

# Accessible Parking Policy Advisory Committee Recommendations Report

---

Updated January 7, 2014

## Executive summary

On a daily basis, people with disabilities have trouble finding parking in San Francisco, making it more difficult to access their destinations. Current disabled parking placard and blue zone policies are failing to increase access for people with disabilities, reducing parking availability for all drivers. The City's Accessible Parking Policy Advisory Committee worked together to find a better solution.

In October 2012, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and the Mayor's Office on Disability brought together the Accessible Parking Policy Advisory Committee, a stakeholder group comprised mostly of disability rights advocates. After six months of collaborative work, the group came to a broad consensus on a package of policy recommendations to increase access to street parking and reduce disabled parking placard misuse.

The Mayor's Office on Disability, the SFMTA, and members of the Accessible Parking Policy Advisory Committee are conducting significant stakeholder outreach regarding these recommendations. Outreach began in May 2013. At the same time, the SFMTA has taken steps towards implementing the recommendations that are under local control. Local recommendations including increasing the number of blue zones and improving disabled parking placard misuse enforcement. Other recommendations require changes at the state level. These include improving the DMV's oversight of placard approvals and allowing qualified jurisdictions the option of requiring meter payment and four-hour time limits for placard holders.



Mayor's Office  
on Disability



**SFMTA**  
Municipal  
Transportation  
Agency

**Table of contents**

**The committee: a stakeholder process ..... 3**

    Committee members ..... 4

**Problem: insufficient access for people with disabilities ..... 5**

**Criteria: ensuring solutions that increase access ..... 5**

**Research and information: a well-informed committee ..... 7**

    Information about San Francisco and the Bay Area ..... 7

    Best practices research ..... 10

**Policy alternatives: developing and analyzing 20 options ..... 11**

**Recommendations: proven solutions to improve access ..... 12**

    1. Increase blue zones ..... 12

    2. Improve enforcement of placard misuse ..... 12

    3. Increase oversight of placard approvals ..... 13

    4. Allow jurisdictions to remove the meter payment exemption ..... 13

    5. Direct an equivalent amount of revenue to accessibility improvements ..... 14

    6. Allow jurisdictions to establish reasonable time limits ..... 14

**Timeline ..... 15**

    1. Conduct outreach regarding recommendations ..... 15

    2. Take steps to implement items that are under local control ..... 15

    3. local support ..... 15

    4. State legislative process ..... 16

    5. Establish local policy ..... 16

**Outreach presentations list ..... Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**Appendix I: Committee meeting schedule ..... 19**

**Appendix II: Outreach for the Oct. 19 accessible parking forum ..... 21**

**End notes: URLs for links in document ..... 32**



## The committee: a stakeholder process

In October 2012, the SFMTA and the Mayor's Office on Disability gathered 16 stakeholders to review and make recommendations regarding on-street accessible parking policies. The majority of the Accessible Parking Policy Advisory Committee members were disability rights advocates, many of whom use disabled parking placards. They were joined by a representative from the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) as well as members representing business, regional transportation, and medical voices.

The committee worked together from October 2012 to March 2013 and took the following steps:

- Identified problems related to parking access
- Established goals and criteria for choosing solutions to problems
- Reviewed research about the San Francisco Bay Area and best practices from across North America
- Proposed and analyzed solutions
- Developed a package of recommended solutions

The SFMTA hired a third party professional facilitator to ensure the process moved forward and all voices were heard. Staff members from various City departments were available as resources, but only Committee members participated in voting and decision-making.

To facilitate in-depth discussion and to help guide the process, a steering committee, representing a subset of the committee, met monthly to recommend items for discussion by the full committee and provide direction and input to staff on research, analysis, and materials for the meetings.

See Appendix I for the full Committee schedule, including the purpose of each meeting and links to agendas and meeting notes.

## COMMITTEE MEMBERS

### Co-chairs

- Carla Johnson, Interim Director, Mayor's Office on Disability
- Ed Reiskin, Director of Transportation, SFMTA

### Steering committee

- Jessie Lorenz, Independent Living Resource Center of San Francisco
- Bob Planthold, Disability Beacon Award winner
- Stu Smith, Paratransit Coordinating Council
- Roland Wong, SFMTA Multimodal Accessibility Advisory Committee and Mayor's Disability Council
- Ann Flemer, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)

### Members

- Andrew Conway, Department of Motor Vehicles
- Pete Curran, San Francisco Medical Society
- Dorene Giacomini, MTC Commissioner
- Vera Haile, San Francisco Commission on Aging
- Henry Karnilowicz, San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations
- Bonnie Lewkowicz, Access Northern California
- Cristina Rubke, Member, Board of Directors, SFMTA
- Jeff Spicker, Building Owners and Managers Association
- Dee Workman, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

### Staff

Staff from the Mayor's office; San Francisco Board of Supervisors; Office of the City Attorney; and SFMTA Accessible Services, Sustainable Streets, Enforcement, Finance and IT, SF*park*, and Government Affairs attended meetings as resources.

### Facilitators

Richard Weiner and Bonnie Nelson, Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates

**Problem: insufficient access for people with disabilities**

The Committee’s first task was to define any problems related to disabled parking placards, blue zones, and on-street parking access in general. They identified the following:

- People with disabilities can't find parking
- There isn't enough parking turnover to ensure there's enough parking for everyone
- Public perception that people with hidden disabilities don't deserve placards

**Criteria: ensuring solutions that increase access**

Based on the existing problems, the Committee then developed criteria by which they would evaluate possible policy solutions.

**EFFECTIVENESS CRITERIA**

Effectiveness criterion	Measure	Desired results
Makes it easier for people with disabilities to find parking in blue zones	Change in parking availability in blue zones	Improved parking availability in blue zones
Makes it easier for people, especially those with disabilities, to find parking in general metered spaces	Change in parking availability at general metered on-street parking spaces	Sufficient parking availability at metered on-street spaces (improved in congested areas)
Reduces placard misuse	Expected change in placard misuse	Reduction in placard misuse
Recognizes diverse needs/requirements of the disabled community	Whether or not policy is suitable for people with disabilities who are low income vs. not low income, and for different types of mobility impairments	Policy designed to be suitable for some variability in income and disability type



**FEASIBILITY CRITERIA**

Feasibility criterion	Measure	Desired results
Approval feasibility	<p>Policy/legal change requirements</p> <p>Likelihood of support</p> <p>Ease of explanation to policymakers</p>	Sufficient comprehension and support to achieve approval
Ease of user interface	<p>Whether it meets ADA requirements</p> <p>Whether policy is easy to understand</p>	Fulfills ADA, and existing communications channels are sufficient to make outside visitors understand changes.
Implementation and operational feasibility	<p>Capability (ability + resources + technology) of relevant agency/agencies to implement and operate solution</p> <p>Feasibility in other California jurisdictions</p>	<p>Relevant agency/agencies have sufficient capability</p> <p>Feasible in other jurisdictions</p>
Financial feasibility	Fiscal impact to City	No adverse fiscal impact to City
Time needed to get new policy approved and implemented	Anticipated year of implementation	A mix of near- and far-term solutions

## Research and information: a well-informed committee

The Committee reviewed significant research about disabled parking placards and blue zones in San Francisco, the Bay Area, and in cities across the country.

### INFORMATION ABOUT SAN FRANCISCO AND THE BAY AREA

The Committee reviewed the following research documents regarding San Francisco and the Bay Area:

- [Accessible parking background information](#)<sup>i</sup>
- [Blue zones overview](#)<sup>ii</sup>
- [Blue zone locations map](#)<sup>iii</sup>
- [Disabled parking placards and license plates overview](#)<sup>iv</sup>
- [Disability, low income status, and car availability statistics overview](#)<sup>v</sup>

Below is a summary of this information.

#### Blue zones

Blue zones are intended to ensure that people with disabilities can park close to public destinations, and only those with valid disabled parking placards can park in them. Blue zones are marked by signage and blue curb paint and are generally located in areas with high public use, such as commercial areas and near public parks and playgrounds.

San Francisco has 29,200 on-street metered parking spaces and 700 unmetered on-street blue zones, equivalent to 2.4 percent of metered spaces. Up to this point, most blue zones in San Francisco have been established by requests via the San Francisco 311 Center or an [online application](#).<sup>vi</sup>

Blue zones provide a higher level of accommodation than other parking spaces, with ramp access, space for wheelchair lifts, and relatively level streets and sidewalks. The City has set a few guidelines regarding where blue zones can be placed, in addition to guidelines from the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act. For a summary of the physical requirements for blue zones, see the [blue zones overview](#).

### Disabled parking placards

Disabled parking placards are governed by California state law, which requires all jurisdictions to exempt placard holders from time limits and on-street meter payment. The exemptions apply in all legal parking spaces except for commercial and passenger loading zones. California is one of just 15 states that require cities to exempt placard holders from paying at the meter, and one of five states that require both meter payment and time limit exemptions for placard holders.<sup>1</sup>

The California DMV issues placards. Individuals who meet eligibility criteria related to limited mobility, reduced sight, cardiovascular or pulmonary conditions may apply for a placard. Full eligibility requirements can be found on the [DMV application](#).<sup>vii</sup> Applications are completed by an individual's doctor, chiropractor, optometrist, physician's assistant, nurse practitioner, or nurse midwife. The eligibility criteria and practitioner list are pretty typical.<sup>2</sup> The DMV's database system is decades old and unable to verify or track information about who is certifying placards.

Disabled parking placard issuance has increased significantly in the last decade. San Francisco now has twice as many disabled parking placards as metered spaces, with 67,500 placards issued to San Franciscans compared with 29,200 metered spaces. There are an additional 454,000 placards issued to people in the other eight Bay Area counties, many of whom drive to San Francisco.

The number of placards issued in the nine-county Bay Area has increased by 100 percent since 2001. However, between 2001 and 2010, the Bay Area population only increased by 5 percent and the 65+ population by 16 percent. Legitimate placards are often misused by people they don't belong to, increasing rates of use. Many blue zones and metered parking spaces are full for long periods of time due to placard use, decreasing access for those who need it.

A 2008 SFMTA survey found that 45 percent of parking meters were occupied by cars displaying placards in the downtown study area. Of the vehicles using placards, 57 percent were registered outside of San Francisco.

---

<sup>1</sup> October 16, 2012, memo from the California Senate Office of Research

<sup>2</sup> See a comparison to other states in the [Policy Options Evaluation](#) Appendices II and III, p. 46-48

### **Disabled parking placard enforcement**

All SFMTA Parking Control Officers (PCOs) help enforce accessible parking, issuing citations for blue zone infractions, ramp obstructions, and expired placards. The SFMTA also has a team of PCOs dedicated solely to enforcing placard abuse.<sup>3</sup> This Disabled Placard Detail conducts stakeouts and twice-weekly stings, confiscating roughly 1,800 placards per year.

The most common form of placard misuse appears to be non-disabled people illegally using legitimate placards that belong to other people, but that's also the hardest to enforce. Because placard holders can use their placards when getting rides from other people, even finding a solo driver using someone else's placard isn't enough; the PCO must prove that the placard holder isn't nearby. Additionally, because of personal privacy concerns, PCOs do not ask people about their disabilities. As a result, if a placard registration matches the individual, it is not possible to determine whether that placard was illegitimately obtained. The placard is assumed to be valid.

The stakes are high with disabled placard enforcement: a citation for placard misuse now costs \$880 and the PCOs confiscate the placard immediately. Almost 60 percent of placard-related citations are contested and 12 percent of those protests go all the way to the CA Superior Court. However, the Disabled Placard Detail conducts its work very carefully, and 82 percent of challenged citations are upheld as valid. These PCOs work in teams of two to provide a witness for future hearings and protect officers from violence. They also spend a quarter of their time writing reports to ensure proper documentation for protest procedures.

Because enforcing placard misuse is so labor intensive, revenue generated by placard misuse citations does not cover the costs of enforcement.

### **Disability, income, and car ownership**

The U.S. Census American Community Survey estimates from 2008-2010 found that in San Francisco, people with disabilities are more likely to have low incomes: 50 percent of people with disabilities have low incomes compared to 25 percent of people without disabilities.<sup>4</sup> However, people with low incomes are less likely to have access to a

---

<sup>3</sup> This team had 11 PCOs and one supervisor when the Committee was in session. Based on Committee recommendations, the SFMTA has increased this number to 14 PCOs and one supervisor.

<sup>4</sup> "Low income" is defined as 200 percent of the federal poverty level.

vehicle or commute by automobile: only 16 percent of people with disabilities are both low income and have a vehicle available in their households, and two percent of low-income people with disabilities commute by automobile.

### BEST PRACTICES RESEARCH

The committee spent two months looking at the accessible parking practices in eleven North American cities. They reviewed case studies and disability rights advocate interviews from cities including Philadelphia; New York City; Chicago; Houston; and Arlington County, Virginia. These case studies illustrated the effects of various policy approaches, such as heavier enforcement, strict protocols for placard issuance, and meter payment.

The Committee reviewed the following peer practices research documents:

- [Accessible parking policies and practices in other jurisdictions- document](#)<sup>viii</sup>
- [Interviews with advocates and staff in other jurisdictions](#)<sup>ix</sup>
- [Accessible parking policies and practices in other jurisdictions- presentation](#)<sup>x</sup>

#### Best practices

All programs that had successfully increased parking access and reduced placard misuse combined three core elements:

- Provide more blue zones
- Conduct sufficient enforcement on placard use and blue zones
- Charge placard holders at meters

The cities that had implemented only one or two of these elements were not as successful. For instance, Houston had the most robust enforcement regime in our survey but was unable to solve the problem until it also introduced meter payment and increased blue zones. The research found no correlation between cities with successful placard programs and those with shorter lists of permitted placard certifiers or tighter eligibility criteria.

### **Meter payment**

Based on experiences in other cities, meter payment is the most effective way to reduce placard misuse and open up parking spaces. For example, when placard holders started paying at the meter in Philadelphia, parking availability rose from two to 13 percent, opening up more than one in ten spots. Vehicles displaying placards downtown dropped from 40 to two percent.

### **Policy alternatives: developing and analyzing 20 options**

During its six months of work, the Committee reviewed numerous approaches to increasing parking access and decreasing disabled parking placard misuse. After defining the problem, establishing criteria, and reviewing extensive research, the Committee identified a series of policy alternatives for further evaluation. The steering committee and full committee discussed the list, adding or removing ideas after full discussion. In the end, the committee analyzed 20 policy alternatives. For details on all the Committee's policy ideas, please see the [policy options analysis](#)<sup>xi</sup>, which evaluates each option according to the group's agreed-upon criteria.

After they conducted this analysis, the Committee concluded that no single policy could successfully create access for people with disabilities, and only a multifaceted approach would work. For instance, they found that no city had significantly increased access and reduced placard misuse using enforcement tactics alone.

## Recommendations: proven solutions to improve access

The San Francisco Accessible Parking Policy Advisory Committee achieved a broad consensus on an integrated program of policy recommendations to increase parking access for people with disabilities and improve parking availability overall. All recommendations passed with at least 70 percent of the committee expressing support. To see the final votes and discussions, including dissent statements, see the [March 26 Accessible Parking Policy Advisory Committee meeting notes](#).<sup>xii</sup> Committee members emphasized that the recommendations function together as a package, and noted that some policy changes are local and some require state law change.

### 1. INCREASE BLUE ZONES

#### 1a. Increase blue zones to at least four percent of metered spaces (local)

To reserve more parking spaces for people with disabilities, a number of spaces equivalent to four percent of metered parking spaces should be designated as blue zones, representing a 70 percent increase (equivalent to roughly 470 blue zoned spaces) beyond what is in place today.

#### 1b. Review San Francisco's requirements for blue zone placement (local)

Under current [ADA and City guidelines](#),<sup>xiii</sup> many locations in need of blue zones will not be eligible. The Committee recommends that the San Francisco Mayor's Office on Disability and the SFMTA consider changing San Francisco's blue zone placement guidelines to make it possible to designate blue zones in more places (ADA guidelines would not be altered).

### 2. IMPROVE ENFORCEMENT OF PLACARD MISUSE

#### 2a. Photo or other identifier on placards (state)

The Committee recommends the California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) make a photo available to personnel enforcing placard use. This could be achieved by placing a photo on the placard itself, on the placard receipt, or tying a photo to the placard database used by enforcement personnel.

#### 2b. Improve local enforcement (local)

To reduce fraudulent use of placards, San Francisco should explore options to improve placard enforcement and implement best practices. This could include increasing the

number of PCOs on the Disabled Placard Detail, increasing stings, conducting outreach regarding placard enforcement, and beginning a volunteer program.

### **3. INCREASE OVERSIGHT OF PLACARD APPROVALS**

#### **3a. Certifier verification program with state database overhaul (state)**

The DMV does not currently have the technical capacity to keep information about the medical providers who certify placards in a searchable database. To increase transparency and accountability, the Committee recommends that the DMV develop and maintain a database to track and verify medical providers, using a system similar to the Bay Area Regional Transit Connection (RTC) Discount Card Program. First-time certifiers would be verified utilizing state medical licensing databases, and subsequent certifications by the same professional would be verified using the provider's previously scanned signature.

#### **3b. Clarify placard eligibility requirements by adding a functional definition to the "limited mobility" criteria (state)**

The Committee recommends further defining the following eligibility criterion from the DMV's placard application: "disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility". Examples of functional definitions used in other states include "cannot walk 200 feet without stopping to rest" and "uses portable oxygen". The DMV's remaining eligibility criteria would not change.

#### **3c. Conduct enforcement on those who certify placards, using data from upgraded database (local)**

The Committee recommends that police officers use the DMV placard certifier database recommended in 3a to focus enforcement on medical providers that repeatedly issue more placards than one would expect.

### **4. ALLOW JURISDICTIONS TO REMOVE THE METER PAYMENT EXEMPTION**

#### **4a. Provide local control, allowing jurisdictions with accessible meter payment options to require parking meter payment for vehicles displaying placards (state)**

Based on experiences in other jurisdictions, meter payment is the most effective way to reduce disabled placard abuse and make parking spaces available because it removes the financial incentive to cheat.<sup>5</sup> The Committee recommends requiring placard holders

---

<sup>5</sup> See [Accessible Policy Options Evaluation](#) and [Accessible Parking Policies and Practices in Other Jurisdictions](#)

to pay at the meter in San Francisco, including blue zones that are in metered areas. Statewide, they stipulate that this should only be allowed as an option in jurisdictions which provide accessible payment options for all meters. Qualified communities would be able to decide whether a meter payment exemption makes sense for them. California is one of only fifteen states that require local jurisdictions to exempt placard holders from meter payment, and one of only five that require both payment and time limit exemptions.<sup>6</sup>

## **5. DIRECT AN EQUIVALENT AMOUNT OF REVENUE TO ACCESSIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS**

### **5a. Revenue from metered blue zones used for accessibility improvements (local)**

To further the significant work San Francisco has done to make its public rights-of-way increasingly accessible, the SFMTA should designate an amount equivalent to revenue received payment at metered blue zones for accessibility improvements that would enhance mobility for people with disabilities.

## **6. ALLOW JURISDICTIONS TO ESTABLISH REASONABLE TIME LIMITS**

### **6a. Allow local jurisdictions to implement time limits at regular metered spaces and blue zones, provided that those time limits are no shorter than four hours (state)**

In order to increase availability of parking spaces, the committee recommends that placard holders in San Francisco have four-hour time limits at regular and blue meters, unless the posted time limit is longer. State law should give local jurisdictions the option of instituting time limits for placard holders in metered spaces and blue zones, provided those time limits are no shorter than four hours. Disability rights advocates in jurisdictions with three- and four-hour time limits report that the time seems to be sufficient for people with disabilities.<sup>7</sup>

### **6b. Allow local jurisdictions to implement time limits in green zones, provided that those time limits are no shorter than 30 minutes (state)**

Paid for by qualifying merchants, green zones are short-term parking zones intended to support business and reduce double-parking. State law currently exempts placard holders from time limits in green zones, rendering many green zones ineffective. The Committee recommends that a time limit be set for placard holders in green zones, not

---

<sup>6</sup> October 16, 2012, memo from the California Senate Office of Research

<sup>7</sup> See the [interviews with advocates and staff in other jurisdictions](#)

including time spent getting in and out of the vehicle. Green zones are generally directly in front of the relevant business.

## Timeline

Working with Committee members, the Mayor's Office on Disability and the SFMTA identified the following action plan.

### 1. CONDUCT OUTREACH REGARDING RECOMMENDATIONS

#### May 2013 and ongoing

The Mayor's Office on Disability, the SFMTA, and members of the Accessible Parking Policy Advisory Committee have conducted significant stakeholder outreach regarding these recommendations. Outreach began in May 2013. See list of presentations in the next section.

### 2. TAKE STEPS TO IMPLEMENT ITEMS THAT ARE UNDER LOCAL CONTROL

#### June 2013 to 2015

The SFMTA has begun taking steps to implement the recommendations that are under local control. As of July 2013, the SFMTA has done the following:

- Increased the number of PCOs serving on the Disabled Placard Detail by over 25 percent, so now the SFMTA has 14 PCOs dedicated to enforcing placard misuse.
- Identified a project lead for establishing more blue zones and begun identifying potential new blue zone locations. The SFMTA aims to install some new blue zones by the end of the year and complete the project by mid-2015.

### 3. LOCAL SUPPORT

#### Late 2013

- SFMTA Board of Directors resolution of support – November 19, 2013
- State Legislation Committee approval of inclusion in the City of San Francisco's state legislative agenda – December 11, 2013
- Letters of support from various local organizations

#### 4. STATE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

##### Late 2013 to 2015

The League of California Cities Transportation, Communications and Public Works Policy Committee has provided conceptual support for the state law changes and directed League staff to continue working on the issue.

The state bill could include the following:

- Improve DMV oversight of placard approvals, including tracking and verification of the medical providers who sign placard applications.
- Clarify placard eligibility requirements without removing any existing qualifying criteria.
- Make placard holder photo available to placard enforcement personnel.
- Remove the meter payment exemption requirement, so that local jurisdictions with accessible meter payment options can choose to require placard holders to pay at the meter.
- Allow jurisdictions the option of establishing placard holder time limits of no shorter than four hours in regular metered spaces and blue zones, and no shorter than 30 minutes in green zones.

#### 5. ESTABLISH LOCAL POLICY

##### After state law changes

As envisioned, the state law change would authorize but not require qualifying jurisdictions to require time limits and meter payment for placard holders; San Francisco would still need to pass its own local policy. The SFMTA and the Mayor's Office on Disability would return to the community for additional input prior to establishing local time limits and meter payment requirements. This would provide an additional opportunity to hone the policies further in response to public feedback. Some issues that could be addressed during this phase include impacts on low income drivers with disabilities and the needs of people with disabilities who commute by automobile and need to park on the street.

**PUBLIC FORMS DEDICATED TO THE ACCESIBLE PARKING RECOMMENDATIONS (2)**

- July 31 – Disability parking forum hosted by FDR Democratic Club\*
- October 19 – Accessible parking forum hosted by the SFMTA and the Mayor's Office on Disability\*

**DISABILITY AND SENIOR GROUPS (14)**

- May 16 – SFMTA Multimodal Accessibility Advisory Committee\*
- May 17 – Mayor's Disability Council\*
- July 11 – Long Term Care Coordinating Council, with over 25 additional senior care and recreation center representatives invited\*
- July 17 – Independent Living Resource Center, with Lighthouse for the Blind and California Council of the Blind invited
- July 30 – FDR Democratic Club Executive Board
- August 7 – Paratransit Coordinating Council\*
- August 7 – FDR Democratic Club monthly meeting
- September 18 – Advisory Council to the Aging and Adult Services Commission\*
- October 2 – Aging and Adult Services Commission\*
- October 7 – Alameda County Transportation Commission senior and disability mobility workshop
- October 9 – Metropolitan Transportation Commission Policy Advisory Council Equity & Access Subcommittee\*
- December 17 – California Commission on Disability Access\*
- January 8 – California Commission on Disability Access\*
- January 8 – Berkeley Commission on Disability\*

**MERCHANT AND BUSINESS GROUPS (3)**

- August 7 – San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Public Policy Committee
- August 20 – San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations
- October 28 – San Francisco Small Business Commission\*

**TRANSPORTATION GROUPS (6)**

- June 6 – SFMTA Citizens’ Advisory Council\*
- June 21 – SFMTA Board of Directors Policy and Governance Committee\*
- August 21 – SPUR Transportation Policy Board
- August 28 – San Francisco County Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee\*
- September 11 – SPUR lunchtime forum
- November 19 – SFMTA Board of Directors\*

**OTHER GROUPS (4)**

- June 14 – League of California Cities Transportation, Communications, and Public Works Policy Committee
- November 8 – California Public Parking Association 30<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference
- November 25 – West of Twin Peaks Central Council
- December 12 – City of San Francisco’s State Legislative Committee\*

This list does not include one-on-one meetings and phone calls, such as multiple briefings with every member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors; phone calls and a lengthy meeting with representatives of the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund (DREDF); calls and meetings with many individual disability rights advocates; and others.

Note that Senior and Disability Action declined a presentation and let us know they are taking a neutral stance on the recommendations.

The San Francisco Chinatown Community Development Center also declined a presentation due to lack of time.

*\*Public meeting including time for public comment and participation.*

## Appendix I: Committee meeting schedule

Date and time	Meeting type	Meeting purpose
Oct. 23, 2012 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.	Full committee	Introduce participants; set ground rules; explain process and set calendar; background information presentation; stakeholder interview summary; solicit initial response to problem understanding; nominate steering committee members. <a href="#">Agenda (PDF)</a> <sup>xiv</sup> <a href="#">Meeting notes (PDF)</a>
Nov. 13, 2012 10 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.	Steering committee	Develop working relationships within the group; explore findings regarding problem definition; set agenda for next full committee meeting. <a href="#">Agenda (PDF)</a> <a href="#">Meeting notes (PDF)</a>
Nov. 27, 2012 2 p.m. – 4 p.m.	Full committee	Define problems related to accessible parking and explore roots of the problems. <a href="#">Agenda (PDF)</a> <a href="#">Meeting notes (PDF)</a>
Dec. 11, 2012 10 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.	Steering committee	Develop list of criteria to evaluate potential solutions to the problem; set full committee meeting agenda. <a href="#">Agenda (PDF)</a> <a href="#">Meeting notes (PDF)</a>
Dec. 18, 2012 10 a.m. – noon	Full committee	Finalize criteria to evaluate potential problem solutions; best practices presentation. <a href="#">Agenda (PDF)</a> <a href="#">Meeting notes (PDF)</a>

Date and time	Meeting type	Meeting purpose
Jan. 8, 2013 10 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.	Steering committee	Develop broad list of policy options to consider for further evaluation; finalize agenda for full committee meeting. <a href="#">Agenda (PDF)</a> <a href="#">Meeting notes (PDF)</a>
Jan. 22, 2013 10 a.m. – noon	Full committee	Agree on list of policy options for evaluation according to criteria; clarify process for evaluating policy options and developing final recommendations. <a href="#">Agenda (PDF)</a> <a href="#">Meeting notes (PDF)</a>
Feb. 5, 2013 10 a.m. – noon	Steering committee	Review and refine policy options discussed at full committee meeting. <a href="#">Agenda (PDF)</a> <a href="#">Meeting notes (PDF)</a>
Feb. 26, 2013 10 a.m. – noon	Full committee	Review policy options analysis; hone list of policy options for further consideration. <a href="#">Agenda (PDF)</a> <a href="#">Meeting notes (PDF)</a>
Mar. 12, 2013 10 a.m. – noon	Steering committee	Develop recommendations for discussion in final full committee meeting; set final full committee meeting agenda. <a href="#">Agenda (PDF)</a> <a href="#">Meeting notes (PDF)</a>
Mar. 26, 2013 10 a.m. – noon	Full Committee	Develop final recommendations. <a href="#">Agenda (PDF)</a> <a href="#">Meeting notes (PDF)</a>

## Appendix II: Outreach for the Oct. 19 accessible parking forum

The report below summarizes the outreach efforts conducted for the October 19, 2013, accessible parking forum hosted by the Mayor's Office on Disability and the SFMTA.

### OVERVIEW

The SFMTA and the Mayor's Office on Disability conducted significant outreach for the accessible parking forum, including the following:

- Press release to:
  - ~1,000 reporters (including Chinese & Spanish language news sources)
  - Thousands of citizens across the region
- Two mailings to the accessible parking mailing list – 185 recipients
- Individual emails to leaders of disability, neighborhood, business, and advocacy organizations – 45 organizations
- Mailing to additional community leaders – 270 recipients
- Emails and flyers to San Francisco Supervisors – all 11 offices
- Emails to state legislators – 4 legislators
- Flyers distributed to libraries, senior centers, etc. – 200 flyers
- Web updates

This outreach resulted in the following known coverage:

- TV news coverage – 1
- Organizations that shared the event information with their members – 14
- Blog posts about the event– 8

### ORGANIZATIONS THAT SHARED ANNOUNCEMENT

We cannot be aware of each and every forum posting or news announcement, but we are aware of the following groups who shared the announcement at our request:

- Mayor's Office on Disability
- Independent Living Resource Center of San Francisco

- SFMTA Multimodal Accessibility Advisory Committee
- Paratransit Coordinating Council
- Support for Families of Children with Disabilities
- Designing Accessible Communities
- Californians for Disability Rights
- San Francisco County Transportation Agency
- South Beach Rincon Hill Community Association + Portside Building
- Planning Association for the Richmond
- Friends of Noe Valley
- Council of District Merchants Association
- Chamber of Commerce
- Mayor's office of Economic & Workforce Development
- Building Owners & Managers Association of San Francisco
- SF Bicycle Coalition (28,000 emails)
- Walk SF

**BLOG/NEWS COVERAGE**

- KCBS
- Independent Living Resource Center website
- SF Streetsblog
- Planning Association for the Richmond website
- Friends of Noe Valley website
- San Francisco FYI political blog
- Eastern Neighborhoods United Front (ENUF) blog
- Building Owners & Managers Association of San Francisco website and blog
- San Francisco Bicycle Coalition website

**GROUPS EMAILED****Disability/Senior groups (22)**

- Access Northern California
- Advisory Council to the Aging and Adult Services Commission
- AIDS Legal Referral Panel
- Disability Rights California
- Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund
- Designing Accessible Communities
- Golden Gate for Seniors
- Long Term Care Coordinating Council
- Lighthouse for the Blind
- Independent Living Resource Center
- Institute on Aging
- SFMTA Multimodal Accessibility Advisory Committee
- Multiple Sclerosis Society of Oakland
- Paratransit Coordinating Council
- SFSU Students with Disabilities
- SD Action
- Self Help for the Elderly
- Support for Families of Children with Disabilities
- San Francisco Commission on Aging and Adult Services Commission
- SF County Transportation Authority Citizen Advisory Committee
- Swords to Plowshares
- Sutter Care at Home

**Merchant and business groups (48)**

- Small Business Commission
- Asian Business League of San Francisco
- Building Managers & Owners Association (BOMA)
- Clement Street Merchants Association
- Council for District Merchants
- Fillmore Merchants Association
- Fisherman's Wharf Community Benefit District
- Inner Sunset Merchants Association
- Glen Park Merchants Association
- Golden Gate Business Association
- Greater Geary Merchants
- Hayes Valley Merchant Association
- Japantown Merchants Association
- Judah Merchants Association
- Laurel Village Merchants Association
- Lower 24<sup>th</sup> Street Merchants
- Lower Haight Merchants Association
- Mayor's office on Economic and Workforce Development
- Marina Merchants Association
- Merchants of Upper Market & Castro
- Mid-Divisadero Merchants Association
- Mission Merchant Association
- Mission Economic Development Association
- National Association of Women Business Owners

- Noe Valley Merchants Association
- Noriega-Lawton Merchants Association
- North East Mission Business Association (NEMBA)
- North Beach Chamber of Commerce
- Outer Mission Merchants and Residents Association
- Outer Sunset Merchants Association
- Parkside Taraval Merchants Association
- Polk Street Merchants Association
- Potrero Hill Association of Merchants and Businesses
- Renew SF
- Sacramento Street Merchants Association
- San Bruno/Ocean Avenue Merchants
- South Beach Mission Bay Business Association
- South of Market Merchants
- San Francisco Convention and Visitors Bureau
- Small Business California
- Small Business Network
- Small Business Advisory Council
- San Francisco Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center
- Chamber of Commerce
- The union Street Association
- Union Square Association
- West Portal Merchants Association
- Tenderloin Merchants Association

**People of color community groups (11)**

- Asian Neighborhood Design
- Black Coalition on AIDS
- Chinese Chamber of Commerce
- Chinatown Merchants Association
- Chinatown Community Development Corporation
- Chinese for Affirmative Action
- Chinatown Alleyway Improvement Association
- Japanese Community Center
- Japanese Community Youth Council
- PODER
- La Casa de las Madres

**Neighborhood groups (70)**

- 16th Street/North Mission Association
- 37th Avenue SAFE Neighborhood Watch
- Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
- Balboa Terrace Homes Association
- BAYCAT
- Bayview Hill Neighborhood Assn.
- Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
- Cathedral Hill/Van Ness Neighborhood Association
- Cayuga Improvement Association
- Central Waterfront Citizens Advisory Committee
- Coalition for SF Neighborhoods
- Cole Valley Improvement Association
- Corbett Height Neighbors

- Cow Hollow Association
- Dolores Heights Design Review Committee
- Dolores Heights Improvement Club
- Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
- Eastern Neighborhoods Citizen Advisory Committee
- ENCORE(Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center)
- Excelsior Action Group (EAG)
- Forest Knolls Neighborhood Organization
- Forest Hill Association
- Francisco Heights Civic Association
- Friends of Duboce Park (FDP)
- Friends of McLaren Park
- Friends of Mountain Lake Park
- Friends of Noe Valley
- Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association
- Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
- Glen Park Neighbors
- Glen Park Association
- Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
- Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
- Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association
- Ingleside Terraces Homes Assoc.
- Japantown Taskforce
- Jordan Park Improvement Association
- Julian Neighbors

- La Playa/Great Highway Neighborhood Watch
- La Raza Information Center
- Lakeside Property Owners Association
- Liberty Hill Residents Association
- Lincoln Park Homeowner's Association
- LMNOP Neighbors
- Lower Haight Neighborhood Organization
- Lower Polk Neighbors & Merchants
- Madrina Group
- Marina Community Association
- Marina Neighborhood Association
- Middle Polk Neighborhood Association
- Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association
- Miraloma Park Improvement Club
- Monterey Heights Homes Association
- Natoma Street Neighborhood Group
- Neighborhood Empowerment Network
- Neighbors of Ardenwood
- New Mission Terrace Improvement Association
- Ninth Avenue Neighbors
- Nob Hill Association
- Noe Valley Neighbors
- North of Panhandle Neighborhood Association (NOPNA)
- North Mission Neighborhood Alliance
- North West Bernal Alliance

- OMI Excelsior Beacon Center
- Outer Mission Residents Association
- Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
- Pacific Heights Resident's Association
- PANA(Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association)
- People of Parkside/Sunset
- Pinelake Park Neighborhood Association
- Planning Association for the Richmond (PAR)
- Pond and Prosper Block Association
- Potrero Boosters
- Potrero Hill Neighborhood House
- POWER Bayview
- Residents of the Southeast Sector (ROSES)
- Richmond Community Association
- Richmond Village Beacon Center
- Russian Hill Improvement Association
- Russian Hill Neighbors
- St. Francis Homes Association
- SHARP-Sunset Heights Responsible
- SOMA Leadership Council
- SOMPAC
- South of Market Cultural Center (SOMARTS)
- South of Market Foundation
- South Beach/Rincon Hill Community Association (400 emails)
- Sunset District Neighborhood Coalition

- Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)
- Sunnyside Neighborhood Assoc.
- Twin Peaks Improvement Association
- Visitacion Valley Meetings List
- West of Twin Peaks Central Council
- West Portal Avenue Association
- Westside Neighbors to End Homelessness
- Westwood Highlands Association
- Westwood Park Association
- Yerba Buena Alliance

**Transportation advocacy groups (4)**

- SF Bicycle Coalition
- SPUR
- Transit Riders Union
- Walk SF

**Elected officials**

- San Francisco Supervisors – all 11 offices
- Mayor Ed Lee
- State Legislators
  - Senator Leland Yee
  - Senator Mark Leno
  - Assemblymember Tom Ammiano
  - Assemblymember Phil Ting

## FLYERS

In addition to electronic media outreach we distributed approximately 200 flyers to nearly 20 locations. When we flyered these locations we also left flyers on the windshields of cars parked nearby with disabled placards.

- Independent Living Resource Center
- City hall/ Supervisors offices
- Main Library
- Chinatown Library
- Mission Library
- SPUR
- Women's Building
- Richmond Senior Center
- Western Addition Senior Center
- Kimochi Senior Center
- Veterans Equity Center
- Korean Center, Inc.
- Manilatown Senior Center
- Lighthouse for the Blind & Visually Impaired
- YMCA Mission senior center
- Women's Building
- Capp Street Senior Center
- Bike Share Open House @ The LGBTQ center (10/16/2013)
- Planning Association for the Richmond meeting (10/16/2013)

## End notes: URLs for links in document

- 
- <sup>i</sup> Accessible parking background information: [http://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/projects/accessible\\_parking\\_overview\\_web.pdf](http://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/projects/accessible_parking_overview_web.pdf)
- <sup>ii</sup> Blue zones overview: <http://sfpark.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/20121107-Blue-zone-overview.pdf>
- <sup>iii</sup> Blue zone locations map: <http://sfpark.org/resources/disabled-parking-census-map/>
- <sup>iv</sup> Disabled parking placards and license plates overview: <http://sfpark.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Disabled-placard-overview2.pdf>
- <sup>v</sup> Disability, low income status, and car availability statistics overview: <http://sfpark.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/20121107-Disability-statistics-overview.pdf>
- <sup>vi</sup> New blue zone request form instructions: <http://sfmta.com/services/streets-sidewalks/installation-requests/new-color-curb>
- <sup>vii</sup> California DMV disabled parking placard application: <http://apps.dmv.ca.gov/forms/reg/reg195.pdf>
- <sup>viii</sup> Accessible parking policies and practices in other jurisdictions- document: <http://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/projects/Research%20and%20analysis-%20accessible%20parking%20practices%20peer%20review.pdf>
- <sup>ix</sup> Interviews with advocates and staff in other jurisdictions: <http://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/projects/Research%20and%20analysis%20-%20peer%20interviews.pdf>
- <sup>x</sup> Accessible parking policies and practices in other jurisdictions- presentation: <http://sfpark.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Accessible-parking-policies-in-other-jurisdictions1.pdf>
- <sup>xi</sup> Policy options analysis: <http://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/projects/Research%20and%20analysis-%20accessible%20parking%20policy%20options%20evaluation.pdf>
- <sup>xii</sup> March 26 Accessible Parking Policy Advisory Committee meeting notes: <http://sfpark.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/20130515-March-26-full-committee-mtg-notes-Accessible-Parking-Policy-Advisory-Committee1.pdf>
- <sup>xiii</sup> Overview of blue zone placement guidelines: <http://sfpark.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/20121107-Blue-zone-overview.pdf>

<sup>xiv</sup> Links to all agendas and meeting notes: <http://sfpark.org/how-it-works/accessible-parking-policy/accessible-policy-schedule/>

