

Comments on Parking and Transportation Demand Management Report as revised after the May 10, 2023 Workshop

1. Purpose: What are we trying to accomplish?

The revised transmittal letter states “There are two key outcomes that the Subcommittee seeks to achieve with the recommendations: (1) to reduce the impact of visitor and employee parking in residential neighborhoods and improve the quality of life for residents; and (2) to enhance mobility in the City’s commercial areas during peak periods to benefit both residents and visitors.”

Those are admirable goals, but do we have any assurance that adding to the supply of parking will prevent any visitors and employees from parking in the neighborhoods? Or will adding to the supply simply accommodate more visitors and employee parking?

A key, unspoken assumption of the report is that adding supply and addressing transportation issues as outlined in the report will result in improved visitor and employee parking impacts in the neighborhoods. There is absolutely no proof offered in the report that that would occur. There is the hope expressed that the Coastal Commission might allow some degree of residential parking permit program, but there is no assurance that that will occur. And, if it were to occur, with over 22,000 residents in Laguna, how many permits would the Coastal Commission agree to allow? If the Coastal Commission required one-for-one parking space replacement, and each space added cost \$100,000 – how many \$100,000 permits could Laguna afford? And who pays for the permit for my property?

2. What is the actual demand? Where is that data? (Where’s the beef?)

What is the demand that we are trying to satisfy? Do we have any data indicating how many parking spaces are needed? In terms of data that addresses actual demand, the report is deficient. There was no estimate of the actual number of parking spaces the City needs. How many vehicles come into and go out of Laguna daily? This was asked in one workshop and the consultant said they really didn’t know. How can the City plan for something if they don’t know what they really need?

Are we trying to park everyone who wants to park in Laguna? If, not, how many more spaces do we need?

3. Without good data, how do we know what we need?

Section Six – Opportunities – lists 278 spaces that could be gained without a parking structure; Table 2 identifies 1,719 spaces that could be gained with a parking structure (at a cost of \$136 million) while Section 11 – Funding Strategies lists 154 spaces that could be gained in the short term and another 803 that could be gained in the medium term. But without clear data on what we really need, how do we know if any of these will solve the problem – if there is a problem that needs to be solved? And if we add any or all these spaces, will the quality of life of the residents – the top priority identified in eth transmittal letter – be improved? Will we even notice a difference?

4. Do we really need more parking spaces?

In fact, do we need any more parking spaces? The IBI study said we have more than enough parking available in the downtown. In fact, the City Council was so convinced that it adopted a downtown specific plan that enshrined a dramatically reduced amount of parking that commercial building owners and developers are required to provide.

If we really have too much parking in the downtown, then why are we looking for more?

5. First Steps in adding to supply

Or, if the IBI study was wrong and we really do not have enough parking, then shouldn't the very first step be to reverse the reduction in the amount of parking required of commercial building owners?

If there is not enough parking and the city does not reverse that reduction, then the city is simply shifting the cost of mitigating the impacts of private development to the public. It is hard to understand how can be justified.

The report is organized into short, medium, and long-term items. Among the shortest of the short-term actions should be to make better use of what we have. From earlier reports, before recent reductions in supply for the Promenade, parklets, and various other changes like Uber loading zones, there were 1674 public spaces and 1691 private spaces in the downtown. Of the public spaces, 925 were on-street and 749 were off-street.

However, of the public off-street parking spaces that are available for the general public, many have been taken away due to various special arrangements – that is city permit programs including:

- a) Downtown Resident permits
- b) Downtown Employee permit,
- c) Quiet Zone permits
- d) Summer Festival permit for artists and Festival employees,
- e) School District permit for non-Laguna Beach residents who reside within the Laguna Beach Unified School District,
- f) Non-Resident Senior permits
- g) Lumberyard permits,
- h) Alice Court permits
- i) Mermaid Lot permits

The report itemizes 317 of the 749 spaces in lots that are not available to the general public including potential customers of local merchants. The estimate of the cost to add parking facilities varies widely, but if we use \$100,000 as an arbitrary number – replacing those 317 spaces would cost over \$30,000,000. Meanwhile, while the report uses \$4,400 as an estimate of the gross revenue produced by an average downtown parking space, the revenue the City could be collecting if all those spaces were collecting average revenue would amount to just under \$1,400,000 per year. Table 5 in the report shows fees charged for the 317 spaces which total \$163,500 per year. That means that if those special programs were terminated, not only would 317 spaces worth probably \$30,000,000 be made available to the general public, but the City would increase its gross parking revenue by over \$1,200,000 per year with no cost to the City. Why would terminating these special programs be the next logical step for the City after correcting the reduction described above in the DSP?

There seemed to be general agreement in that workshop that the City should be pursuing the “low-hanging fruit.” These would seem to be “very low-hanging fruit.”

6. Why not try to reduce demand instead of focusing on increasing supply?

We often hear about there being too much commercial vacancy. That is debatable, but if it is correct, why not encourage conversion of the most marginal commercial properties to residential uses? If there is less demand for commercial space than there is supply, and there is more demand for residential space than there is supply, why not encourage owners of those most marginal commercial properties to convert to residential use. Currently the value of residential in Laguna is similar to the value of commercial property, so there would be no economic penalty to the owner who changes use. Plus, the bonus for the community is that commercial uses are more intense than residential meaning that the amount of traffic generated and amount of parking demand generated by commercial uses is greater than traffic and parking demand attributable to residential uses. So, why not make efforts to reduce parking demand and traffic?

7. Clustering increases demand

Before leaving the topic of decreasing demand, Section 6 discusses concentrating infrastructure in strategic locations. While there is logic to this from the standpoint of coordinating with transit, the unfortunate side effect is that increases demand in these areas potentially increasing traffic and congestion.

8. Better data and understanding of Employee demand is needed

As referenced above, an earlier report indicated there are 3,345 public and private parking spaces in the downtown. Arguably, those are for use of visitors, employees, residents, suppliers, services and anyone else who wants to park there. But how many employees are there in Laguna? Census data indicates there are nearly 14,000 workers working in Laguna Beach. Recently, two different downtown restaurants indicated they employ 60 and 70 employees each. These are restaurants that are smaller than 2,000 square feet, and under the current DSP would be required to provide about 6 parking spaces for each of their restaurants to accommodate their customers and employees. While businesses obviously need employees, without customers, how do they pay their bills?

9. Grandfathering

The report does discuss code revisions. And Councilmembers have talked about “doing something” about grandfathering. As mentioned above, private building owners and developers have provided 1,691 parking spaces in the downtown. The IBI study estimated that had private development provided the number of parking cases specified by the municipal code prior to the reduction in the DSP, there would be 4,421 spaces. Through various concessions over time, the number of parking spaces provided by private development has fallen far below the City’s own stated requirements, and grandfathering perpetuates this – often, even if intensity of use increases for a property. Addressing grandfathering should be a key element in any plan.

10. Who is responsible for providing parking for a business?

Providing parking for a business is actually the responsibility of the commercial building owner. The amount of parking required for a commercial building depends on the use, but that requirement stays with the building when the business leaves. So, the commercial building owner “owns” the parking requirement – or more realistically in most cases in Laguna – the parking requirement concession that

allows that building owner to lease that space to a business without providing truly adequate parking. Too often, in public hearings, the case is presented as a small business having to come up with the parking required for the intended use and sympathies lie with the small business. On the other hand, the commercial landlords are often criticized for charging too much rent and poorly maintaining their businesses. This disparity needs to be better recognized by both the public and elected official granting discretionary approvals.

11. A better approach to Parking In Lieu Fees

Parking In Lieu Fees are mentioned in the report. And parking-in-lieu fees are an appropriate method of providing parking facilities, but currently the City's parking-in-lieu fee is approximately \$23,000 per space while the actual cost to create a parking space could be from \$100,000 to \$150,000 per space. And yet, virtually no one has purchased an in-lieu space in years. Why? Because the City has provided workarounds that end up costing the commercial building owner nothing. And, again, it is important to understand that the obligation for providing parking is that of the commercial building owner, and not of the business leasing space in that building. But, in any event, it is understandable why there would be reluctance for a building owner or business to write a check for \$100,000 or more for each parking space that applicant cannot otherwise provide.

However, there is a better approach. The idea is to charge in-lieu fees as a fee per square foot of building leased paid on a monthly basis. For example, if a parking space costs \$100,000 to produce, rather than charge a \$100,000 parking in-lieu fee, the City could charge a fee based on square footage. If a business leases 2,000 square feet, and interest rates are about 4%, one parking space might cost less than 25 cents per square for per month. Considering that rents could easily be \$5.00 per square foot per month, the parking space is less than 5% of the rent. The fee should be paid by the commercial building owner and the rent charged the tenant determined by negotiation between the lessor and lessee. The City is involved to the extent that, by accepting the fee as fulfilling the private owner's obligation to provide parking, the City does accept the responsibility to mitigate the impact on parking cause by allowing that use. There are refinements necessary, such as clarification as to whether that fee actually provides an actual space, whether the use of that space is exclusive to that business, or whether the fee is in fulfillment of the impact on the community.

12. How far will people walk?

The report addresses a Walkability Study.

A report prepared by Carl Walker - Walking distance tolerances from parking to a primary destination are typically:

200 to 300 feet for shoppers,

500 to 800 feet for downtown employees,

and 1,500 to 2,000 feet for special event patrons and students.

While walkability is discussed, one elephant in the room sized element is the physical (topographical and traffic/safety) aspect of walking and cycling in Laguna Beach. We know there is a practical limit to how far people will walk, Cycling has wider boundaries. But topography is a consideration. People who live up Park, Temple Hills, Nyes, Bluebird, and Diamond may be less inclined to walk or bicycle into the flatter , commercial areas of Laguna. Age is also a factor in the range of walking/cycling capability. And traffic/safety constraints. For example, people living south of Aliso Creek have only one route into and out of central Laguna and even that – the walking path on the inland side of the highway is blocked by an overhead bridge abutment. People living in the Canyon have similar safety considerations for

walking or biking into Laguna. Visitors will want to “land” somewhere in Laguna from which they could safely and conveniently walk or cycle. Perhaps half of the population of Laguna lives up the hill or south of the Creek or out the canyon. Plus – a sizeable piece of the population is older and some may be less mobile than others. Add in visitors – and the goals of walkability and cycle access are still meaningful, but benefit fewer people and present big challenges. While walkability should be a consideration, the City needs to understand that not everyone who lives in Laguna lives in a relatively flat area walking distance to wherever they would like to walk to.

A key to the Laguna going forward with implementing many of the concepts of the document rest with the Coastal Commission and its cooperation or lack of cooperation. The City has historically acted as though it is hostage of the Commission, Yet in many instances, the Coastal Commission may be overstepping its actual charter. If the City makes a sincere effort and the Coastal Commission does not cooperate, the City needs to consider challenging the actual limits of authority of the Commission.

13. Does Item 6 of Table 3 of Section 10 Recommendations – Summary mean that the Church Parking structure is cleared to proceed?

Item 6 of Table 3 of Section 10 Recommendations – Summary reads as follows:
Table 3. Parking Infrastructure Opportunities

Priority Treatment/Outcome
City project for public parking at the Laguna Presbyterian Church site

Action
Proceed with an

6	6	City project for public parking at the Laguna Presbyterian Church site	Proceed with an award of contract for the concept design and present the draft lease agreement to the City Council	Public Works Dept.	1 & 5
----------	---	--	--	--------------------	-------

Does this mean that, if the City Council accepts the report – or accepts the staff recommendation regarding the report – that that is approval for the City to award of contract for the concept design and present the draft lease agreement to the City Council?

Table 2 indicates this location has one of the highest costs per space gained of those outlined on that table. Even if there is a decision to proceed further on a parking structure, considering the higher cost, why would this one jump ahead of other sites?

14. Alternative ways to structure a parking structure on Presbyterian church property

Has there been any consideration given to alternative ways to structure a parking structure for the church?

One alternative might be: Without direct involvement of the City in the “ownership” of the structure, the Church could accomplish its purpose of adding on-site parking by organizing the commercial building owners in the DSP area to form a parking assessment district – much like forming an assessment

district to underground neighborhood utilities. The district could ask the city to assist with use of the city's tax-exempt borrowing power for the district to raise the funds through a revenue bond sale to pay the cost of building the structure. The church and district could negotiate any lease agreement for use of church ground that they could agree upon. The members of the district would guarantee the debt payments and would receive revenue from parking in the facility. The City would have no more active role than it does with any utility undergrounding assessment district other than the risk that default in bond payments by the parking district could have a negative impact on the borrowing ability and credit rating of the city. Maintenance and operation of the parking facility could be by private operator, or the district could hire the city to act as operator on a cost-plus basis. The church would get the parking structure it wants. The downtown merchants and building owners would get some parking. Coastal might consider this replaced parking for the lost Promenade parking structure. The city would have no direct involvement and no substantial exposure to financial risk. Sounds like a win-win-win.

15. Induced Demand

Section 10 has a block of text with the heading: "A word on induced demand." "Induced demand" was the concept illustrated in the movie "A Field of Dreams" and explained as "If we build it, they will come." But the text in Section never actually explained that. As simple as "If we build it, they will come" is many experts in the field of parking and transit subscribe to that very fact. If we add capacity, a supply of users will emerge to use up the capacity and we will be no better off with more capacity than with current capacity. People will still be parking in the neighborhoods, but the City will have spent a lot of taxpayer money without achieving the goal stated in the transmittal letter of "improving the quality of life for the residents."

16. Ride Hailing reduced demand for parking but increases traffic and congestion

Item 16 on page 71 of Section 10 – Recommendations – pertains to ride hailing services like Uber and Lyft. And while these services do reduce the need for parking, the trade-off is that use of ride-hailing doubles the number of trips. That is, what would be one trip in each direction becomes two as the Uber comes first to fetch the rider, then there is a second trip as Uber delivers the rider to the destination. The same works on the reverse trip home. So, ride-hailing involves trade-offs.

17. Flaws in the logic behind the concept of Shared Parking

Item 22, page 72, Section 10. While the arguments about shared parking are seductive, the reality is that shared parking only works in shopping centers with common ownership. If I leave my car in the shoe store parking lot while I wander off to have lunch and buy a shirt elsewhere, I am penalizing the shoe store operator and potentially depriving that business of a client visit because there is nowhere for the next customer to park. And maybe the shop next door is not as forgiving and will have my car towed if I park in his spot when I am not shopping in his store. Shared parking works in a shopping center because the shopping center owner owns all the space leased to shops. The owner of the shopping center benefits if you linger and wander from shop-to-shop spending along the way. The shoe store owner in Laguna is not compensated if the person parked in his spot buys a watch down the street. And if the watch store does not have any parking, there is no opportunity for reciprocity. Note the comment above under Grandfathering that states that Laguna's private commercial buildings have only 1,691 actual parking spaces though the code would indicate that 4,421 is what would be required. So, not every shop has spaces to trade with other shops.

18. Section 11 – Funding Strategies

In all instances, where funding is being considered, the concept of cost – benefit should be a foremost consideration. What is the cost and who benefits? The beneficiary should bear the burden of the cost. Likewise, bankers talk about matching sources and uses of funds. It is the same principle and should apply equally to funding parking facilities and transit. And, cost efficiency should be the third key consideration. Is the proposed solution the most cost-efficient approach to addressing the perceived need?

- a. Since the demand for parking facilities is so closely linked to the demands of local businesses, and we have seen from information provided above that the obligation to mitigate the negative impacts of private development rest with the owners and developers of commercial property, clearly the most appropriate funding mechanism is an assessment district comprised of the commercial building owners within the boundaries of the district. Physical facilities could be funded by revenue bonds issued by the district with the assistance of the City.

The commercial building owners in the downtown or in the Hip District could organize the commercial building owners in the area to form a parking assessment district – much like forming an assessment district to underground neighborhood utilities. The district could ask the city to let it use the city's tax- exempt borrowing power for the district to raise the funds through a bond sale to pay the cost of building the structure. If built on City land, the City and district could negotiate a lease agreement for use of City land. The members of the district would guarantee the debt payments and would receive revenue from parking in the facility. The City would have no more active role than it does with any utility undergrounding assessment district other than the risk that default in bond payments by the parking district could have a negative impact on the borrowing ability and credit rating of the city. Maintenance and operation of the parking facility could be by private operator, or the district could hire the city to act as operator on a cost-plus basis. The city has no direct involvement and no substantial exposure to financial risk.

One thing to consider is the surprisingly modest actual cost of this approach to the commercial building owners. The City's Retail Market Study identified over 800,000 square feet of commercial space in the DSP area, If rents average about \$5.000 per square foot per month for commercial space, the aggregate net rent collected annually by the downtown commercial property owners is likely to exceed \$50,000,000. The 2020 Walker Parking Consultants study estimated a 201-space structure might cost just over \$14 million and that debt service was estimated to be less than \$800,000 per year. Off-setting debt service, the study indicated the facility would be projected to generate substantial parking revenue. Even without accounting for revenue from the facility, the obligation of the district would amount to under 2% of the total aggregate revenue being collected by the building owners.

- b. In spite of the modest cost, if the commercial building owners will not organize a district, there may be the possibility that business owners could form a district funded by a small increase in sales tax charged on retail sales within that district and not on all retail sales citywide. There is some question about whether this could work, but the idea may be worth investigation if the commercial building owners will not organize a district.
- c. The report considers a business license fee or removal of the current cap on business license fees for funding. However, as discussed below, there is an imbalance between

revenue the City receives that is attributable to visitors and the added costs the City incurs due to those visitors. An appropriate adjustment business license fees would be an appropriate correction to that imbalance, but the use of funds should be an addition to the General Fund and should not be earmarked for parking facilities. However, there could be a business license fee created that would be required of commercial building owners that lease commercial space to businesses. That would be a new business license requirement. Currently there are about 200 commercial buildings in the downtown leasing space to 442 businesses and generating – as noted above - approximately \$50 million per year in net rental income. It may be possible to create a business license requirement for those building owners with resulting fees used for creating and maintaining parking facilities or for other related transit uses.

- d. Another funding element that needs to be explored is funding from the State of California. The Coastal Commission efforts to make the beaches accessible to all is reasonable, but its requirements that so severely impact the operational autonomy of the local communities impacted by all the visitors is not so reasonable. What the Coastal Commission and the state have done and continue to do amount to an unfunded mandate. They issue the mandate. We absorb the cost. That is not equitable. At a minimum, the State of California needs to recognize the costs being imposed on local communities and provide appropriate funding to help offset those costs, The City should pursue actions designed to help the state recognize its obligations and to act accordingly.
- e. The comment is frequently made that parking revenue should be used for parking. But other than that sounding good, in the case of Laguna, it is not a good practice. First of all, parking revenue is general fund revenue. It is not a separate “enterprise fund” which is the government term for a government activity where the costs of an activity should be strictly covered only by revenue charged for that activity. The Wastewater fund is an enterprise fund and the cost of maintaining the City’s wastewater operations is required to be covered only by wastewater charges. General Funds are not to be used for that activity. But parking is not an enterprise fund and there is no rational reason why parking revenue should be used only for parking.

In fact, the matching of sources and uses should be to match revenue the city collects due to visitors with costs the city incurs due to visitors. Otherwise, the residents are subsidizing the visitors and the businesses that are largely focused on visitors. This is discussed further in the item below, but briefly the vast majority of revenue the city collects that is attributable to visitors comes from three sources 0 hotel tax, which is almost totally from visitors; parking revenue, which is largely from visitor, though about \$1 million every two years is from shopper permits purchased by residents; and a portion of sales tax, some of which is from residents and some of which is from visitors. If 100% of parking revenue is used for parking, then the second largest source of funds from visitors is diverted to create added parking facilities. And as the following item explains, if adding parking capacity brings more visitors to Laguna, the City – meaning its residents – simply lose more money because more and more of the City budget is diverted to cover the added costs the City incurs due to visitors.

19. The difference between Gross Parking Revenue and Net Parking Revenue is about 37%

Section 11 – Funding Strategies includes Estimates revenue Per Net Gain in Spaces of \$4,400 and that number is used to calculate the amount of debt that could be serviced by \$4,400. However, the most recent Adopted City Budget indicates that operating Expenses for Parking Enforcement, Traffic, Parking, and Sign Maintenance, and Parking Management and Operations aggregate about 17.35% of gross parking revenue. That may not include capital improvement costs like the \$950,000 in the current budget for Glenneyre Parking Structure rehab. Therefore, projections should be adjusted to consider the lower net revenue numbers.

20. Section 11 – Funding Strategies – Table 10 – Increasing Transient Occupancy tax as a Funding Strategies for Medium-Term Items is miss-use of the funds

Item 4 under Table 10 is Transient Occupancy Tax which could generate potentially \$1,800,000 for each 1% it is increased. And, it is generally believed that virtually all Transient Occupancy Tax or hotel tax is collected from visitors rather than from residents. Further, the total hotel tax collected by the City is 12% comprised of the base Transient Occupancy Tax of 10% plus 2% Measure LL tax. Additionally, the Laguna Beach Tourism marketing District tax of 2% is collected from hotel room sales, but that revenue is simply passed through the City budget to the Visitors Bureau and five pools of arts related uses. Never-the-less approximately 30% of the hotel rooms in Orange County are subject to hotel taxes of 15% plus a similar Tourism marketing Tax of approximately 2%. So, arguable, Laguna could charge an additional 3% hotel tax and not be out of line with more than 39% of the hotel room in Orange County. As at last report, Laguna Beach hotels enjoy a very healthy occupancy rate that is well above national averages, so there may be potential to increase hotel tax rates without damaging the local hotel industry. However, as explained below, the more rational use of an increased hotel tax would be to address the overall imbalance between revenue collected by the City that is attributable to visitors and increased costs the City incurs due to those visitors. If the result of adding parking capacity is an increase in the number of visitors, the costs to the City simply increase faster than the revenue from visitors, and the losses incurred by the City, and consequently the residents, increase.

21. REMEMBER Visitor cost exceeds visitor revenue – so adding visitors increases losses until the City corrects that.

A study in 2017 illustrated that revenue attributable to visitors do not cover the additional costs the city incurs attributable to those visitors. The City held a series of meetings to review and further investigate these findings and ultimately agreed there is a substantial imbalance between those costs and expenses. A very simple illustration is that compared to an average California city of population similar to Laguna but which have few tourists, Laguna's police costs are roughly triple the cities with few tourists. Yet that increased cost is necessary to handle the much higher number of calls for service compared to the cities with few tourists. Today the Police Department budget for Laguna is over \$25 million so that that suggests that police costs alone exceed what we would expect the average California city with our population by more than \$16 million. And Police costs are less than 20% of Laguna's total budget, and other Laguna costs are higher due to visitors. At that time, the shortage was over \$23 million per year when the budget was \$94 million. Since then, the Budget has grown to over \$137 million or approaching 50%. Conceivably, the imbalance has also grown.

If the intent of the City's actions is to better deal with the current levels of traffic and parking, that is one thing. But if the effort leads to an increase in visitor volume, the costs to the City simply increase and the losses increase. Much like the intent of Visit Laguna may be to encourage the "right" visitors (meaning those who stay in hotels and make a positive financial contribution to the City finances), the

reality is that the total number of visitors increase. In essence, the City government of Laguna Beach loses money on every visitor, so if the number of visitors increases, the subsidy by the residents of visitors gets worse.

22. REALIZE THAT a parking structure at Act V or other remote locations generates NO revenue and has the added cost of a shuttle that could cost as much as the debt service on the structure – thereby doubling the cost of the facility and generating zero revenue to offset those costs.

While the idea of remote or peripheral parking may have merits, the cost may be much more than most people understand. While Laguna charges for parking in many locations, and one emphasis of the report is to increase parking rates in central locations, the off-set is usually that remote or peripheral parking would be free or very inexpensive so that the lower cost acts as an incentive for people to be slightly inconvenienced. However, realize that while parking in a central location is expected to generate revenue that contributes toward operating, capital, and debt service costs, a remote parking facility may generate little or no revenue from parking and will still have operating, capital and debt service costs. Plus, a remote parking facility will necessitate some sort of shuttle service as an added cost. And using the rates the City uses as a rental rate for its trolleys as an estimate of the cost of operating trolleys, it is likely that the added cost of transit to and from remote could cost as much as or more than the debt service and other costs. So, the cost of a remote parking facility could be double the cost of one more centrally located that does not require transit and yet it would be expected to generate little or no revenue to offset the cost.

23. One Closing comment about SAFETY and the Laguna Beach Emergency Evacuation Plan

After the horrible fire that devastated Paradise, California – a town with – like Laguna – just three (or possibly 4) ways in and out, the City Council had a consulting firm model the time it would take to evacuate Laguna in the event of a natural disaster, such as a fast-moving wildfire. The answer was a bit over 4 hours if everything worked perfectly and the calculation was not very specific about the number of visitors in town, but presumably it was based on a more or less average day. If the end result of Laguna's efforts to improve parking and mobility is to accommodate more visitors, we should take into consideration of those visitors as well as the residents when and if we all need to leave Laguna quickly. Parking and Transportation – and safety – are not unrelated.