Memorandum

DATE   September 25, 2009

TO   Transportation and Environment Committee Members: Linda L. Koop (Chair), Sheffie
     Kadane (Vice Chair), Jerry Allen, Tennell Atkins, Carolyn R. Davis, Angela Hunt, Delia Jasso,
     Pauline Medrano, Ron Natinsky, Vonciel Jones Hill

SUBJECT   Transportation and Environment Committee Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, September 29, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
City Hall, 1500 Marilla, Room 6ES
Dallas, TX 75201

1. Approval of Minutes for September 15, 2009
   (Action / 5 Minutes)

2. Presentation on “Great Streets”
   Thomas Brink, AIA, LEED AP, Vice President, RTKL Associates Inc.
   Erich Dohrer, Urban Design Director, RTKL Associates Inc.
   (Briefing / 50 Minutes)

3. Motor Vehicle Tow Rate Increase
   John Brunk, Assistant Director, Public Works and Transportation
   Gary Titlow, Program Manager, PWT Transportation Regulation
   (Action / 30 Minutes)

4. Valet Parking
   John Brunk, Assistant Director, Public Works and Transportation
   Zena Fernino, Program Manager, Public Works and Transportation - Parking
   (Briefing / 30 Minutes)

[Signature]
Linda L. Koop, Chair
Transportation and Environment Committee
Meeting Date: September 15, 2009   Start Time: 2:05 p.m.   Adjournment: 3:31 p.m.

Committee Members Present:
Linda L. Koop (Chair), Sheffie Kadane (Vice Chair), Jerry Allen, Tennell Atkins, Carolyn R. Davis, Angela Hunt, Delia Jasso, Pauline Medrano, Ron Natinsky, Vonciel Jones Hill

Committee Members Absent:
None

Other Council Members Present:
Mayor Pro Tem Dwaine Caraway

City Executive Staff Present:
Jill Jordan, Assistant City Manager
A.C. Gonzalez, Assistant City Manager

TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes for August 11, 2009 and August 25, 2009

Action Taken/Committee Recommendation:

Motion was made to approve the corrected minutes for the August 11, 2009 meeting subject to any further corrections. Corrected minutes were approved as submitted.

Made by: Kadane   Seconded by: Atkins   Passed unanimously

Motion was made to approve the minutes for the August 25, 2009 meeting subject to corrections. Ms. Hill requested that the minutes be revised to remove hyphen in her name. The minutes were approved with the correction to Ms. Hill name.

Made by: Atkins   Seconded by: Kadane   Passed unanimously

2. RTC Sustainable Development Call for Projects – Project Recommendations

Presenters: John Brunk, Assistant Director, Public Works and Transportation
PM Summer, Senior Planner, Public Works and Transportation
Mr. Summer provided an overview of the RTC Sustainable Development Program, and briefed the Committee on the process used to solicit private sector project proposals then evaluate and rank the projects. Staff asked the Committee to endorse the recommended projects for submission to NCTCOG by the October 2, 2009 deadline. Karl Stundins and Sue Hounsel from Economic Development helped answer Committee questions on specific projects.

**Action Taken/Committee Recommendation:**

Ms. Davis asked if all the projects submitted were around train or light rail transit stations. Mr. Summer confirmed that many were near rail transit stations, however, some were located along bus routes as well. Ms. Davis asked if all the submitted projects would be awarded funding. Mr. Summer stated that it was likely that only about a third of the submitted projects would be approved for funding. He explained that the City’s recommended projects would be submitted to the North Central Texas Council of Governments for review. The Regional Transportation Council (RTC) would then decide which projects would be funded.

Motion was made to endorse the recommended project list as presented to the Committee.

Made by: Allen Seconded by Davis Passed unanimously

3. **Taxicab Task Force Status Report – Temporary Modification of Insurance and Age Limit Requirements**

**Presenter:** John Brunk, Assistant Director, Public Works and Transportation

Due to a conflict of interest, Ms. Koop was not present in the briefing room for this item.

Mr. Brunk provided an update on the Taxicab Task Force and presented a proposal to temporarily modify insurance and age limit requirements that was originally presented to the Committee on June 8, 2009. Staff requested that the Committee either endorse the changes and move it forward to full Council, or reject the proposals and instruct the Taxicab Task Force to continue its work.

**Action Taken/Committee Recommendation:**

Mr. Kadane asked if the City of Dallas changes its insurance requirements such that they don’t match the requirements of DFW Airport, can Dallas taxicabs still serve the airport. Mr. Brunk stated that if the Dallas Council takes action to change the current insurance requirements, the proposal would be taken to the Airport Board for their consideration. However, DFW Airport representatives have stated that they will not change their insurance requirements unless both Fort Worth and Dallas make the same change. A taxicab would be able to drop off passengers at the Airport if the
insurance requirements were different but would not be able to pick up passengers at the Airport.

Mr. Atkins asked that the Committee not forget that we are making rules that affect the region, not just Dallas and Fort Worth. Mr. Brunk stated that one of the primary goals of the Task Force was to look at the Taxicab issues from a regional perspective.

Ms. Hunt asked what percentage of Dallas taxicabs go to DFW Airport per day. Mr. Brunk indicated that staff didn’t have that number available. Ms. Hunt asked if there was a general consensus that we have an over abundance of taxicabs in our area. Mr. Brunk stated that the general consensus was that we do have too many taxicabs. Ms. Hunt stated that she has reservations about lowering any of our standards. Ms. Hunt asked if Fort Worth was interested in making these same changes being discussed. Mr. Brunk stated that the representative from Fort Worth supports keeping the current standards.

Ms. Davis asked about Fort Worth’s standards. Mr. Brunk responded that Fort Worth requires $500,000 in liability insurance and has a 5-year age limit on taxicabs. Ms. Davis asked if taxicab companies might go out of business. Mr. Brunk stated that given the current economic recession and overabundance of taxicabs, it was possible that some of the smaller companies may go out of business in the next few months. Ms. Davis asked why there would not be enough taxicab business with the NBA All-Star game, NFL Super Bowl, and new Convention Center Hotel. Mr. Brunk indicated that although special events would bring taxicab business, the day-to-day business would not necessarily be enough to support all the currently permitted taxicabs.

Ms. Jasso stated that she is concerned about the total number of cabs within the City.

Mr. Allen stated his support for the current requirements and that he is in opposition to lowering those standards.

Mr. Natinsky stated that he is in opposition to lowering current requirements, but indicated his support for moving towards a regional approach.

Motion was made to maintain the current requirements of $500,000 combined single limit for liability insurance and five years for the taxicab age limit.

Made by: Natinsky Seconded by: Allen Passed unanimously
4. **Love Field Modernization Program Bond Financing Preparations**

**Presenter:** Dan Weber, Director, Department of Aviation

Mr. Weber provided a brief overview of the Love Field Modernization Program bond financing preparations. The Department of Aviation asked that the Committee recommend approval of their request to authorize the City Manager to execute a supplemental agreement with Unison Consulting Group to conduct a Bond Feasibility Study.

**Action Taken/Committee Recommendation:**

This item was briefed to the Council’s Budget, Finance and Audit Committee earlier in the day. There was no further discussion.

Motion was made to recommend approval and move this item forward for full Council consideration on September 23, 2009.

Made by: Hunt  
Seconded by: Atkins  
Pas**sed unanimously

Linda L. Koop, Chair  
Transportation and Environment Committee
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DATE  September 25, 2009

TO    Members of the Transportation and Environment Committee:
      Linda L. Koop (Chair), Sheffie Kadane (Vice Chair), Jerry Allen, Carolyn R.
      Davis, Tennell Atkins, Angela Hunt, Pauline Medrano, Delia Jasso and Ron
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SUBJECT  Presentation on “Great Streets” Briefing

Attached is the “Presentation on Great Streets” briefing that will be presented to
you on September 29, 2009.

Please contact me if you need additional information.

Jill A. Jordan, P.E.
Assistant City Manager

C:  The Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
      Mary K. Suhm, City Manager
      Thomas P. Perkins, Jr., City Attorney
      Deborah Watkins, City Secretary
      Craig Kinton, City Auditor
      Judge C. Victor Lander, Administrative Judge
      Ryan S. Evans, First Assistant City Manager
      A.C. Gonzalez, Assistant City Manager
      Forest Turner, Assistant City Manager
      David Cook, Chief Financial Officer
      Jeanne Chipperfield, Director, Budget and Management Services
      Edward Scott, Director, Controller’s Office
      Helena Stevens-Thompson, Assistant to the City Manager – Council Office
      Rick Galceran, P.E., Director, Public Works and Transportation
      Theresa O’Donnell, Director, Development Services
Streets are more than connectors, they are the city...
Streets are the glue that hold a city together...
Streets are the means in which a city is perceived and understood.
Streets are a tangible result of our civic goals and aspirations.
What makes a “great street”???

- Convey the quality, character, and aspirations that distinguish the neighborhood or district
- Provide a framework for activity involving any and all members of the community
- Create a ‘sense of ownership’ by those who work and live on the street
- Balances a diversity of modes… without compromise to any
Streets have been given over exclusively to the realm of the automobile.

At the expense of all other users.
The results are communities that are centered around convenience and parking.
No priority has been placed on identity...

...or maintained any lasting value
Our cities have become a bi-product of a financial exercise.
The streets have become anonymous...
…and we haven’t provided room for people.
The Great Streets concept is a strategy for rebalancing the street.

Addressing the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, transit users...**and** the automobile...
The Kit of Parts: What does it take to create a more balanced approach???
The Kit of Parts: What does it take to create a more balanced approach???
Creating a Balance
Pedestrian Realm:

Sidewalks should include three main zones:

- Planting/Buffer Area
- Sidewalk
- Front Door
Pedestrian Realm:

Pedestrians need sidewalks. Without sidewalks there are no pedestrians.
Pedestrian Realm:

Planting/Buffer Area

• Creates a buffers between pedestrians and oncoming traffic

• Unifies the streetscape

• Provides shade for pedestrians

• Introduces natural features into an urban area

• Creates an area to house ancillary uses (bike racks, transit shelters, street lights, kiosks, etc).
Pedestrian Realm:

Sidewalks

• Sidewalks need to have a clear zone that allows area for two people to walk side by side. Street trees, lighting, newspaper racks, etc. should not be placed in this zone.

• Sidewalks should provide areas for interaction with the building (i.e. entrances, outdoor dining and retailing, storefronts). Think of the sidewalk as a catalyst for civic activity.
Plazas and streets closed to vehicular traffic should be considered a part of the pedestrian realm.
Pedestrian Realm:

Front door

• Front door areas provide space for interaction with the building (i.e. outdoor dining, retailing, seating, and planting areas).

• Front door areas should be designed with the building’s intended ground floor use in mind. Buffer vs. Entrance
Pedestrian Realm:

Intersections

Curb neck downs reduce the crossing distance at intersections.
Pedestrian Realm:

Intersections

Medians provide pedestrian refuge at the center of the street.
Expanding a median’s width can create a centralized open space.
Clearly marked intersections alert drivers to the presence of pedestrians.
Details: Bio Swale
Details: Canopies / Awnings
Details: Street Lamps
Details: Paving Materials
Details: Planters
Bicycle Lanes
Bicycle Lanes:

Painted Bike Lanes
• Low Cost
• Highly Flexible
• Provides clear demarcation for cyclists and automobiles
• Limited by existing R.O.W. width
Bicycle Lanes:

Curbed / Separated Bike Lanes

- Curb or physical separation safe for the cyclists
- Allows for higher volume of bicycle traffic
- Requires greater R.O.W. commitment
Details: Bicycle Rental
Details: Bicycle Racks / Bike Storage
Details: Bicycle Racks / Bike Storage
Transit
Transit:

Dedicated Right-of-Way

- Reduces traffic conflicts
- Can be placed within existing medians
- Allows room for passenger boarding without slowing other traffic
- May require street closure, lane reduction, or wide existing R.O.W.
Transit:
Integrated with Automobile Traffic

- Maximum flexibility in developing routes
- Uses the least amount of space
- Allows transit to be located in areas with narrow R.O.W. without reducing traffic lanes.
- Creates more transit/pedestrian/automobile conflicts.
- Helps to slow automobile traffic.
Detail: Transit Stops

Buses Stops / Transit Stops

• Foster a safe environment and protection from the elements
• Provides a clear arrival and departure point
• Creates an opportunity for public art
Automobile Traffic
Automobile Traffic:

Narrow Drive Lanes
• Reduce traffic speed in pedestrian areas

On-street Parking
• Provides a buffer between the street and sidewalk
• Beneficial to ground floor retail

Intersection Demarcation
• Slows traffic at crucial areas
• Alerts drivers to the presence of pedestrians

Speeds are determined by the street design, not the posted speed.
Narrow traffic lanes, curb neck downs, and buildings built to the edge of the street create a sense of ‘compression’ that will slow traffic.
Automobile:

On Street Parking

- Provides a pedestrian buffer
- Creates opportunities for convenient parking
- Enhances driver’s awareness of surroundings
Automobile:

On Street Parking
Automobile:

Intersections

- Traffic tables and textured paving marks pedestrians crossings and slow down traffic
Details:

Smart Meters

• Accept multiple forms of payment

• Allows payment for spaces from any meter in the district

• Integrates with wireless technology
Details: Zip Car

- Zip Car
  - Car rental for short distance trip
  - Integrates with public transit system
  - Cars located throughout city rather than central facilities
  - Integrates wireless technology
  - Works well in cities where not everyone owns a car
Closing Thoughts:

• Great Streets is an opportunity to balance multiple modes of transportation. As a country we are trending away from using the automobile as the exclusive mode of transportation.

• ‘One size fits all’ approaches to street design does not work. Land use, traffic volumes, identity, and existing context all play a role in streetscape approach.

• Use streets to organize districts or corridors. All treatments do not have to be the same, but consistency in materials, design, and approach help to create unity.
Thank You

Erich Dohrer, AICP
edohrer@rtkl.com

Tom Brink, AIA, LEED AP
tbrink@rtkl.com
DATE September 25, 2009

TO Members of the Transportation and Environment Committee:
Linda L. Koop (Chair), Sheffie Kadane (Vice Chair), Jerry Allen, Carolyn R.
Davis, Tennell Atkins, Angela Hunt, Pauline Medrano, Delia Jasso and Ron
Natinsky, Vonciel Jones Hill

SUBJECT Motor Vehicle Tow Rate Increase Briefing

Attached is the "Motor Vehicle Tow Rate Increase" briefing that will be presented
to you on September 29, 2009.

Please contact me if you need additional information.

Jill A. Jordan, P.E.
Assistant City Manager

c: The Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
Mary K. Suhm, City Manager
Thomas P. Perkins, Jr., City Attorney
Deborah Watkins, City Secretary
Craig Kinton, City Auditor
Judge C. Victor Lander, Administrative Judge
Ryan S. Evans, First Assistant City Manager
A.C. Gonzalez, Assistant City Manager
Forest Turner, Assistant City Manager
David Cook, Chief Financial Officer
Jeanne Chipperfield, Director, Budget and Management Services
Edward Scott, Director, Controller's Office
Helena Stevens-Thompson, Assistant to the City Manager – Council Office
Rick Galceran, P.E., Director, Public Works and Transportation
Theresa O'Donnell, Director, Development Services

"Dallas, The City That Works: Diverse, Vibrant and Progressive"
Motor Vehicle Tow Rate Increase
(Chapter 48A of the Dallas City Code)

Briefing to the Transportation and Environment Committee
Prepared by Transportation Regulation Program
Public Works and Transportation
September 29, 2009
Regulated Wrecker Services

- PWT Transportation Regulation is responsible for regulating two types of wrecker services:
  - “Vehicle Tow Service” that relates to the removal of vehicles from private property without the consent of the owner (City Code – Chapter 48A)
  - “Emergency Wreckers” that relates to the removal of wrecked, disabled and illegally parked vehicles from public streets and property (City Code – Chapter 15D)

- This briefing and recommendations only affect Chapter 48A of the City Code – Vehicle Tow Services
Purpose of Briefing

- Brief the Committee on a proposed rate increase related to motor vehicle tows regulated under Chapter 48A of the City Code
- Request Committee endorsement of the proposed rate increase
Rate Increase

- City Code identifies a methodology for the tow industry to request a rate study
- The procedure requires the industry request come from companies representing at least 50% of the vehicles towed in Dallas from the previous permit year
- Three permitted motor vehicle tow companies requested a rate increase in January of 2009
City staff conducted a review of the tow sheets and found that the three companies represented approximately 46% of the towed vehicles from the previous permit year.

City staff notified the companies that they had not met the minimum requirements as established in the Code and issued a refund of all but $250 of the $5,000 required to initiate a rate study.
Rate Increase
(continued)

- Council approved a rate increase for Emergency Wreckers on February 11, 2009 – historically the rates for emergency wreckers and motor vehicle tows have been the same.

- Since the last rate change for motor vehicle tows services was in 2001 and emergency wrecker rates were recently updated, staff was asked to brief the Committee on a possible rate increase.

- Although City Code provides a procedure for the motor vehicle tow industry to request a rate study, the City can initiate a rate increase.
Rate Increase
(continued)

- Staff conducted a rate study:
  - Change in U.S. Department of Labor Consumer Price Index (CPI) since last rate change in 2001 was 27% -- this amounts to a change from $95 to $121 for a light duty (passenger vehicle) tow
  - Surveyed major Texas cities to determine current towing rates
Rate Increase
(continued)

- Major Texas cities – summary of light duty rates:
  - Austin $150.00
  - San Antonio* $180.00
  - Houston* $212.25
  - Arlington* $202.50
  - Ft. Worth** $202.50

  Average of Other Cities $189.45

- Dallas $95.00

* Indicates private property tow fees are not regulated by the city, however state law allows for one and a half times the tow fee allowed for police tows.
**Ft. Worth sets the private property tow rate at 150% of the police tow rate
Rate Increase
(continued)

- Recommendation is to adjust rates up 27% which places Dallas well below the average rate for private property tows among major Texas cities:
  - Light Duty (vehicle less than 10,000 pounds)
    - Rate increase from $95 to $121
  - Medium Duty (vehicle between 10,000 and 26,000 pounds)
    - Rate increase from $150 to $191
  - Heavy Duty (vehicle more than 26,000 pounds)
    - Rate increase from $350 to $445
Next Steps

- If endorsed by the Transportation and Environment Committee, staff will develop an ordinance revision with the City Attorney’s Office and schedule it for full City Council consideration in November 2009.

- City staff will work with industry representatives and the City Attorney’s Office on a review of the motor vehicle tow regulations to strengthen the City’s ability to effectively protect the public’s interests.
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SUBJECT: Valet Parking

Attached is the “Valet Parking Service License for Use of Public Right-of-Way” briefing that will be presented to you on September 29, 2009.

Please contact me if you need additional information.

Jill J. Jordan, P.E.
Assistant City Manager

C: The Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
Mary K. Suhm, City Manager
Thomas P. Perkins, Jr., City Attorney
Deborah Watkins, City Secretary
Craig Kinton, City Auditor
Judge C. Victor Landre, Administrative Judge
Ryan S. Evans, First Assistant City Manager
A.C. Gonzalez, Assistant City Manager
Forest Turner, Assistant City Manager
David Cook, Chief Financial Officer
Jeanne Chipperfield, Director, Budget and Management Services
Edward Scott, Director, Controller’s Office
Helena Stevens-Thompson, Assistant to the City Manager – Council Office
Rick Galceran, P.E., Director, Public Works and Transportation
Theresa O’Donnell, Director, Development Services
Valet Parking Service
License for Use of Public Right-of-Way

Transportation and Environment Committee Briefing
Prepared by
Parking Management Program
Public Works and Transportation
September 29, 2009
Purpose of Briefing

- In late 2008, staff applied requirements from the Development Code to the review of the location of valet parking
- Parking Management assigned a Parking Enforcement Officer to focus on valet services
- The valet industry raised some concerns about the changes, so the Council asked staff to meet with business and industry representatives to review the process
- This briefing will present issues that the Valet Task Force has identified for Committee discussion
Business Community and Valet Industry Goals

- Return to a simplified approach to licensing valet services consistent with other Texas cities:
  - Require only written authorization or contracts to use remote parking lots
  - Provide rigorous review and enforcement of parking space location to ensure spaces are not committed to another use
- Allow paid valet services to use required parking consistent with other Texas cities
- Update valet license ordinance to enhance control over the quality of valet service – consider adopting a requirement for an operating authority for valet service
Current City Code

- Dallas City Code only licenses valet services operating on (1) public right-of-way or (2) using the public right-of-way for maneuvering vehicles
  - Chapter 43 – Streets and Sidewalks
  - Article VI – License for the Use of Public Right-of-Way
  - Division 3 – Valet Parking Services

- Valet parking service means a business, or any part of a business, which provides a driver to operate a person’s vehicle to and from a parking location so that the person and any passengers in the vehicle may unload and load at their immediate destination (Section 43-126.3)
Department Responsibility

- Parking Management Program in Public Works and Transportation administers and enforces the Valet Parking Services division of the Code

- Responsibility will shift to the Dallas Police Department on 10/1/2009

- PWT coordinates with other departments on application review; most notably, Building Inspection
## Advantages and Disadvantages of Valet Parking Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience for the business customer – don’t have to spend time looking for a parking space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced distance to business for disabled customer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficient use of available parking spaces – packed parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less need for construction of additional parking spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better security – attendant oversight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fees may be charged or tips may be expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some parking patrons do not like to use valet parking (paid or complementary) which may make it harder for them to find a parking space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prime parking spaces are lost near the entrance to a business for loading and unloading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less/More off-site parking on nearby streets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City Issued Valet Licenses
(107 total licenses issued – see attached map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant/Bar/Club</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Medical/Residential</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Jasso)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Medrano)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (Natinsky)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (Margolin)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (Hunt)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# City Procedures Regarding Location of Valet Parking Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior to 2006</th>
<th>2006 to 2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowed required parking to be used for paid valet services</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed required parking to be used for complimentary valet services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of remote parking needed written permission only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of remote parking subject to Certificate of Occupancy, Residential Adjacency Reviews, Special Parking Agreements</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Location of Off-Street Parking for Valet Parking Services

- The application for a valet parking service license must contain the location of off-street parking to be used in connection with the valet parking service and a signed agreement or other documentation showing that the applicant has a legal right to park vehicles at that location (Section 43-126.5(e)(5))
Interrelationship between Valet Parking Services and the Development Code

- Discovery in 2008 that staff was granting licenses for paid valet services to use required parking prompted a review of procedures.

- Requirement that applicant must have a “legal right” to park vehicles at the designated location introduces a linkage between the Valet Parking Services license process of Chapter 43 and the Development Code.
Development Code Issues

- Required off-street parking must be free
- Commercial parking lot certificate of occupancy is being required for paid valet and remote parking
- Residential adjacency review (RAR) is being required for commercial parking lot certificate of occupancy that meets residential proximity criteria
- Special parking agreement (property deed restriction) is being required for parking spaces that are required for another use
## Valet Permitting Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 43 - Valet Parking Services</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valet license application fee</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual valet parking service license fee</td>
<td>$250 to $1000 per parking space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual valet stand fee</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valet signs and curb markings</td>
<td>$25 per sign or marking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 51A - Development Code</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Parking Lot Certificate of Occupancy</td>
<td>$215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Adjacency Review</td>
<td>$50 plus the cost of remediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking agreement</td>
<td>$375 for the first 50 parking spaces plus $12.50 for each additional space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site plan review</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Valet Services and…
Required Off-Street Parking

Definition: Required Off-Street Parking

- Except for the central area district, required off-street parking must be available as free parking or contract parking on other than an hourly or daily fee basis; this does not apply to institutional uses (Section 51A-4.301(a)(8))

For Valet Services:

- **Paid** valet services cannot use required parking; even if the valet parking uses excess parking spaces in a remote lot, unless the zoning allows for paid parking
- **Complementary** valet services can use required parking provided that there are no access restrictions to the parking spaces, and signage indicates that the valet services are complimentary and the spaces are available for self-park
Where is Paid Parking Allowed

- Institutional Uses
  - Community service center; foster home; child-care facility; halfway house; church; convent or monastery; cemetery or mausoleum; public or private school; college, university, or seminary; library, art gallery, or museum; hospital; and convalescent and nursing homes, hospice care, and related institutions uses

- Central Area District Zoning
  - Generally areas downtown

- Planned Development Districts that specify that paid parking is allowed
  - Example is PD 193 (Oak Lawn) for nonresidential uses having frontage on a special retail street – parts of Cedar Springs Road, Knox Street, Maple Avenue, McKinney Avenue, and Oak Lawn Avenue
Inconsistent Treatment of Valet Services

- Valet services provided entirely on private property do **not** require a license from the City – some of these are paid services that use required off-street parking

- Examples:
  - NorthPark Center
  - Hilton Anatole Hotel

- Since valet services on private property are not regulated, they are not required to meet any particular standards (e.g., liability insurance coverage)
### Valet Service and Other Texas Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulations</th>
<th>Dallas</th>
<th>Austin</th>
<th>Fort Worth</th>
<th>Houston</th>
<th>San Antonio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effect of Free Parking

- Requirement for free parking encourages an auto dominated transportation system
- forwardDallas! Plan contemplated more transit oriented development that would encourage alternative travel modes by reducing the amount of parking and allowing pricing
- Recently approved Form-Based zoning moved this direction by allowing paid parking when it is provided as structured parking
- Paid parking allocates more of the cost of using an automobile directly to the user which encourages use of other modes (carpooling, transit, bicycling and walking)
Business Community and Valet Industry Goals

- Return to a simplified approach to licensing valet services consistent with other Texas cities:
  - Require only written authorization or contracts to use remote parking lots
  - Provide rigorous review and enforcement of parking space location to ensure spaces are not committed to another use
- Allow paid valet services to use required parking consistent with other Texas cities
- Update valet license ordinance to enhance control over the quality of valet service – consider adopting a requirement for an operating authority for valet service
Other Potential Code Modifications Regarding Valet

- Consider extension of valet license from 1 to 2 years
- Add provision for a temporary license
- Review valet stand requirements – signage identifying cost of service, complaint hotline, permit information including route and location of valet parking
- Review application and license fees – disparity between level of CBD and non-CBD license fees
- Review and update insurance requirements – needs to be industry specific
- Review company requirements – compliance with federal and state labor and tax laws
- Review valet attendant requirements – background checks, company identification, visibility
Next Steps

- Review Council Committee discussion of valet license requirements
- Complete evaluation of insurance, fees and other potential code amendments
- Hold a public meeting to obtain input from the community, businesses and valet industry about valet license requirements
- Develop final recommendations for review by the Transportation and Environment Committee