

Letter 105

Donald Shoup, Professor
Department of Urban Planning, School of Public Affairs
University of California, Los Angeles

November 12, 2009

Comment 105-1

Commenter supports removing the question “[would the project] Result in inadequate parking capacity?” from the CEQA Guidelines Initial Study Checklist. Notably, the commenter states a project opponent can always claim that a project has inadequate parking because no one knows how much parking is adequate. Current planning practice to provide “adequate” parking has proven detrimental to California’s environment.

Response 105-1

The Natural Resources Agency appreciates the commenter’s support. No further response to this comment is necessary.

Comment 105-2

Commenter counters the argument that inadequate parking will cause cruising for curb parking. Rather, cruising is caused by a city’s failure to charge the right price for curb parking. Current planning practice does not estimate parking demand as function of price but treats free parking as an entitlement. The end result being people are further encouraged to drive knowing there is free parking available.

Response 105-2

The Natural Resources Agency believes the amendments made to Appendix G, Section XVI: Transportation/Traffic adequately address this comment. No further revision to the text is required in response to this comment.

Comment 105-3

Commenter believes CEQA’s parking policy makes bad situations even worse and supports removing the “parking” question from the Initial Study Checklist.

Response 105-3

The Natural Resources Agency appreciates the commenter's support. No further response is required to address this comment.