

15. Parking (RPP)

Do you support an expanded Residential Parking Permit Program? Please address:

- How should it be structured to protect neighborhoods?
- Should neighborhoods get determine which type of program is appropriate for them?
- What alternatives or additional mitigations do you support?

Will you keep in place the commitment to phase out non-resident parking in the Downtown RPP district in 10 years?

Stewart Carl:

I support well-functioning RPPs like we have in place in College Terrace. Getting RPP to work to the satisfaction of residents in complex environments like the University Avenue area can be more difficult, and will require ongoing work and adjustments by the City staff, the City Council, and should be informed by comments and feedback from effected residents who have intimate knowledge concerning how RPP is working in their neighborhood.

Leonard Ely III:

Not sure that this has worked or ever will. Happy to look into it if elected and find a solution or solutions. This is a good example of an ordinance that was passed and has not worked. In my opinion the Council should have admitted it and either rescinded it or amended it.

- How should it be structured to protect neighborhoods? Of course.
- Should neighborhoods get determine which type of program is appropriate for them? I believe that they should be given solutions and the option to opt for one that they feel will work best. Again, with the caveat that if it doesn't work that we will try something else.
- Will you keep in place the commitment to phase out non-resident parking in the Downtown RPP district in 10 years? I have no idea.

Adrian Fine:

First, let's get businesses to reduce car traffic, invest in safe and easy transit, and manage parking effectively so that the RPPs can work.

I support RPPs and expansion to areas where there are well developed neighborhood plans - it's going to be different for each neighborhood. I also support programs such as the TMA that reduce auto use by existing workers. I think there are many approaches to reducing parking needs in addition to well designed RPP programs.

John Fredrich:

Develop rapid transit; maintain current El Camino Real. No route cuts.

Arthur Keller:

For the Downtown RPP program, I support excluding worker permits from those areas added in Phase 2. I also support distributing worker permits to even out the workers, with fewer worker permits issued adjacent to the downtown core because of the greater number of 2-hour parked cars in that area.

Neighborhoods should be able to choose College Terrace-style (no outside worker permits) RPP programs. In particular, Evergreen Park and Southgate (and Ventura if they want one) neighborhoods should be eligible for College Terrace-style RPP programs.

I support phasing out non-resident parking in the downtown RPP district within 10 years other than for low-income workers. (I suggest reduction by 200 permits per year from the previous year's sales of full-price employee parking permits, so it may take fewer than 10 years.) Unless and until we have a low cost permit program for low-income workers, I would retain their permits. Businesses in commercially zoned areas within the RPP district should continue to be eligible for employee permits.

Only businesses on the Business Registry should be eligible for employee permits.

Businesses and residents located in new buildings, which are supposed to be fully parked, should not be eligible for RPP permits.

Liz Kniss:

- How should it be structured to protect neighborhoods?
It exists to protect neighborhoods and we have attempted to structure it, to reduce the impact through enforcement methods.
- Should neighborhoods get determine which type of program is appropriate for them?
Each neighborhood should have a stakeholders group that works with city staff to determine the kind of program that works best in their particular situation.
- What alternatives or additional mitigations do you support?
Transportation Demand Management program (TDM) and valet parking in 3 downtown garages to reduce the impact in that area. With 2 new neighborhoods asking for protection, will need to look at programs such as this to mitigate the impact.
- Will you keep in place the commitment to phase out non-resident parking in the Downtown RPP district in 10 years?
The City Council's current commitment is two-fold: phase out non-resident parking and implement new electronically controlled ways of handling our traffic and related parking. For example, we are currently studying a sensor based parking garage solution that would indicate the available number of spots on a billboard at the entrance, with interior indications of an open spot. Examples of this exist in San Francisco and Santa Monica.

Lydia Kou:

RPPPs! They create all kinds of problems, mostly transferring the problem to another area. But sometimes they are necessary to deal with even bigger problems. They became necessary because City Hall allowed over-development, with a combination of allowing buildings to be under-parked and of not adjusting the rules in response to change in number of employees in a given space (in the 1990s, the expectation was one employee per 250-350 sq.ft.; now it is often less than 100 sq.ft.) It is also another way out for the City to put aside funding to build parking garages.

The current RPP for Downtown Palo Alto is failing to achieve its goals because of inadequate data. There is minimal tracking of the permits given out, and City staff no longer includes resident stakeholders in the meetings, if any, thereby not getting assessments of what is actually happening on the streets.

We need to eliminate the attitude that it is OK to build now, hope for the very best, and mitigate later. It is inefficient and tends to transfer costs from the private property owner to the public.

I support phasing out non-resident parking in Downtown neighborhoods in 10 years. However, I want the option to also support the lower income workers who may work 2 or 3 jobs and have no viable alternative to their cars to get between jobs.

For other neighborhoods, I support offering the College Terrace RPPP. It has proven success and it returns the burden of providing parking to the employers and to the City. I would also support that a certain number of parking permits are granted to property owners at no charge.

Danielle Martell:

DID NOT RESPOND

Don McDougall:

I support the RPP and expansions that are neighborhood initiated. My goal is through the TMA, new public transit options, increased bike infrastructure and the increased use of services like Lyft and Uber to provide real alternatives to driving downtown. I support providing positive options to reducing parking congestion.

Greer Stone:

Yes, I support an expanded RPPP and believe the neighborhoods need to be protected from unreasonable encroachment by non-resident parking. If on council, I would promote reducing the number of non-resident permits from 2000 to 1600 in order to mitigate the intrusion in neighborhoods. We should reduce the number of non-resident permits by 200 each year, and prioritize the outer most zones of the current RPPP. Given the lack of need in zones 9 and 10, those zones should no longer issue non-resident permits. We should facilitate the equal distribution of non-resident permits in each zone to ensure no more than 1/3 of the total space capacity in any one zone is allocated to nonresident permits. I would also promote prioritizing non-resident permits to employers of retail, restaurants, and other service industries, as permitted by California State Vehicle Code § 22507(b). I will continue to support the commitment to phase out non-resident parking in the Downtown district over the next 10 years. I am confident that with increasing transportation technology, and a larger focus on a more biker/pedestrian friendly city, we will have less need for non-resident parking permits in the future.

Greg Tanaka:

- How should it be structured to protect neighborhoods? The current ordinance and our understanding of it is still evolving, and now activated into two new neighborhoods. We must see how the process works, as well as understanding any unintended consequences, before changing the process.
- Should neighborhoods get determine which type of program is appropriate for them? In the current ordinance the neighborhoods are part of the program design, so yes they need to be included in the street changes.
- What alternatives or additional mitigations do you support? A better way to annex into a new program roll out due to identified unexpected impacts.
- Will you keep in place the commitment to phase out non-resident parking in the Downtown RPP district in 10 years? I support that objective.