaos for patrons, business owners, and delivery services.	Chapter 6 "Loading Zones" acknowledges the need to better regulate commercial loading by recommending strategies for staff to consider including, incentivizing off-peak loading, and expanding the use of flexible loading zones.
19	I agree there is an extreme amount of No Parking in many areas of the city. We have so many roads in the city with 3+ lanes that do not encourage street parking or outright don't allow it. Go to any other major city that focuses on transit and you'll rarely see that. Most of these areas would still not be congested with one less lane in some areas. By allowing street parking in these areas, it will help provide a buffer to pedestrians and businesses, as well as slowing down traffic to safe levels. I'm also starting to see a lot of Resident Permit only parking which is extremely strange considering that everywhere I've seen them, the residences all have parking spaces at their residence. I think these permitted areas should be looked into as it is just a thinly veiled way to deter parking in areas that are in the middle of the city for no good reason. Similarly, I think there is not really a good reason to discourage parking in single family neighborhoods. I have lived in areas that had parking in neighborhoods and it did not impact my life in any way to even the smallest degree. Unfortunately, if you're choosing to live in a city there's going to be other people crossing through where you live. Trying to zone and segment things so rigidly is only hurting our growth as a walkable and more dynamic city. Discouraging or eliminating those areas would only add to the issues at hand. If you want a prime example of this, just look at the chaos around Smoky Rose by White Rock. Plenty of areas to park but it's been banned almost everywhere but the parking lot of the building. This leads a lot of people to not want to go to these places. Unless we want to blight the city with even more parking lots/parking garages, I feel like this is inevitable part of living in a city. Lastly, and the most important thing is to truly cut down on the need for more parking we need to start targeting the core issue of our	Request to evaluate a corridor for on-street parking can be submitted through 311. Both residential parking programs will undergo a review to ensure they fulfill their intended purposes without adversely affecting other curb users with rightful access.

#	Comment	Response
	<p>city not having good public transit. We need public transit that better serves trips within neighborhoods and urban areas, and not just as a tool to commute to work and back. Most of the DART stations are a sea of empty parking lots. If I have to drive to a DART station I might as well just try to my destination. We need to start developing transit around the densest areas of the city and encourage development around stations if we want to solve the real problem. Most other resolutions are only a temporary fix.</p>	
20	<p>I am in agreement with the drafted policy. If anything, I would recommend raising the base price of metered parking even higher. Thank you for your work on this.</p>	<p>Comment notes. Parking will be priced to maintain a maximum 85% utilization rate.</p>
21	<p>I am only one property owner, so I don't presume to represent all who will attend the meeting. Today, however, in addition to studying the draft policy, I have conferred with most of those invited, so as a courtesy I want to alert you to the objections to "managed parking" in Bishop Arts you might expect, and the reasoning behind those objections.</p> <p>1)To jump to the punch line, no one I've reached out to wants Bishop Arts declared a Managed Parking Area (MPA); therefore, expect a fervent effort to remove the portrayal of Bishop Arts in the policy document as some kind of model for MPAs</p>	<p>Staff has decided to not consider MPA as a parking strategy. Focus will be on areas with paid parking.</p>
	<p>2)You're likely to hear disbelief that City Hall wants to meddle in the district's parking scheme when there is no evidence that affected property owners, merchants, the merchants' association, nearby residents or the surrounding neighborhood association have asked the City to intervene. There's the same disbelief that no one with a commercial interest in the district was recruited for the advisory committee or even interviewed by Transportation staff. How did the process get this far – just short of Council approval, per your calendar – without Bishop Arts being consulted? The document opens with: "The districts and streets that were selected for the inventory were identified by the Department of Transportation staff as having the greatest conflicts."</p> <p>What conflicts? Have staff collected 911 or 311 complaints related to parking conflicts? Reports of one driver assaulting or threatening another? Damage to public or private property as a result of parking conflicts? Complaints by emergency workers whose access was blocked by errant parking?</p>	<p>The advisory committee incorporated a representative for the Bishop Arts Area, with members selected for their capacity to impartially represent the interests of both businesses and residents in their respective districts.</p> <p>During the public engagement phase of policy development, efforts were made to collect feedback from the broader public. The Bishop Arts Merchants Association was contacted to inform them about the policy and seek input from their members.</p> <p>Districts were chosen based on 311 requests for enforcement and parking management.</p>
	<p>3)Probably everyone at next Friday's meeting will concede that parking in Bishop Arts is crazy. Our streets were platted in 1889 for use by horse and buggy. Now 18-wheelers arrive at dawn to deliver to our restaurants, followed by the first of three shifts of workers, then FedEx and UPS with inventory shipments, then a caravan of construction trucks, then a parade of Uber drivers lasting until late night – with every minute between filled by patrons and pick-up drivers. Yet, it works! The policy document bemoans "ad-hoc curb management," but it is precisely that flexible skein of individual decisions by drivers that makes the most efficient use of our 26-foot-wide streets. Because almost all our businesses are "mom and pops," there is constant dialogue between owners: Can you ask the beer truck to come earlier? Tell your valet service not to park vehicles on the public street. Can you ask your new server not to park in front of my store all day?</p>	
	<p>4) By contrast, the City's efforts at parking management are illusory. Bike-lane and crosswalk paint wears off in a couple of years, never to be refreshed. Posted time limits are never enforced, nor are no-parking-on-this-side-of-street signs. Abandoned cars sit curbside for weeks without being towed. Next Friday, prepare to hear a lot of cynicism about City Hall's ability to help.</p>	<p>Staff are taking inventory to determine budget and staffing needs to implement policy</p>
	<p>5) As I described over the phone, installing parking meters in Bishop Arts will immediately cut our inventory of curbside parking in half: Flanking Bishop Ave., our streets (7th, 8th, Melba, etc.) typically feature twenty 50'-wide lots, each served by a driveway about 12' wide, leaving 38' of curb per property. Drivers (employees, patrons, delivery, etc.) routinely parallel-park two vehicles in that 38', using the adjacent 12'-wide curb-cut to maneuver in and out. Transportation will have to create by-the-book 22'-long parking spaces – thus eliminating 20 spaces per block. I observe that about 20 surrounding blocks serve Bishop Ave. If each of those 400 spaces you just eliminated would</p>	<p>The policy document does not advocate for the installation of parking meters in the Bishop Arts area. Instead, it offers strategies to tackle common issues associated with on-street parking and</p>

#	Comment	Response
	<p>otherwise serve retail and restaurant patrons 12 hours a day, that's a lot of sales tax the City is scaring away. Eliminating those spaces also pushes commercial parking further into surrounding neighborhoods, creating longer journeys for pedestrians, which is more opportunity for crime. An MPA in Bishop Arts fails to pencil-out.</p>	<p>curb management without imposing strict directives.</p>
	<p>6) Guessing at your age, at the same point in my career I was compiling planning studies similar to the MPA policy, so I very much sympathize and am grateful for your efforts. However, next Friday, a chorus of Bishop Arts stakeholders is likely to press you and Dr. Khankarli to downplay how Bishop Arts is featured in Transportation's presentation to City Council. The draft document opens with, "Bishop Arts is intended to represent areas like Lower Greenville...." It would be an embarrassment to the department and to Councilman West if, at the "horseshoe," Bishop Arts demands to opt out as an MPA. In that regard, I suggest you make a substantive change in the language on p. 33: Under "Step 1," MPA creation should only be initiated by local interests, not by the City alone. Similarly, while the draft policy makes clear that City Council approval is required to create a Parking Benefit District, it is not clear who approves an MPA. Bishop Arts' experience thus far demonstrates that City Hall cannot presume to know the priorities of MPA-candidate neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Staff has decided to not consider MPA as a parking strategy. Focus will be on areas with paid parking. Action Item has been removed.</p>
22	<p>I don't have time to read a 90 page study, but I can tell you the problems in my Oak Lawn neighborhood.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
23	<p>I like the overall idea of increasing meter prices to make parking more available.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
24	<p>I live in the Knox District area on the corner of Oliver and Travis streets. We usually try and take the side streets to I-75 since Knox street has been reduced down in size and there is so much traffic on that street now. But because parking is allowed on both sides of Oliver street, it's rare for us to be traveling either east or west without having to pull over to allow a vehicle going in the opposite direction to pass. I know the area needs parking - but having that much congestion on these small streets is a recipe for disaster. In my opinion, side streets like Oliver, Armstrong, Lee, etc should only allow parking on one side of the street. In addition, 3 lanes one way roads tend to encourage drivers who are not familiar with the area to turn right or left out of the middle lane right in front of other vehicles! We see this happen all the time on Cole - not so much on Mckinney. When I say we see it all the time on Cole - at least 2 times a week. Between people pulling wide to turn in to Trader Joe's, and turning out of the middle lane to turn left on Armstrong or Oliver - we are extremely careful in trying to keep distance between us and other drivers. If you reduced the 3 lanes down to 2 and had parking on one or both sides of those streets, that might solve two problems at the same time - people would be less likely to turn out of the wrong lane, and it would create more parking spaces.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Service Request has been submitted to evaluate Oliver and Leet streets to restrict parking on one side of street.</p>
25	<p>I think we need to remove parking minimums and allow more on-street parking so that patrons can go to stores with parking on the street. Additionally, remove the required parking spots in front of businesses and allow for more walkable / pedestrian focused infrastructure</p>	<p>The Planning and Urban Design Department is actively addressing off-street parking requirements. If these requirements are eliminated, the tools outlined in the policy document will be instrumental in managing the increased demand for curb access.</p>
26	<p>I wanted to send a note expressing support for the concept of Managed Parking Areas in areas with high on-street parking occupancy, especially when paired with a parking benefit district to return funds to the neighborhood. During today's meeting with stakeholders in Oak Cliff, there were several questions raised about the prospect of a managed parking area and I wanted to make some suggestions on how to address them.</p> <p>1) Visual clutter</p> <p>When imagining paid on-street parking, most parties envision the old meters we are used to seeing in Downtown, Deep Ellum, or Baylor hospital areas. These meters do indeed require a relatively large amount of sidewalk space and considerable expense to install and maintain. Emphasizing the low-impact nature of modern multi-space pay stations (such as this one on the 1900 block of Main Street serving the entire block) may allay fears about cluttering up the scarce sidewalk space.</p>	<p>The policy recommends updating current parking meter infrastructure, suggesting solutions such as a single pay station serving multiple meters and the use of pay-by-app signage to minimize the risk of visual clutter.</p>

#	Comment	Response
	<p>2) Loss of parallel spaces I believe I heard an example given of a 50ft lot with a 12ft curb cut that can currently fit 2 ad-hoc parallel parking spaces but only 1 official 22ft long parallel space. This loss could compound over several lots until there are only eighteen 22ft official spaces where there were once 33 usable spaces. Once again using multi-space pay stations to service a paid parking zone can address this concern. If a pay station is used, the curb usage can continue to be maximized without losing parallel spaces. 1900 Main Street again serves as a great example as cars fit the available space without need to regard the suggested markings. While I would recommend a more permanent solution of removing the definition of parallel parking spaces being 22ft from the city code. For purposes of the curb management plan, multi-space meters should address the concern</p>	<p>Parking space dimensions are regulated by the TMUTCD, with a specified minimum size. However, the manual allows for some flexibility by permitting end spaces to have a minimum length of 20 feet.</p>
	<p>3) Visitors won't come if they have to pay for on-street parking</p> <p>In practice, paid on-street parking (where occupancy is high and appropriately priced) helps stimulate business. When Ventura, CA implemented parking meters in 2010 by 2013, 83% of business owners within the district supported the meters with it earning a unanimous endorsement from the board of the neighborhood business association. The Ventura BID Executive Director praised the PBD, saying "some of our most vocal proponents of the meters had been our merchants, who have now come to appreciate that their customers can usually find a stall in front or near their store for little more than a dime or a quarter.</p> <p>On-street parking is very valuable: far too valuable to leave unmanaged! Shopping center owners know this: Many centers have rules in their leases dictating that employees cannot park in the spaces closest to shop entrances and even have staff patrolling to enforce this to ensure easy customer access to shops.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
27	<p>I would like to see an allowance of free parking for residents of the 75208 zip code. Bishop Arts has become so busy that those of us who live here cannot find a place to park in order to support our local businesses anymore.</p>	<p>Currently, Residential Parking Only zones can be requested through 311. A petition signed by occupants of two-thirds of the residences and business establishments abutting the side or sides of the street block(s) for which the zone is requested is required to establish zone.</p>
28	<p>I would love to see more resident only parking in the Bishop arts district, specifically on Melba St. Parking is hard enough for residents during the week, but weekends are almost impossible. I have to circle the block for 15+ minutes just to find parking, only to have to walk 3-4 blocks back to my home.</p>	<p>Currently, Residential Parking Only zones can be requested through 311. A petition signed by occupants of two-thirds of the residences and business establishments abutting the side or sides of the street block(s) for which the zone is requested is required to establish zone.</p>
29	<p>If I understood correctly, there seems to be a concern for how increased parking rates will affect low wage employees. Do you consider that many travelers consider taking transit if parking costs are unaffordable?</p>	<p>The consideration of employees using transit to avoid parking fees is acknowledged, but the primary objective is to support those who commute during late night or early morning hours when DART is not in operation.</p>
30	<p>I'm not sure. I'm using this opportunity to register a concern.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
31	<p>Is it reasonable to designate loading zones on side, minor streets, not major thoroughfares ?.....or is half a block away too far for some of these loading/unloading activities to occur? Maybe this practice is already occurring and I just haven't noticed.</p>	<p>Staff will take this into consideration when commercial zoning regulations and permits are under review.</p>
32	<p>Keep the City out of parking to the fullest extent possible. The City government cannot handle its current responsibilities, let alone take on additional ones. Focus on removing encampments and cleaning up streets, not further eroding the fabric of this city with more unconnotational micromangement controlling regulations. Street parking is just for that parking for vehicles, not scooters or other social justice warrior propaganda that hypocrites on</p>	<p>The policy document offers guidance on managing parking in city owned rights-of-way and controlled parking areas, to</p>

#	Comment	Response
36	My concern is that significant street parking and certain open parking lots in and around Bishop Arts have been co-opted by commercial valet services. How could this happen? Are not our city streets property of the public? What city entity allowed for this, and is the contract creating this arrangement available for public scrutiny?	To obtain a permit, valet operators are required to submit an application to the Department of Transportation. The regulations governing valet operations are outlined in Section 43-126.7 of the City Code.
37	Page 15-16: I would like to comment on pricing. Pricing Structure should not be based on 85% Occupancy of lots. The city should not be in this as a "profit" based company. All pricing should be determined from the minimum amount required to cover costs of maintaining the parking lot structure, related equipment, surrounding area, and related staff, etc. plus covering for any inflation/over run costs. Charging more in high 85% occupancy forces people to circle, causing more traffic, pollution/air quality concerns, safety concerns for pedestrians and cyclists, and can hamper nearby businesses. Having full parking lots is NOT a concern - it is both a benefit to nearby businesses and to the city in the tax revenue it generates.	The performance-based pricing structure seeks to enhance public access to parking by promoting turnover of parking spaces. If the price is too low, it would lead to drivers occupying spaces for extended periods, causing others to circle searching for parking. Setting prices with an 85% utilization goal ensures the availability of one to two parking spaces at all times to prevent illegal parking and drivers from circling.
38	page 45. Additional meters should be considered for Park Ave between Taylor and Canton. This is in an mpa. currently just overflow from surrounding MF, taking away availability from patrons of Farmers market.	Parking meters can be requested by sending an email to the Parking Management and Enforcement Division at TRNParkingServices@dallas.gov
39	Page 45. Installing parking meters on 900 block of S Harwood. It is in an MPA, I believe. Currently, overflow from existing MF takes up spaces from patrons of the Farmers Market. The bike lanes that exist currently on west side of street have next to no usage and could expand street parking	Parking meters can be requested by sending an email to the Parking Management and Enforcement Division at TRNParkingServices@dallas.gov
40	<p>Page 75 - "Confusing signs". I have email a few request about clarification of a sign on Denton Drive, Dallas TX to TRNParkingServices.</p> <p>I live at Lenox Maplewood Apartments, located at 5490 Denton Drive Cut Off, Dallas, TX 75235. On Monday, July 10, at approximately 1:20PM, a parking enforcer was observed writing violations on Denton Drive, specifically in between Denton Drive Cut Off and Hudnall Street. The top sign says "no parking here to corner" and the bottom says "No parking or standing anytime". An enforcer is writing violations for every car leading up to the sign vs those only parked from the corner to the sign. The sign is simply misleading and causing conflicts amongst neighbors who own houses.</p> <p>I am a recent resident of this street and neighborhood. However, according to other neighbors, these violations have been ongoing for several weeks if not months. Are you able to park in between Denton Drive Cut off and Hudnall Street, until the "No parking, here to corner" sign?</p>	Parking is prohibited on both sides of the sign. Service request has been submitted to review signage and determine if/what changes are needed.
41	Pertaining to parking in Downtown Dallas - No Curb Parking should be allowed on any part of Akard - North/South from Tollway to Elm. FIG is the worst offender of this and it is constantly backing up traffic. If the city does redo the parking/add more - then reinforce it with tickets and especially during rush hour. You want more people in the city core, then help traffic flow better and make parking away from the main entry points.	Comment noted.
42	Please fix the roads, the curbs are much less important!	Comment noted.
43	<p>Stakeholders in the area bordered by Montfort, the Tollroad, LBJ and Alpha should consider elements of an On-Street Parking and Curb Management Plan when the Council has finalized it. Slide 21 and 22 could be of particular interest when developing how a street handles transit and mobility hubs.</p> <p>It would be infinitely easier to implement some basic parking, transit and safety principles before the park is built. Otherwise we are going to have issues with pedestrian safety, traffic, on street parking, etc. in and around the park. There has always been the thought that the entire International District will need a Parking Management Plan in the</p>	Safety of road users is the highest priority when allocating curb space.

#	Comment	Response
	future (garage parking etc.). Parts of the On-Street Parking and Curb Management Plan could be a first step in that process.	
44	The Lower Greenville Neighborhood Association(LGNA) and its residents have significant concern about the verbiage regarding RPO's on page 70. The verbiage indicates the existing RPO zones do not meet the criteria of the code. The concern is that the RPO zones will be revoked. RPO's are important to our neighborhood to avoid the inundation of traffic from local businesses onto our residential streets. We've experienced this in the past. Prior to establishing RPO's, this inundation caused issues with residents not having a place to park in front of their homes, with safety concerns from bar goers returning to their cars late at night, and to the overall stagnation or reduction of property values. LGNA residents live in a residential area by purpose, and do not wish their residential property to become commercial parking lots on weeknights and weekends. Please confirm and ensure that the RPO's located in in the LGNA are not revoked.	The City has no plans to eliminate current RPO zones. Both residential parking programs will undergo a review to ensure they fulfill their intended purposes without adversely affecting other curb users with rightful access. The review process will provide opportunities for public input.
45	These are good policies, thanks for your work on this.	Comment noted.
46	This plan ignores a growing problem with available curb space and the decline of property values: The storage of junk vehicles on the streets as part of auction-purchased vehicle resale businesses operated out of homes and apartments. These businesses abuse the use of free curb parking and paper license tags by using fake tags or swapping out legitimate paper tags for different names and models. Dallas should have an ordinance that allows traffic enforcement to issue citations for vehicles parked on the street with expired paper tags, fraudulent tags or expired vehicle inspections and tags from out of state. This problem is seen in the suburbs along Gramercy Oaks and Timberglen, as examples. The owners of these vehicles should be fined and subject to towing. At present, the 24 hour ban against unmoved vehicles is the only tool available. It is not doing the job and requires constant vigilance and effort beyond what homeowners should be expected to do.	Comment noted.
47	Valet parking: Oversaturation in Downtown Dallas must be addressed.	Chapter 6 "Loading Zones," provides recommendations and actionable steps for the city to take in order to tackle the challenges that neighborhoods are facing with valet operators.
48	While this plan addresses issues within the major business and commercial districts, it neglects emerging neighborhoods expected to have population booms. I encourage the committee to expand their parking expertise, especially those with a large population growth expected within the next 2-5 years. Growing areas include Oak Lawn, West Love Field, Medical District and Lower Greenville. Parking has become a major issue in the areas mentioned, and it'll be more problematic within the next five years as townhomes, apartments and other housing are completed.	The document profiled select neighborhoods to represent the range of neighborhoods in the city experiencing parking challenges. Staff is mindful of changing neighborhoods where the utilization of curb space is expected to pose a growing challenge. The tools highlighted in the document will be accessible to these areas as well to formulate a parking strategy customized to their specific needs.
49	Why are people allowed to park in the wrong direction?	Parking in the wrong direction is illegal. Vehicles found parked in the wrong direction may receive a citation.
50	Why is it illegal to park at a meter in downtown from 4-6 pm for those of us that work past 4pm we have to pay \$20 to park in a parking garage which the cheapest is \$17 and if you work every day it's around 300-400 a month, that's a car payment why am I paying that price for the "luxury" of driving my own car to work?	Peak parking restrictions are active from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. and 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. The purpose of peak parking restrictions is to allow the parking lane to be used as a travel lane to allow commuters to get in and out of business districts during the morning and evening peak traffic hours. Chapter 7 "Parking for Special Users" proposes solutions to address the unique

#	Comment	Response
		parking challenges experienced by employees working in the city's business districts.
51	With the RPO permit process stay the same as it is today?	The policy document recommends a review of the RPO program. Changes to the program are to be determined. The City will provide opportunities for public input during the review process.
52	Would like to see less cars parked in the street, in general. Whatever that looks like, I would welcome. Including extending outdoor restaurant space and food truck usage in those entertainment districts. It might require expansion of DART services which I would absolutely welcome.	Comment noted.
53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many businesses in the CBD use private haulers to remove waste from front-load dumpsters that are on casters and are wheeled into the street in the evenings/overnight to be emptied, and are removed from the right-of-way afterwards. This is permitted by City Code Sec. 18-6. • Some historic buildings in the CBD have no interior or alley space for dumpsters and instead rely on 96-gallon residential rollcarts serviced directly by Sanitation. These carts are often placed against the buildings, on the sidewalk within public view, at all times between collections. This is not compliance with City Code, but is allowed due to the historic nature of the buildings and their design which predates the relevant ordinance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ These carts are then placed on the sidewalk just behind the curb in the CBD for manual collection. Crews should be able to wheel the carts to and from the truck with minimal lifting or maneuvering around curbs or other obstructions. ○ Sanitation provides collection services 7 days per week in the CBD. Some customers elect daily service, therefore their rollcarts are permitted to be at the curb at all times. ○ Sanitation is exploring alternative service models in the CBD for certain locations which have numerous carts out daily, which is unsightly. Behind the Majestic Theatre on Pacific is the first location under consideration for an alternative service model. Large, shared trash containers (European-style) permanently placed at the curb on Pacific or in an on-street parking spot (which is frequently hooded for Majestic events) would better serve that building and the adjacent building at the corner of Harwood. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This collection model may also be more desirable within the next decade for other dense residential areas identified in the Curb Management Policy, that are currently serviced manually using 96-gallon rollcarts. • As on-street parking becomes denser, regulations related to cart placement will likely need to be revised to allow placement on the street on the traffic side of parked cars. Crews may not be able to reasonably access them otherwise. This is not attractive, but 	DDOT will coordinate with the Department of Sanitation on a process to evaluate allocation of curb space to minimize conflicts with waste collection schedules and bin and dumpster placements.

#	Comment	Response
	<p>short of more large shared waste containers in the right-of-way, as are common in Europe, it may be needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="247 245 1396 342">• Many modern large buildings in the subject areas have dumpsters or stationary compactors at-grade or underground, which are not publicly visible, and would not be affected by issues listed above.	