From:mt mab <mt_mab@yahoo.com>Sent:Friday, June 15, 2018 11:13 AMTo:John J. Bauters; Ally Medina; Dianne Martinez; scott donahue; Christian Robin Patz; Sheri HartzCc:Larry Yahoo; Betsy Cooley; Marilyn Fulrath; Mary Farrell; Kim Adolf; Albert Repola; Finley RobbinsSubject:Residential Parking Permits available to residents at WatergateFwd: Some initial comments re
parking

OUR City Representatives NEED TO also represent Watergate Condo tenants: Make Residential Parking Permits available to residents at Watergate either for in-line purchase or at no charge.

I live at the Watergate condo... I support Betsy Cooley's message, and

Martha Birch

----- Forwarded Message -----From: Betsy Cooley To: Betsy Cooley Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 9:08 PM Subject: Fwd: Some initial comments re parking

There will be a Study Session on the Parking Proposal next Tuesday, June 19th, at 6 p.m. at City Hall. Below is a link to the agenda and agenda packet for the Study Session. At the moment the recommendation is for parking meters on both sides of Powell Street that would charge \$1 an hour for 4 hours, then \$6 an hour for 4 hours, for a total of \$28/day if someone were to park all day. There are NO plans to make Residential Parking Permits available to residents at Watergate either for purchase or at no charge. Staff is currently proposed some alternatives to the City Council which would be either making Residential Permits available to residents at whatever charge they determine for the City's residents overall and would maintain the parking meters on both sides of Powell Street, but would allow residents with the RPP to park there without paying the parking meter fee. Another possibility would be having parking meters on the South side of Powell Street, and the North side of Powell Street would allow Residential Parking Permits. This might be 2-hour parking, with residents with a RPP able to park for longer than the designated time period without a getting a ticket and the parking would be most likely available to anyone who wants to park there, but they would have the 2-hour restriction. If you have any interest in what happens on Powell Street and how the parking plan is implemented, please attend the meeting on June 19th and let your wishes be known. Mayor Bauters was at the Ashby Village Coffee this morning and he emphasized how important it is for residents' voices to be heard and it

always has more impact if you are actually present at the meeting. I sent some initial comments which are below. Thanks, Betsy

http://emeryville.legistar1.com/emeryville/meetings/2018/6/1606_A_City_C ouncil_18-06-19_Agenda.pdf

Begin forwarded message:

From: Betsy Cooley <<u>betsycooley@gmail.com</u>>

Subject: Some initial comments re parking

Date: June 12, 2018 at 8:24:43 PM PDT

To: John Bauters <<u>jbauters@emeryville.org</u>>, Ally Medina <<u>amedina@emeryville.org</u>>, Dianne Martinez <<u>dmartinez@emeryville.org</u>>, scott donahue <<u>scott@sdonahue.com</u>>, Christian Patz <<u>cpatz@emeryville.org</u>>, Sheri Hartz <<u>shartz@emeryville.org</u>>

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 hear their homes. In these areas, the City wishes to prioritize residents, <u>REDUCE SPILLOVER PARKING FROM COMMERCIAL AREAS</u>, and discourage all-day parking for those who neither live not 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 <u>LIKELY REDUCES RESIDENTIAL SPILLOVER INTO THE STREET</u>, 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.

<u>Metered Parking</u>

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