

**From:** Betsy Cooley <betsycooley@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 12, 2018 8:25 PM  
**To:** John J. Bauters; Ally Medina; Dianne Martinez; scott donahue; Christian Robin Patz; Sheri Hartz  
**Subject:** Some initial comments re parking

Mayor Bauters and members of the City Council,

This email is a preliminary list of some comments I have regarding the parking proposal that will be discussed at the upcoming Study Session for the parking proposal implementation.

Initially, I want to point out that San Francisco Parking Policies do reference parking meters for "Major Transportation Corridors." I lived and worked there for many years and having the Emery Go-Round on Powell Street every 20 or 25 minutes is not in any relevant way comparable to the Major Transportation Corridors you might find on Market Street or Van Ness Avenue in San Francisco where multiple forms of buses and street cars run nonstop. I also don't think that calling Powell Street in Emeryville a Transit Corridor can legitimately be used to justify expensive parking meters on both sides of the Street and effectively limiting residential access to parking on that street.

These comments do not incorporate some of my fundamental objections to the plan as it impacts Watergate, but does pull out some items in the agenda packet that I'd like to call to your attention.

1. On p. 13 of the Staff Report it suggests "During upcoming sewer construction Watergate could consider a private transaction with The Towers to use their excess off-street parking." When we lost the EGR service several years ago, I measured the distance from my lobby to the parking area at The Towers and it is 1/2 a mile. It is not at all practical to expect residents who live on Admiral or Anchor to park 1/2 a mile away.
2. On p. 14 of the Staff Report under factors to be considered if Residential Parking Permits were to be considered on Powell Street West of 80, it states: It would redirect employees into paid lots at The Towers, Casual Carpool parkers would be displaced. Why is that a concern? Wouldn't that be a positive impact of RPP? Any place I've ever worked, we had to either take public transit or pay for parking. As of today on their websites, the parking all day at The Towers is a maximum of \$15/day and monthly parking is \$105/month, or at 23 days business days a month, it would be \$4.57/day. The parking at 2100 Powell Street is currently \$90/month, which works out to \$3.91/day. These market rate parking prices at the highrise office buildings make the \$28/day meters seem somewhat out of sync with reality.
3. In the Draft Parking Plan on p. 20, it states: "Many residential areas in the City experience high parking demand throughout the day, and many residents have trouble parking their cars near their homes. In these areas, the City wishes to prioritize residents, **REDUCE SPILLOVER PARKING FROM COMMERCIAL AREAS**, and discourage all-day parking for those who neither live nor work in Emeryville but take advantage of free parking and transit accessibility." [Emphasis added.]
4. On p. 14 of the Staff Report under Powell Street West of I-80, it states: "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. SOOOO, apparently in some residential areas the City is concerned about the residents and in other areas, it appears the nearby recreational space (which has significant parking available) seems to be the primary concern if the Staff Report accurately reflects the interests of the City.

5. On p. 9 of the Public Comment Summary and Posters Community Workshop,

## The Peninsula

### Recommends

Mid-term metered parking along Powell Street

Serves visitors of Marina Park and Bay Trail

Discourages long-term Trans-Bay bus riders (where is the Trans-Bay bus that would serve these riders - certainly not The Peninsula), carpoolers and office workers.

This doesn't even reference the approximately 2,400 residents who reside alongside Powell Street and have had access to the parking, along with everyone else, for the past 45 years. It's all about the Bay Trail and the park which is approximately 1/2 a mile away.

### Metered Parking

Goals: Customers

Employees

Transit, biking, walking

Financial sustainability for parking program

Now it is all about making money since there really are minimal if any customers to be served on this stretch. The Market has a parking lot and Trader Vic's has parking and they mostly use it on weekends or nights.

On p. 10,

### Residential Parking Permits

Goals: Improve residents ability to find parking near home.

Protect residents from spillovers from meters.

Reduce commuter parking in residential area.

Once again, we face the conundrum of protecting some residents from spillovers from meters and some streets from spillovers from residents.

The words to express how I feel about this escape me at the moment. I will have comments either before the Study Session or at the meeting to express my more fundamental concerns about fairness and how resident groups different areas of the city are being treated very differently from other residential areas and also the fact that the \$28/day parking meters are a form of a Regressive Tax which falls disproportionately on those with lower incomes or on fixed incomes.

Thanks for your consideration of my comments.

Betsy Cooley

30-year resident of Watergate in Emeryville