



**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** June 19, 2018  
**TO:** Carolyn Lehr, City Manager  
**FROM:** Charles S. Bryant, Community Development Director  
**SUBJECT: Draft Parking Management Plan**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the City Council provide direction on the Draft Parking Management Plan as discussed in this report and presented by staff at the study session.

**SUMMARY**

This report summarizes background information on the Draft Parking Management Plan (“Draft Plan”), details recent work by staff to restart planning for paid parking for the North Hollis Pilot Area and expand it Citywide and, based on information collected from the public and analyzed by staff, proposes steps toward implementation of the Plan. Staff is requesting that the City Council consider the public’s comments on the Draft Plan and provide direction to staff regarding the Draft Plan and alternatives presented in this report.

**BACKGROUND**

Planning for parking management, including introduction of paid parking in the public right of way and expansion of the existing permit parking program, has been considered since 2006.

In September 2006, the City Council and Planning Commission convened a joint meeting to discuss various aspects of parking policy, and subsequently issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to consultants to provide parking research services.

In March 2007, the City Council and former Redevelopment Agency selected Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA), which has since become CDM Smith, to prepare a Parking Policy and Management Implementation Plan (PPMIP) to reduce solo driving while maintaining economic vitality through management of on-street parking, implicitly affecting off-street parking, as a pilot project in the North Hollis area. The North Hollis area is generally bounded by Powell Street to the south, the railroad tracks to the west, the Berkeley city border to the north, and the Oakland city border to the east.

WSA presented a “Findings, Analysis and Solutions” report, the first phase of this project, at a City Council study session on May 20, 2008, and suggested possible next steps in implementing the PPMIP. At that meeting, the Council directed WSA to prepare

recommendations on the implementation of parking pricing, the use of on-street controls, and implementation of a residential parking permit program.

On December 16, 2008 WSA presented the results of the PPMIP in the North Hollis area to the City Council. At that meeting, the City Council provided additional comment on the Plan, and directed staff to expand the parking study to other areas in the City.

Per the direction of the City Council, the study was expanded to three specific subareas of the City, and additional data was obtained in 2009. Those three areas were:

1. South of Powell: Bounded by Powell Street to the north, 40<sup>th</sup> Street to the south, San Pablo Avenue to the east and the railroad tracks to the west. This area includes Grifols, Novartis and Pixar.
2. The Triangle Neighborhood: Bounded by 53<sup>rd</sup> Street to the north, 36<sup>th</sup> Street to the south, the Oakland city boundary to the east, and San Pablo Avenue to the west. This area is primarily residential with some local-serving commercial.
3. North Bayfront: Bounded by the I-80 freeway to the west, Powell Street to the south, the railroad to the east, and the Berkeley city border to the north. This area includes several large multi-family projects, such as Pacific Park Plaza, and various commercial uses.

Within these areas, additional data was evaluated from locations of high parking demand, or “hotspots”, to determine if these additional areas would be suitable candidates for a parking management plan. Only one such additional “hotspot” was identified, within the South of Powell area. This “hotspot” is the area bounded by Horton Street to the west, Powell Street to the north, Vallejo Street to the east and Stanford Avenue/Doyle Street/55<sup>th</sup> Street to the south. It is immediately south of the original North Hollis study area.

WSA completed their analysis and integrated the findings into the PPMIP on March 19, 2010. The PPMIP recommended instituting paid parking and utilizing variable pricing for short term (high turnover parking) and longer term (employee parking) in the North Hollis area, among other policy recommendations. The analysis also concluded that these actions would be revenue positive for the City.

However, on September 7, 2010 the City Council determined that its implementation during the then ongoing economic downturn could be perceived as a “tax” and could have a negative effect on businesses. For employees and employers, the loss of free on-street parking would represent an additional financial burden, particularly for businesses that did not have access to off-street parking. In light of this situation, the City Council approved a staff recommendation to delay the implementation of the variable parking pricing policy until the economy had sufficiently recovered.

Meanwhile, time limited parking zones (i.e. green curbs) were installed in areas needing more turnover for adjacent retailers or service providers. However, Police resources have been limited for enforcement of these areas without a dedicated revenue source to hire additional personnel.

Despite the reduced urgency, the North Hollis Paid Parking and Transportation Demand Management project has remained in the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) since that time. As the economy recovered and parking pressures increased, Economic Development and Housing Division staff began to restart work on the paid parking program in 2016.

On August 29, 2016, the Alameda County Transportation Council (ACTC) issued a call for project nominations for its 2018 Comprehensive Investment Plan (2018 CIP) to program funding anticipated for fiscal years 2017-18 through 2021-22. Pursuant to City Council direction, staff submitted a nomination for the North Hollis Paid Parking and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) project and the City was awarded \$930,000 for fiscal year 2018-2019.

On February 21, 2017, the City Council held a study session to provide feedback to staff on various projects in the CIP for fiscal years 2016-2017 through 2020-2021. During this study session, the City Council highlighted the North Hollis Paid Parking and Transportation Demand Management project as a priority, and directed staff to expand the scope beyond the North Hollis area to consider parking management citywide.

In preparation for implementation of the ACTC grant award and the City Council's direction to broaden the geographical scope of parking management, staff asked CDM Smith to prepare a Scope of Work to update and expand the parking study completed in 2010. On September 5, 2017, the City Council approved a Professional Services Agreement with CDM Smith for the Emeryville Parking Management Plan Update.

The overall goal for the update of the Parking Management Plan is derived from the City's General Plan Goal for parking (Goal T-G-8) which calls for the City to:

- Manage the parking supply to balance:
  - Economic development
  - Livable neighborhoods
  - Environmental and energy sustainability
  - Public safety
- ...while reducing dependence on the automobile.

Finally, in 2017, the American Automobile Association's Gig ("Get in - Go!") car share division approached the City about allowing one-way car share in Emeryville. One-way car share allows members to pick up a vehicle at one location and drop it off at another location. Members find locations of available vehicles in real time using the organization's mobile application or web site. Unlike traditional car share companies such as City CarShare and ZipCar, one-way car share vehicles are not picked up and dropped off at

discrete “pods”, but can be parked and subsequently picked up anywhere within the company’s “HomeZone”. One-way car share requires pre-payment of parking fees by the organization and exemption from parking time limits (except limits less than 2 hours), so members can leave cars on the street. Based on a recommendation from the Transportation Committee, on December 5, 2017, the Council directed staff to prepare an ordinance allowing and regulating one-way car share. The one-way car share permit fees will be based on parking fees in the Parking Management Program, and there will be overlap in the administration of the two programs. Therefore, staff recommends incorporating the one-way car share provisions into the ordinance that will be necessary to implement the Parking Management Plan.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **A. *City’s Parking Controls in Context of Other Cities***

Emeryville is unique in relation to its adjacent municipalities in its lack of parking meters within the public right of way and the minimal use of parking permits in residential areas adjacent to major activity nodes with the potential for parking demand to seep into adjacent residential areas, adversely affecting residents.

In Oakland, most on-street parking is currently \$2 per hour. Short term (2-hour) parking in Berkeley ranges from \$3.00 to \$3.50 per hour depending on the location, mid-term (3- to 4-hour) parking ranges from \$1.50 to \$2.50 per hour, and long-term (8-hour) parking is \$2.50 per hour. Both cities use credit card enabled meters and have a mix of both single space and multi-space meters. Pay by Phone has just been introduced in Berkeley and the same vendor is used in Oakland. License Plate reading technology for enforcement is being piloted now in Berkeley. Oakland has an adopted policy for the capture, storage and use of digital data obtained through Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) technology.

Both cities have extensive residential parking permit programs in neighborhoods adjacent to major activity and transportation areas, with variation in permitting for merchants or other users including nannies, construction, and visitors. Permits for residents are currently \$55/year/vehicle in Berkeley and will rise to \$66/year in July 2018; in Oakland permits are \$82/year/vehicle in most areas with a renewal fee of \$59/year/vehicle, except for “Area M” (located in the Jack London Square area of Oakland) which is \$160/year/vehicle. Neither Berkeley nor Oakland offers a means tested reduced fee for low income households. Emeryville charges \$58/year/vehicle and a \$27/year/vehicle for low-income households.

### **B. *Updates to 2010 PPMIP***

In summary, the 2010 PPMIP recommended the following:

- Implement variable pricing through installation of meters for on-street areas with the following features:
  - Short-term parking in high-turn-over areas. Parking rates would start at \$1/hour, increasing every 2 hours.
  - An option of long-term meters or long-term employee permits in employee and extended-stay visitor areas. Parking rates were recommended at \$0.50/hour.
  - No meters or parking restrictions in industrial areas.
- If warranted, expand the residential parking permit area and initiate a limited employee permit parking program.
- Implement bus corridor parking restrictions along Hollis Street during commute hours.

### **C. 2018 Parking Study**

The recommendations of the 2010 PPMIP were evaluated against any changes in patterns and overall growth since 2010, and the Marina/Powell Street area west of I-80 was added to the analysis. The updated Draft Parking Management Plan addresses four key elements:

1. **Pricing** – The pricing plan developed in 2010 needed to be revisited in terms of the geographic areas and off-street facilities, the pricing strategy and policy, and the plan for pricing implementation. For example, the updated plan includes the Emeryville Marina area, which was not included in the 2010 study.
2. **Technology** – The technologies that will be used for parking pricing and enforcement needed to be identified and an implementation plan developed. Recommendations now include use of license plate readers at the Police Department's request. Additionally, dual head meters with capabilities for variable pricing by duration of stay, credit card reading, phone payment capabilities and user convenience are being considered based on adjacent community experience with maintenance and user feedback as well as Emeryville community preferences.
3. **Permit Parking** – The residential parking permit (RPP) guidelines that the City adopted in 2007 and the RPP plan that was presented in the 2010 study have been reviewed and expanded to streamline designation of permit areas. This is particularly related to changes in assumptions regarding current enforcement and administrative resources and costs.
4. **Management** – The internal structure for the management of the parking program in terms of administration, public communications, maintenance, and enforcement needs

to be defined and a revised financial plan needs to be prepared. With the revised financial plan, the City will be positioned to determine the best management plan. Upon completion of the Plan Update, the City will have the option to contract with CDM Smith for implementation services. CDM Smith would then provide support for the implementation of the plan including development of RFPs for technology vendors, assistance with grant applications and development of job descriptions for parking management staff positions. Because the scope of this task will not be clear until decisions are made regarding the types of technology and vendor services that will be required, a detailed scope and budget has not provided for this task but is forthcoming.

The Draft Plan (see Attachment 2) includes the following elements:

- Updated Existing Conditions Report
- Recommendations Report
- Financial Analysis of Plan recommendations
- Survey instrument and results
- Comparison of other jurisdictions' Residential Parking Permits

In summary, the Draft Plan includes the following:

### ***(1) Existing Conditions***

There are 6,820 on- and off-street parking spaces in Emeryville. Currently the spaces are largely unregulated with two out of three parking spaces having no controls and the public widely citing lack of enforcement of the controls on those with time restrictions, as evidenced by the average stay in “short term” parking in North Hollis being recorded as four hours, on average.

**Table 1.1: Parking Inventory**

	Total	Percent
Unregulated	4557	67%
Permit	719	11%
Private Paid	564	8%
Reserved	303	4%
2-Hour	285	4%
Loading	82	1%
1-Hour	45	1%
Short Term < 45 min	19	<1%
ADA	112	2%
Other	134	2%
Total	6820	100%

**Table 1.2: Study Area Inventory by Space Type**

	Total	Unreg- ulated	2-Hour	1- Hour	Short Term <45 Min	Private Paid	Loading	Permit	Reserved	ADA	Other
Central	624	75%	4%	2%	0%	0%	4%	10%	0%	1%	4%
Doyle	822	88%	2%	0%	1%	0%	1%	9%	0%	0%	0%
North Bayfront	231	94%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	4%
North Hollis	2869	52%	6%	1%	0%	20%	1%	12%	5%	2%	2%
Park Avenue	726	92%	3%	0%	1%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Peninsula	832	44%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	29%	21%	4%	2%
South Emeryville	105	59%	30%	8%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Triangle	611	93%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	2%	0%	1%	1%
<b>Citywide</b>	<b>6820</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>

**Figure 1.1 Parking occupancy by block face at morning peak period**



**Table 1.3 Change in occupancy between study periods**

Area	2010	2017	Change
Central	71%	68%	-3%
Doyle	71%	87%	+16%
North Bayfront	89%	89%	0%
North Hollis	87%	90%	+3%
Park Avenue	83%	88%	+5%
Peninsula	N/A	97%	N/A
South Emeryville	100%*	67%	-33%
Triangle	63%	71%	+8%



**(2) Survey**

In November and December of 2017, the City conducted two online surveys - one of business and commercial property owners throughout the city, and one of parking users. The survey asked questions related to the supply of parking on and near the businesses and properties of survey respondents, and the parking behavior of employees. The survey questions were designed to better understand the supply and utilization of parking on private property, attitudes about the parking experience throughout Emeryville, and opinions about potential changes to the parking permit program.

The Business and Property Owner Survey was open online from November 4, 2017 to December 19, 2017. Survey respondents were recruited through a flyer included with the City’s business license renewal mailer, as well as through links on the Parking Management Plan website, which was shared during public meetings and other public communications about the project. Fifty business and property owners completed the survey.

The Parking User Survey was open for the same period. Survey respondents were recruited through flyers handed out in-person and left on car windshields in the North Hollis, Doyle, and Park Avenue neighborhoods during one day in early December 2017. The survey was also accessible via the Parking Management Plan website, which was shared during public meetings and other public communications about the project. The survey was completed or partially completed by 192 respondents.

The surveys were not intended to be statistically significant, as their primary purpose was to add detail to existing parking behavior data and qualitatively gauge parking user attitudes.

**(3) Recommendations**

*Meters*

The Parking Management Plan recommends three initial pricing schemes with different intended outcomes dispersed throughout the City. The three pricing arrangements are:

Hour	\$/Hour								\$/day	\$/week	\$/month
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
Short Term	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$46.00	\$230.00	\$920.00
Mid Term	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$6.00	\$6.00	\$6.00	\$6.00	\$28.00	\$140.00	\$560.00
Long Term	\$0.50	\$0.50	\$0.50	\$0.50	\$0.50	\$0.50	\$0.50	\$0.50	\$4.00	\$20.0	\$80.00

Pricing tiers are intended to communicate the relative importance of turnover on any given block. The price is higher initially in more complex demand blocks and rises sharply when the desired turnover period is reached. While this requires user education and clear communication, it reduces enforcement requirements.

**Short-Term Metered:** In these locations, parking would be metered with an hourly parking rate using a variable pricing scheme to encourage two-hour parking without an enforced time limit. This designation is used in commercial areas visited heavily by customers who do not need to spend a long time at their destination. Businesses would benefit from the increased parking availability created by higher vehicle turnover. Clear signage and a description of the pricing variation is integral to self-enforcement in areas expected for high turnover. The variable pricing scheme is preferred as it reduces enforcement costs from becoming prohibitive and it allows for flexibility in responding to changes in parking behaviors.

**Mid-Term Metered/Business Permit:** In these locations, parking would be metered, as above, with a variable hourly rate which encourages parking durations of four hours or less. This designation is recommended in areas where some turnover is preferred, but the short-term rates are deemed inappropriate. This includes areas on the peninsula where visitors to the park, marina, or residential towers need mid-length parking, as well as some commercial areas where short-term parking is unlikely to be sufficient for visitors. Businesses may also be issued permits for the mid-term parking areas to allow employees to park at these meters for an annual fee rather than paying the meter each day.

**Long Term Metered:** In these locations, parking would be metered with a relatively low hourly rate and no variable pricing or time limit. This designation is used in commercial areas where parking is used primarily by employees or long-term visitors, or in areas adjacent to commercial locations where employees can park for longer periods of time.

There are two types of meters that can be used for on-street parking.

**Single-Space Meters** are the more traditional type of parking meter, and would be located at each parking space. Modern smart meters can accept credit cards, coins or phone payments. These could be implemented on single-head meters or double-head meters covering two adjacent parking spaces. A dual head meter uses a single pole, reducing sidewalk impacts and minimizing distance to payment, while creating diffused payment options, in case of equipment failure.

**Multi-space meters** can be kiosks that serve multiple parking spaces. Parkers pay at the kiosk and return to their car to display the receipt on the dashboard, or the meters can be set up so that parkers enter their license plate number and do not need to return to their vehicle. Multi-space meters can accept credit cards, cash, or coins. Based on feedback received during the public workshops, and to be relatively

consistent with neighboring Oakland's technology, dual head- meters are recommended for Emeryville.

### *Residential Permit Areas*

In locations proposed for Residential Permit Parking ("RPP"), there would be no meters, but there would be a 2-hour time limit for non-permit holders. Vehicles with a parking permit would be exempt from the time limits. This designation is intended for residential areas and mixed-use areas with significant residential uses. Permits would be available to residents on blocks within the permit areas, with a maximum of two permits per dwelling unit, and to businesses within the permit areas and in specified nearby commercial areas. There are two RPP areas recommended: North Hollis/Doyle in Phase 1, and Triangle, if needed, in Phase 2 (phasing of the plan is discussed in further detail below).

Business adjacent to these areas will be allowed a limited number of permits for employees. The number of permits issued to businesses may vary based on the demand from residents (who may have off street options like driveways and garages and not want a permit) but will initially be set at a relatively low number to maintain no greater than an 85% parking occupancy rate on a typical block.

The City's current RPP guidelines require that a petition be submitted by the residents of each block face (i.e. each side of a street between intersections) to begin the process of establishing a permit area, although they do allow the City Council to unilaterally designate a block face as a permit area. The guidelines would be revised to allow the City Council to designate entire neighborhoods as permit areas without the need for petitions from residents.

### *Pricing*

The pricing recommendations are to adopt the initial parking rates discussed above, along with a pricing policy that would set the process for increasing or decreasing rates after implementation.

The pricing policy will:

- Target 85% on-street parking occupancy throughout the city and review occupancy rates at least annually.
- Require the city to review occupancy, turnover, citywide modal use changes, and complaints at least annually, and bi-annually if needed.
- Set occupancy thresholds for raising or lowering parking prices within each metered parking category.

It is recommended that meter prices be lowered when average occupancy within each metered parking designation (short-, mid-, and long-term) falls below a low occupancy threshold, recommended to be 65% occupancy during the peak period, and raised when occupancy rises above a high occupancy threshold, recommended to be 85% occupancy during the peak period.

The city should also review block faces within each area to determine if individual blocks should be re-designated to a different meter category or if additional meter categories should be created to allow for differing needs throughout the city.

The increment by which parking prices are raised or lowered is recommended to be low to avoid dramatic changes to parking prices, but high enough to change behavior. \$0.50 is recommended as a reasonable increment. Variable increments may also be set based on the magnitude by which observed occupancies differ from the occupancy thresholds. Maximum and minimum parking rates should be set citywide, recommended to be \$10 per hour maximum and \$0.50 per hour minimum.

### *Phasing*

The parking recommendations include a phasing plan for rolling out meters, pricing, and permits throughout the city.

The first phase includes all designations within the North Hollis and Doyle neighborhoods, bordered by Overland Avenue and the railroad tracks to the west, 53rd St to the south, and the Emeryville City limits to the north and east. This would include the entirety of the proposed North Hollis/Doyle parking permit area.

The second phase includes all parking designations in the remainder of the city, including the Peninsula. The Triangle permit area would be included in this phase if residents and the City identify a need to manage parking on residential streets in the Triangle after other improvements on San Pablo Avenue or 40th Street alter parking patterns.

The third phase would potentially implement a peak period bus lane on one or both sides of Hollis St, replacing parking during peak periods. Implementation of this option depends on a feasibility study, including whether the lane geometry would allow conversion of the parking lane, determination of the direction and times during which buses are most impacted by traffic, and limitations on turning movements or impacts of turning movements on through travel

### **D. Public Comments**

The City held two community workshops, one in the afternoon and one in the evening, on Wednesday, April 18 where the Draft Plan's recommendations were presented to approximately 100 participants, evenly split between the two meetings. The following day, at the City's Transportation/Public Works Committee meeting, staff presented a summary of the workshop material, and highlighted the concerns raised by the public at the

workshops and expressed in emails to staff. Nearly 70 individuals have emailed staff with comments.

Staff noted significant overlap between the emailed concerns and the concerns raised at the public workshops, which can be characterized as follows:

1. Costly mid-term meters rather than Residential permits on Powell Street west of I-80
2. Long-term meters on 67<sup>th</sup> Street east of Hollis Street rather than leaving no treatment
3. Low cost, long-term meters near the proposed Sherwin Williams development that could promote park and ride behavior rather than Residential permits
4. No Residential permits offered to residents in the Park Avenue District or Watergate, either as an overlay with meters or exclusively
5. Price of residential permits for first and especially second vehicles and the pricing and availability of business permits
6. Evening parking congestion in the Triangle neighborhood, not addressed by permits
7. Charging for parking in the Marina, given the users of the public park
8. Spillover into Oakland's adjacent unregulated streets is an operational multi-jurisdictional issue of concern to residents of the Oakland side of Vallejo Street.
9. Hollis Street Bus Corridor consistency with recommendation for long-term metered parking on Hollis Street
10. Existing school employee permit programs potential conflict with proposals

These opportunities for discussion led to the suggestion of several alternatives to address some of these concerns, including:

1. **Powell Street West of I-80.** Offer Residential permits to Watergate residents and allow residents with those permits to park during the day at the midterm meters on Powell Street. An alternative approach was also considered, to place meters only on the south side of Powell Street and designate the north side of the street for permits only. In both the current proposal and these alternatives, no business permits would be allowed in this area, therefore, employees of businesses in the Towers would need to park in the Towers garages or pay the meters on Powell.

During upcoming sewer construction, Watergate could consider a private transaction with the Towers to use their excess off-street parking. The Existing Conditions report, prepared as part of the draft Plan and from which some information was shared at the workshops, noted that 40% of Powell Street parkers are residents, and 60% are non-residents.

Factors to consider with these alternatives include that the designation of this area exclusively for RPP could preclude public access to the Bay Trail and public facilities adjacent to the street for visits of more than two hours (though

this could be altered to four hours) and would redirect employees into paid lots at the Towers. Casual carpool parkers would be displaced. RPP is relatively expensive to enforce and generates insufficient offsetting revenue. In contrast, mid-term meters charge a moderate sum for visitors up to 4 hours but eliminates free access and likely reduces residential spillover into the street, casual carpool and employee parking in the public right of way, thereby emphasizing these spaces availability for public users of the adjacent recreational space. Casual carpool could continue at the Marina lot, potentially at a lower rate.

2. **Park Avenue District.** Offer Residential permits to Park Avenue District residents on Horton Street and 45<sup>th</sup> Street west of Hollis Street and south of 53<sup>rd</sup> Street, and allow residents with these permits to park all day at the midterm meters in this district. A shuttle between West Oakland BART and the Sherwin Williams project is anticipated, and Lennar (developer of the Sherwin Williams project) and the Park Avenue Residents' Committee (PARC - a resident advocacy organization) are negotiating mitigation of parking spillovers into the Park Avenue District. Residents at the 45<sup>th</sup> Street Artists Co-op have suggested that the shuttle stop location could result in significant park and ride users at long term meters. The spillover from the Sherwin Williams project could exacerbate occupancy. With development of the Sherwin Williams project, residents in that project may be precluded from obtaining permits in the future. Additionally, parking treatments for adjacent roadways, including pricing of meters or eligibility for permits, could be staged concurrent with the Sherwin William development's occupancy in future phases.
3. **67<sup>th</sup> Street East of Hollis Street.** Offer business permits to businesses on 67th Street east of Hollis Street and change these meters from Long Term to Mid Term pricing. Staff observed conditions on 67th Street east of Hollis Street on April 19, 2018 at 9 am and could not find a single available space on either side of the street; however, at the same time, parking on the top floor at the Foundry 31 building (3100 San Pablo Avenue, in Oakland/Berkeley at 67<sup>th</sup> Street) was almost completely empty. Fees are charged for this garage. Long-term meters would be less expensive than this garage; therefore mid-term meters would be preferable to avoid spillover from employees and visitors at the Foundry 31 building, especially as a medical use is leasing the space and will be occupying a significant portion of this building shortly. However, offering business permits to the adjacent businesses in Emeryville would allow a more cost-effective employee parking option, perhaps creating an optimal alternative.
4. **Vallejo Street and Adjacent Blocks in Oakland.** Offer Oakland residents on Vallejo Street adjacent to the Emeryville right-of-way (and perhaps also 53<sup>rd</sup> Street if this is an issue) access to Emeryville residential parking permits and offer signage and enforcement of both sides of Vallejo Street. Issues regarding liability, street cleaning, and signage placements need to be coordinated with the City of Oakland to implement this alternative. Additionally, or at a minimum,

staff proposes that the City of Emeryville, when commissioning occupancy data for review of pricing (anticipated annually), should include the blocks between Emeryville and San Pablo Avenue in data collection and provide this data to the residents of these blocks and the City for Oakland for consideration of initiating an Oakland residential permit area for these blocks. Oakland residents have requested free permits; however this is not consistent with the Plan's objectives and would not be equitable for Emeryville residents.

5. **Permit Pricing.** Residents in the Doyle Street and Triangle neighborhoods have raised concerns about the proposed permit prices, particularly for the second vehicle. They have also suggested that business permits or business taxes could offset residential permit costs. Berkeley will be raising their current fees to \$66 per vehicle as of July 1, 2018 based on the cost of enforcing and administering their permit fees. The City could consider making the first permit fee consistent with this cost (an increase of less than 20% over existing permit fees with significantly better enforcement) and that the second vehicle permit fee be twice as much to create a disincentive to storing multiple vehicles in the public right-of-way when driveway parking is a viable option for many. Regardless of the pricing levels selected, staff recommends that the current discount for low income residents be retained, which allows qualifying households to pay 50% of the permit fee. One-way car share vehicles are proposed to be eligible to park in permit areas so that residents may move to car sharing as opposed to storing an underutilized vehicle on the street during peak parking periods.
6. **Parking Space Demarcation in Residential Areas.** In response to residents' concerns about parking behavior, the City could consider demarcation of parking spaces where there is space for two cars between driveways, while still allowing sufficient room to maintain access to driveways for off-street vehicle storage.
7. **Marina.** It has been suggested that Residential permit holders be allowed to park for free at the Marina. However, if parking at the Marina were free for everyone, it could become much harder for residents to enjoy the Marina if it were impacted by casual carpoolers or long-term parkers taking the Emery Go-Round to the MacArthur BART station. Long-term meters would only cost park users \$2 for four hours. Furthermore, meters would generally not operate during the hours of sunset, sunrise and weekends, which are the most popular park user times.
8. **Hollis Street Bus Corridor.** Implementation of the Hollis Street Bus Corridor may require lane reconfigurations and changes to accommodate turning movements that may require some parking elimination. Some intersections such as Powell/Hollis have no adjacent parking, and may need to have turning lanes eliminated or require transit to merge with traffic at the most congested points, thereby reducing the transit lane benefits. Consideration of limiting the

bus lane to just one side, or just in the peak direction, may make such trade-offs more feasible. With this many unknowns, it is unclear if there will be a conflict with long-term metered parking. Comments were also received requesting simplification of the changes proposed from block to block and to consider only one or two treatments on Hollis. Staff is considering recommending mid-term meters in lieu of long-term meters where proposed on Hollis; however additional restrictions on business parking permits in these spots would complicate the Hollis corridor.

9. **Haruff Street.** On Haruff Street, a business tenant has requested short-term metered parking in lieu of the long-term metered parking included in the Draft Plan. This change would be consistent with the proposed change in use of the adjacent building from warehousing and storage to retail. This is the only alternative presented here that represents a positive fiscal impact to the Draft Plan recommendations.

## **NEXT STEPS**

After staff receives City Council direction on the Draft Plan, future steps include:

- Final Plan development and adoption by the City Council
- City Council consideration of ordinance(s) for Parking Permit Program and Parking Meter Program, including one-way car share (two readings required)
- Construction bid for North Hollis and Doyle Phase I area
- Bid for operations and maintenance of meters
- Review of Phase I performance
- Program revisions as needed (modification of pricing under the Program parameters or revision of the Ordinance as needed based on Pilot findings)

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

The current CIP includes \$1,200,000 for the North Hollis Paid Parking and Transportation Demand Management Project, with \$200,000 budgeted in Fiscal Year 2017-2018 and \$1,000,000 budgeted in Fiscal Year 2018-2019. Additionally, and as noted above, ACTC awarded the City a \$930,000 grant for this project. The City funds budgeted for this project have been used to develop the Plan with the anticipation that City and the ACTC grant funds would be used to implement the Phase I capital improvements, with costs estimated at \$1,144,000. The remaining City funds total \$812,000 and could be used to implement later phases of the Plan; however, the estimated cost of capital improvements required for Phase II is \$1,941,000. Therefore, additional funding from either parking revenue, general capital funds, or grant sources will be needed to complete all phases of the Plan.



The Draft Plan assumes Phase I revenue of just under \$1,000,000, split evenly between short and mid-term meters with one tenth of this revenue from permits. In Phase II, annual revenue is estimated to rise to \$2,700,000 initially, however this amount is expected to decline over time as various competing uses for curb spaces are assumed to remove 2.5% of curb space annually, on average. With this assumption and holding proposed parking prices constant, in 2026 revenue would decline to \$2,300,000.

The Draft Plan estimates labor and contracting costs plus amortization of all capital assets over 10 years at approximately \$1,100,000 per year in Phase I, principally due to the hiring of 3.0 full time equivalent staff (“FTE”) for program management and enforcement plus contractors for collections and maintenance functions. After implementation of Phase II, costs are expected to continue to increase annually, rising to \$2,000,000 in 2026, at which point the program would no longer be cost-neutral. This deficit could be paid by accumulated reserves from prior years of the program (amounting to \$2,200,000), which would delay substantive program revisions until 2028. Several options for correcting this potential deficit in 2028 include:

- i. Revising the capital equipment replacement schedule for the program or providing replacement capital from another source.
- ii. Revising parking meter and permit prices to reflect cost increases over time – this might be done incrementally and automatically as meters are adjusted annual for maximum curb utility.
- iii. Analyzing actual revenues versus actual expenses and correcting assumptions that have proven overly conservative. Such key assumptions include occupancy at short-term meters and loss of revenue-producing curb spaces.

Implementation of the program alternatives outlined in this report could significantly affect the revenues and expenses described in this section. In particular, the fiscal impact resulting from changes related to short-term meter revenue are significant.

## **STAFF COMMUNICATION WITH THE PUBLIC**

### Public Comment Opportunities

The public was notified of the proposed Plan and given opportunity to comment or seek clarification in the following ways:

- Four workshops were conducted, with both a day and evening workshop in both November 2017 and April 2018. The November 2017 workshops were to solicit early feedback about parking concerns and opportunities. In April 2018, the Draft Plan and a review of existing conditions were presented for comment. Approximately fifty

attendees were present at the November 2017 workshops, and about 100 attended the April 2018 workshops.

- Notification of the April 2018 workshops was sent by postcard to every Emeryville address, with over 10,000 postcards delivered.
- Additional notifications were made via electronic media, including:
  - Twitter, City’s website, and the Activity Guide
  - Nextdoor (just under 20 individuals have exchanged over 50 comments)
  - Community Services Department Facebook post
  - Emails to over 300 individuals, with approximately 200 invited to the Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC) meeting to review the Draft Plan (note these lists may overlap)
  - Two online interactive tools have been made available after each workshop on the Parking Management Plan website
  - In November 2017, an online mapping tool was provided where participants could indicate location-specific concerns or issues generally
  - In April 2018, an online map was provided where participants could note specific concerns or issues in response to the Draft Plan’s proposed improvements
  - Comments were accepted through the project website at <http://www.placeworkscivic.com/project/emeryvilleparking>
  - Over 30 comments were received through the project website’s public engagement tools
- Publicly noticed Committee and Commission meetings included:
  - Public Works/Transportation Committee, April 19, 2018 – 2 attendees
  - Budget Advisory Committee, May 3, 2018 - 3 attendees
  - Economic Development Advisory Committee, May 16, 2018, – approximately 15 attendees
  - Planning Commission, May 17, 2018 – 20 attendees
- A dedicated webpage has continually been updated with materials at [emeryvilleparkingmanagement.org](http://emeryvilleparkingmanagement.org) – staff has received over 70 emails from this source

## **DISCUSSION QUESTIONS**

Staff requests the City Council’s direction regarding the following issues:

1. Does the Council agree with the proposed Short-Term (“ST”), Mid-Term (“MT”), and Long-Term (“LT”) metered parking areas in general?

- i) Should the areas proposed for meters of a certain type be altered from the Draft Plan recommendations, including:
  - (1) 67<sup>th</sup> and 66<sup>th</sup> – a) change LT meters to MT meters with permit overlay or b) No meters or permits
  - (2) Haruff from LT meters to ST meters
  - (3) Hollis (from 53<sup>rd</sup> to 45<sup>th</sup>) and 45<sup>th</sup> (Horton to Hollis) – LT meters to MT meters with residential permit overlay, or LT meters to RPP
  - (4) Yerba Buena; West MacArthur – designated ST meters
  - (5) Emery (south of 40<sup>th</sup>) - designated MT meters
  - (6) Marina - Eliminate LT meters or allow RPP overlay
2. Does the Council think that the use of pricing to manage turnover in priority areas is an appropriate tool for managing parking, versus time limits requiring enforcement?
  - i) Should prices be initially higher or lower in any of the three types of meters?
  - ii) Should time limits be enforced that prohibit parking after two hours in short term meter areas, and after four hours in mid-term meter areas?
  - iii) Should 4-hour free parking (instead of 2 hour) be allowed in any of the proposed RPP areas?
3. Does the Council agree with the expansion, and the proposed geography, of RPP areas? Does the Council agree with the transfer of responsibility for designation from individual block faces by resident petition to areas to be designated by the City Council?
  - i) Should the permit prices be lower? Should there be a differential (i.e. higher) second vehicle price? Should permits be limited to just two vehicles per dwelling unit?
  - ii) Should the areas proposed for RPP be altered from the Draft Plan including:
    - (1) Adding RPP eligibility and enforcement to the east side of Vallejo Street
    - (2) Adding a new RPP area in the Park Avenue District on Horton Street (from 53<sup>rd</sup> to 45<sup>th</sup>) and 45<sup>th</sup> (Horton to Hollis)
    - (3) Adding a new RPP area along Peralta Street south of West MacArthur Boulevard.
    - (4) Should these areas be discrete areas or combined with overlay RPP in MT meter areas adjacent to these areas?
    - (5) Adding a new RPP area along the north side of Powell Street from Captain Way to Trader Vic's

- iii) Should the geography and policy proposed for RPP be altered from the Draft Plan to include overlays of RPP in specific areas including allowing residents adjacent to MT meter zones:
  - (1) Horton (from 53rd to 45th) and 45th (Horton to Hollis)
  - (2) Park Avenue District
  - (3) North Bayfront at 64th and Christie
  - (4) Powell Street west of I-80
- 4. Does the Council agree with the concept of Business Parking Permits (BPP) to allow all-day parking at MT meters and in RPP areas adjacent to commercial areas?
  - i) Should BPP be allowed at
    - (1) North Bayfront
    - (2) Park Avenue
  - ii) At what price?
- 5. Does the Council agree that the Hollis Street Bus Corridor should be studied further as a separate capital project? Should LT meters on Hollis north of Powell be modified to MT meters to avoid future conflict with peak travel parking prohibitions?
- 6. Does the Council have any further comments on the public's requested alternatives?

**PREPARED BY:** Amber Evans, Community & Economic Development Coordinator II

**REVIEWED BY:** Chadrick Smalley, Economic Development and Housing Manager

**APPROVED AND FORWARDED TO THE  
CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EMERYVILLE:**



---

Carolyn Lehr, City Manager

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment 1: Fact Sheet – an easily digestible summary of major recommendations
- Attachment 2: Draft Parking Management Report April 17, 2018
- Attachment 3: Public Comment Summary and Posters Community Workshop Two
- Attachment 4: Alternative Map and Key