

Downtown RPP Stakeholder Meeting

4:00 PM Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Community Meeting Room
in the Lobby of City Hall, 250 Hamilton Ave., Palo Alto

AGENDA

Purpose of this meeting: City staff would like to share permit data and parking occupancy data collected in December and discuss any adjustments to the Downtown RPP program that are warranted at the end of the Phase 2 "Pilot" on March 31, 2017.

1. Introductions
2. Review of Permit and Parking Occupancy Data from the Phase 2 Pilot
3. Review of Current Program Parameters & City Council Direction September 6, 2016
 - A. Pilot Program Parameters
 - Boundaries and zone structure
 - Hours of enforcement
 - Resident Permits
 - Employee Permits
 - Other
 - B. September 6th Council-Requested Changes
 - Freeze sale of employee permits in Zones 9 & 10 & allow future streets in these zones to be added for resident-only parking, reducing the total number of available employee permits in all zones by this amount
 - Eliminate 5 day passes
 - Propose quantitative objectives
 - Give priority to low income workers (already included in the program)
 - Require employer registration in the Business Registry (already included in the program)
 - Require employer participation in the TMA or a staff-approved TDM program if legally permissible
4. Discussion of Issues & Potential Changes for City Council Consideration February 6, 2017
 - Clustering in zones closest to the core
 - Permit types, numbers & duration
 - Enforcement
 - Other
5. Next Steps

Downtown RPP Meeting

Wednesday January 4th Meeting Notes

A. Concerns/Comments

- Zone 8 enforcement could be more robust, as Zone 6/7 employee tags are seen in the area.
- 10 permit cap for employees are hard for employers, accommodations could possibly be made for larger employers.
- Occupancy data should begin red threshold at 80%, not 85%. (Against industry standard).
- What is 2,000 maximum authorized permit based on? More data should justify this, not a conservative guess.
- Data that uses an “urban standard” should be possibly switched to a “residential standard”, if it exists.
- Some of the occupancy data is hard to understand or looks incomplete (references to Zone 10 data).
- Who parks in occupancy data maps? Employees or residents?
- RPP program seems too aggressive in some areas, noticing empty streets in RPP.
- Outreach of RPP needs to be more robust, especially for retailers and their employees.
- 12-2 employee occupancy is not red at all.
- Southern boundaries of zones 5-7 are totally solid all day long.
- Zone system seems outdated, especially for residents close to Downtown core (feel as though it isn't working well).
- Enforcement robustness is working well.
- Deeper analysis for retailers would be great so they can identify employee/resident parking in their area.

Suggestions/Recommendations

- Align contractor permits available at the MSC with scratchers as they are perceived to be expensive (~\$72/week).
- Scratchers should be expanded. Especially employees.
- It would be great to see citation numbers.
- Maybe a 0\$ low-income permit for employees, or a quarterly rate.
- A different tiered employee system for 1st floor retailers (mixed use areas find it hard to purchase permits).
- We feel there is a supply issue-tweak permits numbers allowed.
- Experiment with making subzones in really high-use areas.

- Please break down who is parking where (alluding to making T2 reporting more comprehensive)
- The 10% phase down of permits will really hurt employers, even with the TDM, more lots/garages, etc.
- Investigate sliding enforcement hours later in the day, or add more hours in the afternoon (early morning employees not really a problem).
- 2 hour parking limit could be shifted (perhaps longer?)
- High use areas (bordering Downtown core) can stand to use the 10% phase down, but not in the outer extents like 9 and 10.

B. Ancillary Resident/Employer notes:

- 1) The parking for a school in an RPP district is a unique issue. Addison School covers one block, but one block face is on Middlefield which is not suitable for parking. Perhaps permits should be sold for Addison through the principle's office. They could sell them only to school employees and they would only be valid for use on one of the school's 3 face blocks. These permit parking signs and stickers must have a unique color. I would suggest parking stickers that go on the inside lower left corner of the rear car window. These type of stickers could be moved from one vehicle to another but it not as convenient as a hang tag to move. The stickers could be coded to a particular vehicle but that could be changed in the computer at the schools request if an employee moves or is transferred.

I have mentioned before that buying a parking permit should not authorize anyone to park in front of a school all day who does not belong there. Also having a parking sticker on your car should not prevent police from having "probable cause" to approach a vehicle and inquire the nature of their business if parked in front of a school all day.

Just my thoughts, thanks for your consideration, Paul

- 2) I remain very pleased that you are making the time to engage stakeholders in an update of the Downtown RPP.

And I wish to thank you and Josh for taking our questions into consideration. Since these open meetings have significant time constraints, I would like to ask that in the future city staff share any new data and analysis AHEAD OF TIME so that participants can have the opportunity to become familiar with it before we meet. I believe this will make our time together more productive.

- 3) The clustering issue to which Neilson referred in his message and which we wish to discuss at our meeting on January 4 is especially prevalent on the West side of the Downtown RPP district in the areas immediately adjacent to the commercial core.

In DTS the area bounded by Bryant Street, High Street, Forest Avenue and Embarcadero Road is consistently fully parked. In fact, 13 of the 17 blocks in that area are fully parked or overly parked on a daily basis during working hours. It is this specific area for which we believe we have a low cost, easy to implement solution . . . and that is to turn this specific area into an unique zone the permits for which can be more granularly managed.

Please see the attached files for details of the data we collected at the beginning of December.

Thanks!

Michael

mehodos@mac.com

- 4) We are prepared to elaborate on these concerns on Jan 4 and look forward hearing your responses. Call John Guislin or Neilson Buchanan if you have any questions. Our primary concerns are:

Council policy requires annual reduction in the number of non-resident vehicles parked on residential streets. We dont have information to understand the numbers and types permits issued during the last nine months of Phase 2. Therefore, we submitted the attached request for public records covering Aug 1 thru Dec 31.

Severe clustering on some streets is evident and this too must be addressed by staff and Council. Residents have compiled data and will continue through January 2017 and beyond. Michael Hodos will be submitting data demonstrating the clustering problems. He also has a low-cost solution for you to consider.

Reduction of non-resident vehicles can be managed by reducing number of non-resident vehicles permits and balancing among the 8 zones. This requires active management and review by city staff quarterly.

We are hopeful that the January 4 meeting and staff report to Council will also address the long-standing concerns below.

Cost of enforcement and technology. Consistent placement of permits on vehicles can be improved. Some technology was introduced in 2016 but more technology is warranted. We are confident that staff and residents are in agreement that permits must be consistently placed on vehicles at designated locations to lower enforcement costs. Lack of technology, especially garage guidance technology, restricts efficiency of city garages and lots. This creates more parking pressure upon residential neighborhoods.

Two-hour parking. Unlimited 2-hr will compromise integrity of the Council's commitment to reduce non-resident vehicles. Certain zones obviously are vulnerable to commercial parking spillover from the commercial core. The current study of commercial core parking and pricing will highlight the scope of this problem as it impacts RPP.

Inconsistent Quality Standards. Inconsistent quality standards for bumper/window stickers compromises RPP. Attached are the photos of stickers in use within the commercial core and neighborhoods. The highest quality sticker (for city garages and lots) contains serial number, location, license plate and expiration. We noted that many of the parking permits in use in the City Hall garage (CC) do not comply with RRP or commercial core sticker standards. Also the orange "CC medalion" stickers are not consistently on rear bumpers or windows to reduce enforcement costs.

Hangtag Design. Hangtags are subject to fraud and abuse. We will present to you and Council examples of easily counterfeited hang tags. Only technology can eliminate this abuse which will escalate over time as prices incentives are created. We have not found technology which can read hang tag through a window shield. Use of hangtags next year should be exception not the rule.

Temporary Permits. Phase 2 resulted in temporary paper permits without expiration dates. Some of these dashboard paper permits are still in use by residents and non-residents. It is possible that bumper stickers are in use on other vehicles. Next year all temporary paper permits must have expiration dates to eliminate abuse and lower enforcement costs.

Admin Guidelines. We are still unclear about the notification and approval process for Administrative Guidelines for RPP. Please cover this issue on January 4 and in your upcoming staff report to City Council.

Loss of Residential Parking Spaces. We understand that parking spaces may be reduced soon only to improve bike safety on a limited number of intersections. We ask that Administrative Guidelines prescribe a notification and comment period for reduction of any parking capacity in the residential neighborhoods. The number of permits to be issued must be reduced in proportion to the loss of parking capacity.

Expectations for January 4. We are hopeful that you can address most of these issues during Wednesday's community meeting. If you are unable to address the issues, then lets conclude the meeting with understanding of a follow-up timetable.

Neilson Buchanan

155 Bryant Street

Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484

650 537-9611 cell

cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com