

Baumb, Nelly

From: Norman Beamer <nhbeamer@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2020 12:32 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Fw: Changes to Downtown parking in-lieu program

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

Begin forwarded message:

On Friday, May 1, 2020, 12:13 PM, Norman Beamer <nhbeamer@yahoo.com> wrote:

I agree that this action is ill conceived. Don't use the COVID situation to slip this resident-unfriendly action by the public.

On Friday, May 1, 2020, 12:07:57 PM PDT, Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com> wrote:

Please table any action which eliminates or reduces the parking in-lieu fees. The staff report is inaccurate, incomplete and does not consider impact upon a square mile of residential properties adjacent to the University Avenue commercial core.

There is no way that thousands of citizens have had time to change their personal priorities to understand a massive change in development policies. Emergency conditions of the virus threat should not apply to this staff recommendation for Council action.

Please table this matter until full public review and understanding can be achieved. This includes re-examination of office market and public transit conditions by the Planning Commission.

Reference: *Allow the expiration of a 1-year ban on office uses above the ground floor from participating in the City's Downtown parking in-lieu program.*

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?t=62107.34&BlobID=76464>

Neilson Buchanan
Redacted
Palo Alto, CA 94301

[650 329-0484](tel:6503290484)
[650 537-9611](tel:6505379611) cell

cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

Baumb, Nelly

From: Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2020 1:06 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Changes to Downtown parking in-lieu program

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

please excuse this repeat email. The original email had incomplete email address for you.

Neilson Buchanan
Redacted t
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>
To: City Council <city.council@cityofpalo.org>
Cc: Jocelyn Dong <jdong@embarcaderopublishing.com>; Gennady <gsheyner@paweekly.com>; Dave Price <price@padailypost.com>; Planning Commission <planning.commission@cityofpaloalto.org>; Norm Beamer <nhbeamer@yahoo.com>; Greg Welch <welgreg@gmail.com>; Sallyann Rudd <sallyannr03@gmail.com>; Malcolm Roy Beasley <beasley@stanford.edu>; Michael Hodos <mehodos@mac.com>; Ray Dempsey <rademps@aol.com>; KJ Chang <kuojungchang@gmail.com>; Fred Balin <fbalin@gmail.com>; Fred Kohler <fkohler@sbcglobal.net>; Hamilton Hitchings <hitchingsh@yahoo.com>; Shikada Ed <ed.shikada@cityofpaloalto.org>; Tina Peak <tmpeak@yahoo.com>; Lora Smith <myslora@pacbell.net>; Vita Gorbunova <vitago@gmail.com>; Tim Knuth <tknuth00@gmail.com>; Janine Bisharat <janine@karunaadvisors.com>; Jan Merryweather <jan@hamilton.com>; Marion Odell <marionodell7@gmail.com>; Ted Davids <tdavids@sonic.net>; Lauren Burton <lauren@thinkgardens.net>; Leslie Caine <lrgc@sbcglobal.net>; Elaine Meyer <emeyer3@gmail.com>; Gabrielle Layton <strop@redjuice.com>; Harris Barton <harris@bartonam.com>; Meg Barton <megbarton@me.com>; David Kwoh <dkwoh@yahoo.com>; Joe Baldwin <zbrcp1@comcast.net>; Beth Rosenthal <bbr550@gmail.com>; J T Gusilin <jgusilin@gmail.com>; Beth Guislin <beth.guislin@gmail.com>; Jerry Smith <jerry.smith@sonic.net>; Nick and Kristine Peterson <nrpeterson@yahoo.com>; Irv <irvb@pacbell.net>; Nadia Naik <nadianaik@gmail.com>; Chris Robell <chris_robell@yahoo.com>; Wolfgang Dueregger <wolfgangdueregger@gmail.com>; Carol Scott <cscott@crossfieldllc.com>; Holzemer/hernandez <holz@sonic.net>; Peter Rosenthal <pnr21@comcast.net>; Roger Petersen <roger.petersen@gmail.com>; Richard Willits <rwillits@gmail.com>; Annette Ross <port2103@att.net>
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2020, 12:04:54 PM PDT
Subject: Changes to Downtown parking in-lieu program

Please table any action which eliminates or reduces the parking in-lieu fees. The staff report is inaccurate, incomplete and does not consider impact upon a square mile of residential properties adjacent to the University Avenue commercial core.

There is no way that thousands of citizens have had time to change their personal priorities to understand a massive change in development policies. Emergency conditions of the virus threat should not apply to this staff recommendation for Council action.

Please table this matter until full public review and understanding can be achieved. This includes re-examination of office market and public transit conditions by the Planning Commission.

Reference: *Allow the expiration of a 1-year ban on office uses above the ground floor from participating in the City's Downtown parking in-lieu program.*

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?t=62107.34&BlobID=76464>

Neilson Buchanan
Redacted
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

Baumb, Nelly

From: Wolfgang Dueregger <wolfgangdueregger@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2020 3:33 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Fwd: Changes to Downtown parking in-lieu program

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

fyi

thank you

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Wolfgang Dueregger <wolfgangdueregger@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, May 1, 2020 at 6:30 PM
Subject: Re: Changes to Downtown parking in-lieu program
To: Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>
Cc: City Council <city.council@cityofpalo.org>, Jocelyn Dong <jdong@embarcaderopublishing.com>, Gennady <gsheyner@paweekly.com>, Dave Price <price@padailypost.com>, Planning Commission <planning.commission@cityofpaloalto.org>, Norm Beamer <nhbeamer@yahoo.com>, Greg Welch <welgreg@gmail.com>, Sallyann Rudd <sallyannr03@gmail.com>, Malcolm Roy Beasley <beasley@stanford.edu>, Michael Hodos <mehodos@mac.com>, Ray Dempsey <rademps@aol.com>, KJ Chang <kuojungchang@gmail.com>, Fred Balin <fbalin@gmail.com>, Fred Kohler <fkohler@sbcglobal.net>, Hamilton Hitchings <hitchingsh@yahoo.com>, Shikada Ed <ed.shikada@cityofpaloalto.org>, Tina Peak <tmpeak@yahoo.com>, Lora Smith <myslora@pacbell.net>, Vita Gorbunova <vitago@gmail.com>, Tim Knuth <tknuth00@gmail.com>, Janine Bisharat <janine@karunaadvisors.com>, Jan Merryweather <jan@hamilton.com>, Marion Odell <marionodell7@gmail.com>, Ted Davids <tdavids@sonic.net>, Lauren Burton <lauren@thinkgardens.net>, Leslie Caine <lrgc@sbcglobal.net>, Elaine Meyer <emeyer3@gmail.com>, Gabrielle Layton <strop@redjuice.com>, Harris Barton <harris@bartonam.com>, Meg Barton <megbarton@me.com>, David Kwoh <dkwoh@yahoo.com>, Joe Baldwin <zbrcp1@comcast.net>, Beth Rosenthal <bbr550@gmail.com>, J T Gusilin <jgusilin@gmail.com>, Beth Gusilin <beth.gusilin@gmail.com>, Jerry Smith <jerry.smith@sonic.net>, Nick and Kristine Peterson <nrpeterson@yahoo.com>, Irv <irvb@pacbell.net>, Nadia Naik <nadianaik@gmail.com>, Chris Robell <chris_robell@yahoo.com>, Carol Scott <cscott@crossfieldllc.com>, Holzemer/hernandez <holz@sonic.net>, Peter Rosenthal <pnr21@comcast.net>, Roger Petersen <roger.petersen@gmail.com>, Richard Willits <rwillits@gmail.com>, Annette Ross <port2103@att.net>, Paul & Karen Machado <plmachado@gmail.com>, David Schrom <david@ecomagic.org>

Dear City Council and City Manager,

- 1: We all would appreciate more transparency and proper public discussion of issues of this magnitude.
- 2: I fully support the concerns in below email. Similar consideration must be given to the Evergreen Park /Mayfield RPP zones as well as other RPPs that are in place.
- 3: The new garage on Cal Ave will be completed very soon. Will this garage then be used for commercial parking around Cal Ave so that no more business parking permits will be sold in our neighbor hood streets?

Wolfgang Dueregger

On Fri, May 1, 2020 at 3:07 PM Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com> wrote:

Please table any action which eliminates or reduces the parking in-lieu fees. The staff report is inaccurate, incomplete and does not consider impact upon a square mile of residential properties adjacent to the University Avenue commercial core.

There is no way that thousands of citizens have had time to change their personal priorities to understand a massive change in development policies. Emergency conditions of the virus threat should not apply to this staff recommendation for Council action.

Please table this matter until full public review and understanding can be achieved. This includes re-examination of office market and public transit conditions by the Planning Commission.

Reference: *Allow the expiration of a 1-year ban on office uses above the ground floor from participating in the City's Downtown parking in-lieu program.*

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?t=62107.34&BlobID=76464>

Neilson Buchanan
Redacted
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

Baumb, Nelly

From: Wolfgang Dueregger <wolfgangdueregger@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 6:42 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Fwd: Changes to Downtown parking in-lieu program

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

fyi

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Wolfgang Dueregger** <wolfgangdueregger@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, May 6, 2020 at 9:40 PM
Subject: Re: Changes to Downtown parking in-lieu program
To: Shikada Ed <ed.shikada@cityofpaloalto.org>, <philip.kamhi@cityofpaloalto.org>
Cc: David Schrom <david@ecomagic.org>, Paul & Karen Machado <plmachado@gmail.com>, Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>, Norm Beamer <nhbeamer@yahoo.com>, J T Gusilin <jgusilin@gmail.com>, Beth Guislin <beth.guislin@gmail.com>, Nadia Naik <nadianaik@gmail.com>, Chris Robell <chris_robell@yahoo.com>, Carol Scott <cscott@crossfieldllc.com>, Terry Holzemer <holz@sonic.net>, Kendra Fadil <kendrafadil@gmail.com>, Christian Pease <cgpease2016@gmail.com>, City Council <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>, Gennady <gsheyner@paweekly.com>

Dear City Manager and City Council,

-1: as stated in this article <https://paloaltoonline.com/news/2020/05/05/palo-alto-to-reopen-tennis-courts-restore-access-to-nature-preserves>

Mr. Kamhi is spearheading an effort to "divert cars from three existing bike boulevards". EvergreenParkMayfield wants to ask you to add Stanford Ave to this list of streets for traffic calming. Covid19 or not, every day people take short cuts to race down Stanford Ave to Cal Ave (Uber, Lyft, delivery services, etc.).

We raised the issue of cut-thru-traffic to Cal Ave through Stanford Ave many times in the past. We hope this time you will act and do something.

There will be no safe bike blvd on Park Blvd when constant cut-through car traffic feeds into Park blvd (at intersection of Stanford Ave).

Also proper signage (coming from or crossing El Camino onto Stanford Ave, as well as on El Camino and Park Ave) should be posted, something like "Evergreen Park Neighborhood, not thru traffic to Cal Ave".

-2: Our RPPs are essential for the safety and the liveliness of our neighborhoods. So is their enforcement. The discussion by Mrs. Kniss et al. about suspending/reversing the enforcement of RPPs, eliminating any permit fees (which are ridiculously low anyways) will make things even worse. The argument of the biz community that suspending enforcement is important for them makes zero sense - since they have plenty of parking available EVERYWHERE. They don't even need to get into our neighborhood, they can conveniently park in front of their business.

-3: You have not replied yet to our request about the phase out of business parking permits in our neighborhood, once the Cal Ave garage is completed.

thank you

Wolfgang Dueregger

On Fri, May 1, 2020 at 6:30 PM Wolfgang Dueregger <wolfgangdueregger@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear City Council and City Manager,

-1: We all would appreciate more transparency and proper public discussion of issues of this magnitude.

-2: I fully support the concerns in below email. Similar consideration must be given to the Evergreen Park /Mayfield RPP zones as well as other RPPs that are in place.

-3: The new garage on Cal Ave will be completed very soon. Will this garage then be used for commercial parking around Cal Ave so that no more business parking permits will be sold in our neighbor hood streets?

Wolfgang Dueregger

On Fri, May 1, 2020 at 3:07 PM Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com> wrote:

Please table any action which eliminates or reduces the parking in-lieu fees. The staff report is inaccurate, incomplete and does not consider impact upon a square mile of residential properties adjacent to the University Avenue commercial core.

There is no way that thousands of citizens have had time to change their personal priorities to understand a massive change in development policies. Emergency conditions of the virus threat should not apply to this staff recommendation for Council action.

Please table this matter until full public review and understanding can be achieved. This includes re-examination of office market and public transit conditions by the Planning Commission.

Reference: *Allow the expiration of a 1-year ban on office uses above the ground floor from participating in the City's Downtown parking in-lieu program.*

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?t=62107.34&BlobID=76464>

Neilson Buchanan
Redacted
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

Baumb, Nelly

From: John Guislin <jguislin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 3:47 PM
To: Council, City; Shikada, Ed
Cc: Lait, Jonathan; Neilson Buchanan
Subject: MAY 11 COUNCIL MEETING: Action Item #8 - Do not let the ban on in-lieu fees expire

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Council Members; City Manager:

In Action Item #8 you have before you a poorly written and almost data free staff report that recommends letting the ban on in-lieu fees expire for downtown commercial development above ground floor. The report makes speculative claims with no supporting data, for example, that “This ban may actually discourage home building,” No data or analysis are provided to support this statement and others.

But even more striking is the comparison of the the approach by the City of Palo Alto compared to the County of Santa Clara when it comes to efforts to reduce the traffic burden on modern life.

Palo Alto’s recommendation would encourage non resident serving businesses on upper floors of downtown buildings and increase traffic in an already congested area that lacks sufficient commercial parking.

In contrast, the County of Santa Clara is exploring ways to reduce commercial traffic - see below.

“This is a really exciting opportunity that we have,” Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors President Cindy Chavez said. “The coronavirus outbreak and shelter-in-place mandate have forced companies to devote time and money **to make large-scale, commute-free work operational during the past seven weeks. Now is the time to expand and sustain this blueprint in Santa Clara County.**”

Carl Guardino, president of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, which represents major technology firms, said businesses embrace the concept.

<https://www.mercurynews.com/2020/05/04/coronavirus-made-telework-necessary-santa-clara-county-to-explore-ways-to-keep-it/>

This is particularly critical given that one of the credible scenarios about our new normal predicts that more people will avoid public transportation and commute as SOV drivers.

In lieu parking fees simply provide commercial enterprises a way to avoid one cost of doing business in a way that negatively impacts near-by residential neighborhoods. In an effort to address the problem of too many commercial vehicles in downtown created over the past decades, Palo

Alto has had to enact a series of RPP programs, which are now under threat from business champions on the City Council.

If Council is serious about building more housing, then focus on doing that through programs that encourage residential building, not giving more financial breaks to commercial development.

Please VOTE NO on letting this ban on in-lieu fees expire.

Sincerely,

John Guislin

Baumb, Nelly

From: Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 9, 2020 5:15 PM
To: Council, City
Cc: Shikada, Ed; Jocelyn Dong; Gennady; Dave Price; Emily Mibach
Subject: May 11 530pm Council Agenda Item #8 In Lieu Fees

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

I am extremely disappointed to see staff recommendation for eliminate the ban on in lieu fees for commercial development.

Incentives for housing should continue to be top priority for Council and Staff.

In lieu fees do not account for the land value in city garages and parking lots. Therefore, in lieu fees do not reflect full cost charged to a developers. Furthermore, current city in lieu policy grants parking entitlement in perpetuity far beyond the long-term useful life of garages and surface lots.

The new Office of Transportation should be tasked to report on how in lieu fees aggravate the parking shortages noted by downtown merchants. This professional analysis would cure the endless debates for the past 20 years and eliminate kicking the parking can down the road.

The current health crisis should not be an excuse to prioritize commercial office development over the city's high priority for housing. The fog of virus is being used like the fog of war. Most experts feel that office space in our region will be "in oversupply" for the next 24 months due to social distancing, work-at-home and reduced workforces in most businesses.

Now is the time to call upon the Planning and Transportation Commission with the support of a professionally managed Office of Transportation. There is no reason to weaken city development policy with a bypass of the PTC.

The most rational policy is to extend the current in lieu fee policy for these commercial office properties.

Neilson Buchanan
Redacted
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

Baumb, Nelly

From: Allen Akin <akin@arden.org>
Sent: Saturday, May 9, 2020 7:39 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: May 11 Council Meeting, Item 8 (In Lieu Fees)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

It's unwise to adopt a policy that increases the financial incentive to build office space when (a) it's unclear that such a move will be needed once the COVID-19 emergency abates, and (b) office space should be discouraged in favor of housing anyway.

Please renew the temporary ban on commercial-project participation in the in-lieu parking program.

Best,
Allen Akin

Baumb, Nelly

From: Andie Reed <andiezreed@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 10, 2020 12:11 PM
To: City Mgr; Council, City
Subject: keep ban on in-lieu fees

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Fine, City Council Members, City Manager Shikada:

Thank you for all the hard work and unexpected heavy lifting you are facing during this devastating COVID time.

In reviewing the agenda for Monday's meeting, #8 stands out as an important item that may slip by during the pandemic. The in-lieu fees have historically been a theoretical solution that has not realized actual benefits, and which encourages commercial and office space to the detriment of housing. Although the staff report is very helpful and thorough, there continues to be no data provided to show that in-lieu fees have been successful for the intended purpose of easing the parking problem downtown.

The goal of the ban, to research ways to encourage and promote housing development, shouldn't be discarded because of COVID or because there hasn't been sufficient staffing and appropriate PTC involvement to study it. The impact on costs or savings is speculative at best.

Please don't make a hasty decision. Keep the ban on in-lieu fees in place.

Respectfully,
Andie Reed

--

Andie Reed CPA
Redacted
Palo Alto, CA 94301
530-401-3809

Baumb, Nelly

From: Carol Scott <cscott@crossfieldllc.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 10, 2020 7:55 PM
To: Council, City; Shikada, Ed
Subject: Re: MAY 11 COUNCIL MEETING: Action Item #8 - Do not let the ban on in-lieu fees expire

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Council Member and City Manager:

I write to ask you to reject the City staff's recommendation that the ban on in-lieu fees be allowed to expire. The justification for such a recommendation is unclear, and the current situation is far too uncertain to take such an action.,

The City previously banned the practice of allowing developers of commercial office space to pay a one-time fee in lieu of including sufficient parking in their developments. The City quite rightly rejected such fees as totally inadequate to compensate for the negative consequences of inadequate parking. These negative consequences include, but are not limited to, the encroachment of employee parking into residential neighborhoods simply to increase developer profits for additional commercial office space that we do not need.

Now is not the time to allow this ban to expire. All signs at present point to increased automobile commuting into Palo Alto as people shun crowded public transportation for fear of contracting the coronavirus. We need to ensure the City remains in compliance with the comprehensive plan that states that business should be encouraged, but not at the expense of the quality of residential life.

The argument for letting ban expire that has been made the City staff makes no sense and no data is presented to support it. One argument is that no one is building commercial space right now anyway. I fail to see how this supports letting the ban expire, unless the provision of a gratuitous give-away to developers to encourage them to build commercial spaces is the goal. Yet, the staff recommendation cites the need to encourage housing as the reason for letting the ban lapse. I do not see any rationale laid out that would explain exactly how allowing developers to pay an inadequate one-time fee in lieu of providing sufficient parking will spark the creation of more housing.

I also do not see how allowing the ban to continue would do anything to assist in balancing our now compromised budget. Clearly, developers should be providing parking as part of their projects. The City should not bear the burden of paying for garage space, nor should residents bear the burden of employee encroachment into their neighborhoods simply to provide more profit to developers.

Now is not the time to allow the ban to lapse. I ask you to continue the ban, at least until we have more visibility into how construction and commuting patterns evolve as business reopen amid a continuing contagious viral threat. Continuing the ban has no negative consequences that have been documented, and it can always be removed at a later date. Allowing it to lapse can potentially cause great harm that will be difficult to undo. The Council should not be taking such chances for no apparent gain.

Carol Scott
Resident of Evergreen Park

Carol Scott
Sent from my iPad

On May 8, 2020, at 3:47 PM, John Guislin <jguislin@gmail.com> wrote:

Council Members; City Manager:

In Action Item #8 you have before you a poorly written and almost data free staff report that recommends letting the ban on in-lieu fees expire for downtown commercial development above ground floor. The report makes speculative claims with no supporting data, for example, that “This ban may actually discourage home building,” No data or analysis are provided to support this statement and others.

But even more striking is the comparison of the the approach by the City of Palo Alto compared to the County of Santa Clara when it comes to efforts to reduce the traffic burden on modern life.

Palo Alto’s recommendation would encourage non resident serving businesses on upper floors of downtown buildings and increase traffic in an already congested area that lacks sufficient commercial parking.

In contrast, the County of Santa Clara is exploring ways to reduce commercial traffic - see below.

“This is a really exciting opportunity that we have,” Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors President Cindy Chavez said. “The coronavirus outbreak and shelter-in-place mandate have forced companies to devote time and money to **make large-scale, commute-free work operational during the past seven weeks. Now is the time to expand and sustain this blueprint in Santa Clara County.**”

Carl Guardino, president of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, which represents major technology firms, said businesses embrace the concept.

<https://www.mercurynews.com/2020/05/04/coronavirus-made-telework-necessary-santa-clara-county-to-explore-ways-to-keep-it/>

This is particularly critical given that one of the credible scenarios about our new normal predicts that more people will avoid public transportation and commute as SOV drivers.

In lieu parking fees simply provide commercial enterprises a way to avoid one cost of doing business in a way that negatively impacts near-by residential neighborhoods. In an effort to address the problem of too many commercial vehicles in downtown created over the past decades, Palo Alto has had to enact a series of RPP programs, which are now under threat from business champions on the City Council.

If Council is serious about building more housing, then focus on doing that through programs that encourage residential building, not giving more financial breaks to commercial development.

Please VOTE NO on letting this ban on in-lieu fees expire.

Sincerely,

John Guislin

Baumb, Nelly

From: Amie Ashton <aashton@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 10, 2020 8:44 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: KILL THE GARAGE!

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Council,

Please completely de-fund and cancel the downtown garage as part of the budget changes being considered. We don't need the downtown garage when a TMA can be so much more effective at reducing parking demand at a fraction of the cost. Working from home will continue at a higher level after the pandemic, as will biking and walking around town. We really do not need an antiquated garage (NO CITY IS BUILDING GARAGES ANYMORE), especially at the ridiculous cost.

The parking in-lieu fee should fund the TMA. The 5.2 million available when the garage is cancelled should go to the bike ped/planning and projects to reduce our stubbornly high GHG emissions.

Thank you,

Amie Ashton
Car-free Downtown Resident

--

Baumb, Nelly

From: Kathy Jordan <kjordan114wh@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 10, 2020 9:47 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: writing to object to proposal not to require parking for commercial office space

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

To all:

I write to object to staff's suggestion not to require parking for commercial office space development and to give developers an in lieu payment option instead.

Mass transit use has been declining despite massive public investments. It has not reduced vehicles as a commuting mode of transportation. Owning an automobile is one of the most effective means to combat poverty for lower income groups.

But for Americans in poverty—those for whom a car-free lifestyle is a matter of economic necessity—the costs of adopting or abandoning different modes of transportation may be a more complicated judgment. A *new study in the Journal of Planning Education and Research* offers a glimpse into why. It shows that, over the past 50 years, owning a car has been among the most powerful economic advantages a U.S. family can have.

<https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2019/02/car-ownership-climate-change-driving-poverty-economic/582091/>

A recent UCLA public transit study (<https://www.its.ucla.edu/transit/>) summarizes by saying,

"California is counting on public transit to help meet its ambitious goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and traffic congestion. Yet despite large public investments in bus and rail service, the state's transit ridership is on the decline."

Using mass transit is currently a health hazard, and will remain so until a vaccine or cure for the novel coronavirus is discovered.

According to researchers live coronavirus particles can survive anywhere from three hours to seven days on surfaces, depending on the material.

New York Gov. Andrew Cuomo emphasized the lifespan of the novel coronavirus in the air and on surfaces while describing the challenges facing the city's massive public transport system during the novel coronavirus pandemic.

"The virus can live up to 72 hours on plastic surfaces and stainless-steel surfaces," Cuomo said in a press conference Friday. "Just think about this from a transit point of view or from your car point of view. It can live on a pole in a bus or on a seat in a bus for up to 72 hours."

Business Insider: Novel coronavirus can live for 72 hours on bus and subway surfaces - Business Insider.

<https://www.businessinsider.com/novel-coronavirus-can-live-on-bus-and-subway-surfaces-2020-4>

The City of Palo Alto, facing large potential deficits, should not and need not subsidize developers, just to face huge expenses later to build parking garages to make up the un parked deficit.

Please reject this proposal.

Thank you.

Best,

Kathy Jordan

Baumb, Nelly

From: Wolfgang Dueregger <wolfgang.dueregger@alumni.stanford.edu>
Sent: Sunday, May 10, 2020 10:09 PM
To: Council, City; Shikada, Ed
Cc: Neilson Buchanan; Paul & Karen Machado; John Guislin; Carol Scott; David Schrom; Chris Robell; Christian Pease; Irene Au; Tim Mealiffe; Terry Holzemer; Jeff Levinsky
Subject: May 11 Council Meeting Action Item #8 developer in-lieu fees expire

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear City Council, City Manager:

In Action Item #8 the report recommends letting the ban on in-lieu fees expire for downtown commercial development above ground floor. The report makes speculative claims with no supporting data, that “This ban may actually discourage home building.” Show us the data to support this claim.

But even more striking is the comparison of the approach by the City of Palo Alto compared to the County of Santa Clara when it comes to efforts to reduce the traffic burden on modern life.

Palo Alto’s recommendation would encourage non-resident-serving businesses on upper floors of downtown buildings and increase traffic in an already congested area that lacks sufficient commercial parking.

In other words, getting crammed software companies into downtown and Cal Ave, when - as we have seen during the past 8 weeks - most software companies (incl. conservative Wall Street firms) started to embrace remote work. So no more need for more office space! There is already a need for LESS office space!

Did anybody in City Council proclaim during the past 2 years that we need "low income housing" or was it just a lip service to get elected?

All those council members who were so strongly supporting housing during the campaign and thereafter, where is the logic that more office space will solve this problem? Especially that money is now more scarce than before? What will cut it is to move existing software companies OUT OF commercial core and repurpose those offices to low income housing. And those "displaced" workers won't be sad, since they will be working from home in the future. See below what our county is actually thinking about remote work.

“This is a really exciting opportunity that we have,” Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors President Cindy Chavez said. “The coronavirus outbreak and shelter-in-place mandate have forced companies to devote time and money **to make large-scale,**

commute-free work operational during the past seven weeks. Now is the time to expand and sustain this blueprint in Santa Clara County.”

Carl Guardino, president of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, which represents major technology firms, said businesses embrace the concept.

<https://www.mercurynews.com/2020/05/04/coronavirus-made-telework-necessary-santa-clara-county-to-explore-ways-to-keep-it/>

This is particularly critical given that one of the credible scenarios about our new normal predicts that **more people will avoid public transportation and commute as SOV drivers.**

It would be bizarre to encourage building more office space - when there is no longer a need for it PLUS suck in more traffic than our saturated streets can handle anyways.

If Council is serious about building more housing, then focus on doing that through programs that encourage residential building, not giving more financial breaks to commercial development.

We are a residential town, not an office park. We want an environmentally friendly and balanced approach to housing, traffic and parking.

We urge you to vote NO on letting this ban on in-lieu fees expire.

Sincerely,

Wolfgang Dueregger

Baumb, Nelly

From: jaclyn schrier <jaclyn@schrier.net>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 8:46 AM
To: Council, City; Council, City
Subject: *Keep* ban on in lieu fees for commercial development

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

City Council Members:

Please *keep* the ban on in lieu fees for commercial development in place. We do *not* need to encourage more office development. We *need* to encourage more housing development.

Thank you.

jaclyn schrier
Redacted
Palo Alto

Baumb, Nelly

From: Christian Pease <cgpease2016@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 9:35 AM
To: Council, City; City Mgr
Cc: Christian Pease
Subject: Reject Agenda Item#8

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear City Council Members and City Manager,

I write concerning Item#8 on the agenda for this evening's city council meeting.

It is clear the city faces difficult times and that you must bear burden of hard choices in response to the Covid19 pandemic,

However, I find no linkage or advantage to the City of Palo Alto in letting of the existing ban on accepting one-time, in-lieu fees in exchange for lifting downtown commercial office development parking requirements.

The rationale presented for doing so is speculative at best - NO data or hard facts included. The facts of Palo Alto's long standing, pre-pandemic parking and congestion problems are not.

This is why City wisely rejected such fees as inadequate to compensate for the consequences of inadequate parking which, one way or another, impose years of follow-on cost to the city, its residents, and its locally-serving retail businesses.

It almost feels as if the pandemic is being used to advance a long-term political objective in support of favored constituencies: Commercial office developers and real estate interests, together with their most lucrative office-centric, non-retail businesses clients; the two central beneficiaries of one time, relative to true cost - couch change - payments.

I sincerely hope this is not the case.

In any case, the existing prohibition against one-time, in-lieu fees in place of required investments in adequate commercial office building parking should remain in place.

I urge you to reject tonight's agenda Item#8.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Christian Pease
Evergreen Park

Baumb, Nelly

From: Jan Merryweather <jan@hamilton.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 11:50 AM
To: Council, City
Subject: May 11 530pm City Council Agenda Item #8 In Lieu Fees

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Hello City Council Members,

I am writing in support of Neilson Buchanan's email (below), and in **support of extending the city's current in lieu fee policy.**

I hope you and yours are staying healthy and positive.

Jan Merryweather, Redacted , 94301

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>
To: City Council <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>
Cc: Shikada Ed <ed.shikada@cityofpaloalto.org>; Jocelyn Dong <jdong@paweekly.com>; Gennady <gsheyner@paweekly.com>; Dave Price <price@padailypost.com>; Emily Mibach <emibach@padailypost.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 9, 2020, 05:15:09 PM PDT
Subject: May 11 530pm Council Agenda Item #8 In Lieu Fees

I am extremely disappointed to see staff recommendation to eliminate the ban on in lieu fees for commercial development.

Incentives for housing should continue to be top priority for Council and Staff.

In lieu fees do not account for the land value in city garages and parking lots. Therefore, in lieu fees do not reflect full cost charged to a developers. Furthermore, current city in lieu policy grants parking entitlement in perpetuity far beyond the long-term useful life of garages and surface lots.

The new Office of Transportation should be tasked to report on how in lieu fees aggravate the parking shortages noted by downtown merchants. This professional analysis would cure the endless debates for the past 20 years and eliminate kicking the parking can down the road.

The current health crisis should not be an excuse to prioritize commercial office development over the city's high priority for housing. The fog of virus is being used like the fog of war. Most experts feel that office space in our region will be "in oversupply" for the next 24 months due to social distancing, work-at-home and reduced workforces in most businesses.

Now is the time to call upon the Planning and Transportation Commission with the support of a professionally managed Office of Transportation. There is no reason to weaken city development policy with a bypass of the PTC.

The most rational policy is to extend the current in lieu fee policy for these commercial office properties.

Neilson Buchanan
Redacted
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

Baumb, Nelly

From: Marion Odell <marionodell7@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 12:21 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Downtown parking

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

I support the letter from Neilson Buchanan regarding parking issues near University and California avenues. I have lived in the downtown area for 30 years and appreciate the current parking conditions.

Marion Odell
Everett and Cowper

Baumb, Nelly

From: Jeff Levinsky <jeff@levinsky.org>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 1:02 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Prioritize Housing – Continue the In-Lieu Ban on Upper Floor Offices

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear City Council Members:

Please retain the ban on in-lieu parking for upper floor Downtown offices. The ban was created to focus downtown development on producing more housing. Such policy changes can take several years to reap benefits due to the length of the development cycle. The staff report provides no tangible evidence that the ban was even harmful, so why end it now? Have we accomplished all our housing goals?

Instead, please continue the ban and ask the PTC to review the policy, as was the original plan. For example, the commission might consider adjusting the ban to allow in-lieu parking for projects that create more housing than jobs. Such a change would then allow upper floor offices to use in-lieu parking when it's also a win for housing.

Thank you,

Jeff Levinsky

Baumb, Nelly

From: Beth Rosenthal <bbr550@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 2:49 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: In-Lieu Parking Fees

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Fine and City Council Members,

I am writing to urge you to continue the ban on in-lieu fees for parking. Developers should not be able to build offices without offering sufficient parking to tenants. If this were allowed, the problem of overflow parking in residential neighborhoods would continue and be exacerbated. If there is to be any construction downtown, it should be housing with sufficient parking, not further office development. I think the nature of future office need is unknown at this time. The forecast is that many people will continue to work from home until the Covid-19 complications are fully resolved. The exercise of going into an office on a daily basis may change permanently with the successful experience many businesses have had with employees working from home. To take this action, which has significant repercussions on the residents, during a time when people are not able to give sufficient attention to the actions of Council is inappropriate. Please bring this up for consideration when people can register their views, not during a time of crisis.

Sincerely,

Beth Rosenthal, PhD

Baumb, Nelly

From: Paul Machado <plmachado@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 1:41 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Priority

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

I concur with below letter composed by a very knowledgeable resident.....

Below is a reasonable set of questions reflecting a strong consensus among experienced resident leaders who understand deeply rooted parking issues in the commercial cores and neighborhoods.

The root problem is under-management of the public and private parking assets within the commercial cores. For example, there is absolutely no shortage of parking after 5pm weekdays and weekends. The issue is modern signage to the garages and then guidance to spaces within the garages.

In my opinion City Councils and City Managers have politically mismanaged parking policy by making certain there was no real understanding among city staff. Therefore, the commercial core/residential neighborhood parking can was kicked down the road with advantage tipped for the landlords and tenants of office spaces.

Looking backwards won't help. However, if developer pressures of today's council are successful in weakening the new Office of Transportation we will lose professional staff and the opportunity to harmonize public and private assets within the commercial cores and neighborhoods.

Wednesday's Council key decisions are the following:

1. Staffing levels in the Office of Transportation
2. Guidance systems within the city garages
3. Modern signage to find garages and surface lots
4. Parking permit managements system integrated for commercial core and neighborhoods
5. Elimination of Palo Alto TMA...its usefulness has not materialized and it is more irrelevant than ever. Joint city TMAs could be feasible if they can achieve economies of scale.

PS it is important to remember that there is absolutely no parking shortage in downtown commercial core after 5pm and on weekends. This unused capacity will continue for many months forward. The problem is effective guidance to parking capacity.

Here are questions to ask staff. I have great confidence in Philip Kamhi who leads the Office of Transportation.

1. When will city staff and Council reduce non resident permits authorized for sale in the Mayfield/Evergreen Park neighborhoods? What is the new completion date for California Avenue city garage? Its new capacity will allow a substantial reduction or actual full elimination in non-resident parking permits of residential neighborhoods.

2. What is the city's intent to enforce permit and short-term parking "rules" in the commercial zones? Since April 1 there is unlimited supply of free parking in all RPP neighborhoods. This means unrestricted parking for downtown workers *and Caltrain riders*.

There is no incentive to buy parking permits within the California and University Avenue commercial cores. It is easier and cheaper (zero cost) to park in the neighborhoods than move vehicles within the time limited color zones in the University Avenue commercial core. When Caltrain riders return, then there is incentive to park in neighborhoods especially Old Palo Alto, Downtown North and Professorville. This will displace downtown workers, customers and residents. What happens when Stanford employees, faculty and students return and park just off campus for free and often convenient.

3. Why is commercial parking in the neighborhoods less expensive than the commercial cores? Pricing differentials should be higher in the residential neighborhoods to create incentives to park in the commercial cores and not park on residential streets. Priorities are ignored for traditional business such as retail goods and services. Lower paid workers, especially sales tax generating businesses, should have some access to commercial core parking.

4. In lieu fees are a bargain to developers. Developers paying in lieu fees are granted parking in perpetuity. Most irrational is that cost of city land is not included in the calculation of in lieu fees. In reality this is a gift of public property to developers who completely avoid land costs when they elect in lieu fees. Thus pricing of parking is subsidized and not market driven.

5. After budget cuts, what level of parking programs will be managed by "surviving" staff in the Office of Transportation? If the head count is reduced from 15 to 10, is the OTT a viable "organization for one of our top priorities or just a homeless section within the Planning Department.

6. There has no parking shortage whatsoever in evenings and nights within the cores of both downtowns. Finding parking is the problem. The mid-day Monday to Friday parking crunch is real and a direct result of chronic under-management by city staff and Council.

Bottom line: RPPs cannot survive if enforcement is suspended for more than a few months. RPPs took almost 20 years to establish and they cannot be silently killed without Palo Altans even knowing what is going on!

Re-establish RPP enforcement within 90 days in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan which states *city policy to promote commerce but not at the expense of residential neighborhoods*.

Thank you

Paul Machado

Baumb, Nelly

From: Bob Moss <bmos33@att.net>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 2:48 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Fw: May 13 City Council Meeting Parking

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Councilmembers;

While Barron Park isn't directly impacted by the type of overflow commercial and office parking that is a problem in residential areas near downtown and California Avenue, we do get some spillover commercial parking from offices and retail on El Camino, so we understand this problem. I fully support the comments and questions that Neilson lists.

Regards,

Bob Moss

Dear Neighbors in DTN,

I ask you to express your opinion immediately to City Council.

As you know, the Council is making critical rationing decisions for city services. Residential parking adjacent to the two downtowns is at risk.

Below is a long email encompassing the complex, inter-related issues necessary to protect neighborhoods from intrusion of commercial parking.

You have two good options.

#1 Forward my email to city council and state your support. city.council@cityofpaloalto.org

#2 Compose your own opinions using the email below as a guide.

Neilson Buchanan
Redacted
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>
To: City Council <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>

Cc: Shikada Ed <ed.shikada@cityofpaloalto.org>; Philip Kamhi <philip.kamhi@cityofpaloalto.org>; Hur Mark <mark.hur@cityofpaloalto.org>; Nathan Baird <nathan.baird@cityofpaloalto.org>; Planning Commission <planning.commission@cityofpaloalto.org>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020, 11:14:29 AM PDT
Subject: May 13 City Council Meeting Parking

Below is a reasonable set of questions reflecting a strong consensus among experienced resident leaders who understand deeply rooted parking issues in the commercial cores and neighborhoods.

The root problem is under-management of the public and private parking assets within the commercial cores. For example, there is absolutely no shortage of parking after 5pm weekdays and weekends. The issue is modern signage to the garages and then guidance to spaces within the garages.

In my opinion City Councils and City Managers have politically mismanaged parking policy by making certain there was no real understanding among city staff. Therefore, the commercial core/residential neighborhood parking can be kicked down the road with advantage tipped for the landlords and tenants of office spaces.

Looking backwards won't help. However, if developer pressures of today's council are successful in weakening the new Office of Transportation we will lose professional staff and the opportunity to harmonize public and private assets within the commercial cores and neighborhoods.

Wednesday's Council key decisions are the following:

1. Staffing levels in the Office of Transportation
2. Guidance systems within the city garages
3. Modern signage to find garages and surface lots
4. Parking permit managements system integrated for commercial core and neighborhoods
5. Elimination of Palo Alto TMA...its usefulness has not materialized and it is more irrelevant than ever. Joint city TMAs could be feasible if they can achieve economies of scale.

PS it is important to remember that there is absolutely no parking shortage in downtown commercial core after 5pm and on weekends. This unused capacity will continue for many months forward. The problem is effective guidance to parking capacity.

Here are questions to ask staff. I have great confidence in Philip Kamhi who leads the Office of Transportation.

1. When will city staff and Council reduce non resident permits authorized for sale in the Mayfield/Evergreen Park neighborhoods? What is the new completion date for California Avenue city garage? Its new capacity will allow a substantial reduction or actual full elimination in non-resident parking permits of residential neighborhoods.
2. What is the city's intent to enforce permit and short-term parking "rules" in the commercial zones? Since April 1 there is unlimited supply of free parking in all RPP neighborhoods. This means unrestricted parking for downtown workers *and Caltrain riders*.

There is no incentive to buy parking permits within the California and University Avenue commercial cores. It is easier and cheaper (zero cost) to park in the neighborhoods than move vehicles within the time limited color zones in the University Avenue commercial core. When Caltrain riders return, then there is incentive to park in neighborhoods especially Old Palo Alto, Downtown North and

Professorville. This will displace downtown workers, customers and residents. What happens when Stanford employees, faculty and students return and park just off campus for free and often convenient.

3. Why is commercial parking in the neighborhoods less expensive than the commercial cores? Pricing differentials should be higher in the residential neighborhoods to create incentives to park in the commercial cores and not park on residential streets. Priorities are ignored for traditional business such as retail goods and services. Lower paid workers, especially sales tax generating businesses, should have some access to commercial core parking.

4. In lieu fees are a bargain to developers. Developers paying in lieu fees are granted parking in perpetuity. Most irrational is that cost of city land is not included in the calculation of in lieu fees. In reality this is a gift of public property to developers who completely avoid land costs when they elect in lieu fees. Thus pricing of parking is subsidized and not market driven.

5. After budget cuts, what level of parking programs will be managed by "surviving" staff in the Office of Transportation? If the head count is reduced from 15 to 10, is the OTT a viable "organization for one of our top priorities or just a homeless section within the Planning Department.

6. There has no parking shortage whatsoever in evenings and nights within the cores of both downtowns. Finding parking is the problem. The mid-day Monday to Friday parking crunch is real and a direct result of chronic under-management by city staff and Council.

Bottom line: RPPs cannot survive if enforcement is suspended for more than a few months. RPPs took almost 20 years to establish and they cannot be silently killed without Palo Altans even knowing what is going on!

Re-establish RPP enforcement within 90 days in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan which states *city policy to promote commerce but not at the expense of residential neighborhoods.*

Neilson Buchanan
Redacted
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

Baumb, Nelly

From: LaNell Mimmack <lmimmack@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 1:45 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Fw: May 13 City Council Meeting Parking

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

We support Neilson Buchanan's proposals below.

From: Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 6:28 PM
To: Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>
Subject: May 13 City Council Meeting Parking

Dear Neighbors in DTN,

I ask you to express your opinion immediately to City Council.

As you know, the Council is making critical rationing decisions for city services. Residential parking adjacent to the two downtowns is at risk.

Below is a long email encompassing the complex, inter-related issues necessary to protect neighborhoods from intrusion of commercial parking.

You have two good options.

#1 Forward my email to city council and state your support. city.council@cityofpaloalto.org

#2 Compose your own opinions using the email below as a guide.

Neilson Buchanan
Redacted

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>
To: City Council <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>
Cc: Shikada Ed <ed.shikada@cityofpaloalto.org>; Philip Kamhi <philip.kamhi@cityofpaloalto.org>; Hur Mark <mark.hur@cityofpaloalto.org>; Nathan Baird <nathan.baird@cityofpaloalto.org>; Planning Commission <planning.commission@cityofpaloalto.org>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020, 11:14:29 AM PDT
Subject: May 13 City Council Meeting Parking

Below is a reasonable set of questions reflecting a strong consensus among experienced resident leaders who understand deeply rooted parking issues in the commercial cores and neighborhoods.

The root problem is under-management of the public and private parking assets within the commercial cores. For example, there is absolutely no shortage of parking after 5pm weekdays and weekends. The issue is modern signage to the garages and then guidance to spaces within the garages.

In my opinion City Councils and City Managers have politically mismanaged parking policy by making certain there was no real understanding among city staff. Therefore, the commercial core/residential neighborhood parking can was kicked down the road with advantage tipped for the landlords and tenants of office spaces.

Looking backwards won't help. However, if developer pressures of today's council are successful in weakening the new Office of Transportation we will lose professional staff and the opportunity to harmonize public and private assets within the commercial cores and neighborhoods.

Wednesday's Council key decisions are the following:

1. Staffing levels in the Office of Transportation
2. Guidance systems within the city garages
3. Modern signage to find garages and surface lots
4. Parking permit managements system integrated for commercial core and neighborhoods
5. Elimination of Palo Alto TMA...its usefulness has not materialized and it is more irrelevant than ever. Joint city TMAs could be feasible if they can achieve economies of scale.

PS it is important to remember that there is absolutely no parking shortage in downtown commercial core after 5pm and on weekends. This unused capacity will continue for many months forward. The problem is effective guidance to parking capacity.

Here are questions to ask staff. I have great confidence in Philip Kamhi who leads the Office of Transportation.

1. When will city staff and Council reduce non resident permits authorized for sale in the Mayfield/Evergreen Park neighborhoods? What is the new completion date for California Avenue city garage? Its new capacity will allow a substantial reduction or actual full elimination in non-resident parking permits of residential neighborhoods.
2. What is the city's intent to enforce permit and short-term parking "rules" in the commercial zones? Since April 1 there is unlimited supply of free parking in all RPP neighborhoods. This means unrestricted parking for downtown workers *and Caltrain riders*.

There is no incentive to buy parking permits within the California and University Avenue commercial cores. It is easier and cheaper (zero cost) to park in the neighborhoods than move vehicles within the time limited color zones in the University Avenue commercial core. When Caltrain riders return, then there is incentive to park in neighborhoods especially Old Palo Alto, Downtown North and Professorville. This will displace downtown workers, customers and residents. What happens when Stanford employees, faculty and students return and park just off campus for free and often convenient.

3. Why is commercial parking in the neighborhoods less expensive than the commercial cores? Pricing differentials should be higher in the residential neighborhoods to create incentives to park in the commercial cores and not park on residential streets. Priorities are ignored for traditional business such as retail goods and services. Lower paid workers, especially sales tax generating businesses, should have some access to commercial core parking.

4. In lieu fees are a bargain to developers. Developers paying in lieu fees are granted parking in perpetuity. Most irrational is that cost of city land is not included in the calculation of in lieu fees. In reality this is a gift of public property to developers who completely avoid land costs when they elect in lieu fees. Thus pricing of parking is subsidized and not market driven.

5. After budget cuts, what level of parking programs will be managed by "surviving" staff in the Office of Transportation? If the head count is reduced from 15 to 10, is the OTT a viable "organization for one of our top priorities or just a homeless section within the Planning Department.

6. There has no parking shortage whatsoever in evenings and nights within the cores of both downtowns. Finding parking is the problem. The mid-day Monday to Friday parking crunch is real and a direct result of chronic under-management by city staff and Council.

Bottom line: RPPs cannot survive if enforcement is suspended for more than a few months. RPPs took almost 20 years to establish and they cannot be silently killed without Palo Altans even knowing what is going on!

Re-establish RPP enforcement within 90 days in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan which states *city policy to promote commerce but not at the expense of residential neighborhoods.*

Neilson Buchanan
Redacted
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

Baumb, Nelly

From: jazzbuff@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 12:46 PM
To: Council, City
Cc: 'Neilson Buchanan'
Subject: Parking in residential areas near downtown; parking garages; elimination of TMS

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Council Members: I am in complete agreement with Neilson Buchanan's comments below. I support his recommendations and ask you to follow them, as you deliberate on budget issues. Thank you, D.Michael Griffin 344 Poe St.

Wednesday's Council key decisions are the following:

1. Staffing levels in the Office of Transportation
2. Guidance systems within the city garages
3. Modern signage to find garages and surface lots
4. Parking permit managements system integrated for commercial core and neighborhoods
5. Elimination of Palo Alto TMA...its usefulness has not materialized and it is more irrelevant than ever. Joint city TMAs could be feasible if they can achieve economies of scale.

PS it is important to remember that there is absolutely no parking shortage in downtown commercial core after 5pm and on weekends. This unused capacity will continue for many months forward. The problem is effective guidance to parking capacity.

Here are questions to ask staff. I have great confidence in Philip Kamhi who leads the Office of Transportation.

1. When will city staff and Council reduce non resident permits authorized for sale in the Mayfield/Evergreen Park neighborhoods? What is the new completion date for California Avenue city garage? Its new capacity will allow a substantial reduction or actual full elimination in non-resident parking permits of residential neighborhoods.
2. What is the city's intent to enforce permit and short-term parking "rules" in the commercial zones? Since April 1 there is unlimited supply of free parking in all RPP neighborhoods. This means unrestricted parking for downtown workers *and Caltrain riders*.

There is no incentive to buy parking permits within the California and University Avenue commercial cores. It is easier and cheaper (zero cost) to park in the neighborhoods than move vehicles within the time limited color zones in the University Avenue commercial core. When Caltrain riders return, then there is incentive to park in neighborhoods especially Old Palo Alto, Downtown North and Professorville. This will displace downtown workers, customers and residents. What happens when Stanford employees, faculty and students return and park just off campus for free and often convenient.

3. Why is commercial parking in the neighborhoods less expensive than the commercial cores? Pricing differentials should be higher in the residential neighborhoods to create incentives to park in

the commercial cores and not park on residential streets. Priorities are ignored for traditional business such as retail goods and services. Lower paid workers, especially sales tax generating businesses, should have some access to commercial core parking.

4. In lieu fees are a bargain to developers. Developers paying in lieu fees are granted parking in perpetuity. Most irrational is that cost of city land is not included in the calculation of in lieu fees. In reality this is a gift of public property to developers who completely avoid land costs when they elect in lieu fees. Thus pricing of parking is subsidized and not market driven.

5. After budget cuts, what level of parking programs will be managed by "surviving" staff in the Office of Transportation? If the head count is reduced from 15 to 10, is the OTT a viable "organization for one of our top priorities or just a homeless section within the Planning Department.

6. There has no parking shortage whatsoever in evenings and nights within the cores of both downtowns. Finding parking is the problem. The mid-day Monday to Friday parking crunch is real and a direct result of chronic under-management by city staff and Council.

Bottom line: RPPs cannot survive if enforcement is suspended for more than a few months. RPPs took almost 20 years to establish and they cannot be silently killed without Palo Altans even knowing what is going on!

Re-establish RPP enforcement within 90 days in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan which states *city policy to promote commerce but not at the expense of residential neighborhoods.*

Baumb, Nelly

From: Larry Alton <lalton@pacbell.net>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 12:33 PM
To: Council, City
Cc: Shikada, Ed; Kamhi, Philip; Hur, Mark; Baird, Nathan; Planning Commission
Subject: Fw: May 13 City Council Meeting Parking I support this approach to solving parking problems

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Below is a reasonable set of questions reflecting a strong consensus among experienced resident leaders who understand deeply rooted parking issues in the commercial cores and neighborhoods.

The root problem is under-management of the public and private parking assets within the commercial cores. For example, there is absolutely no shortage of parking after 5pm weekdays and weekends. The issue is modern signage to the garages and then guidance to spaces within the garages.

the commercial core/residential neighborhood parking can was kicked down the road with advantage tipped for the landlords and tenants of office spaces.

if developer pressures of today's council are successful in weakening the new Office of Transportation we will lose professional staff and the opportunity to harmonize public and private assets within the commercial cores and neighborhoods.

Wednesday's Council key decisions are the following:

1. Staffing levels in the Office of Transportation
2. Guidance systems within the city garages
3. Modern signage to find garages and surface lots
4. Parking permit managements system integrated for commercial core and neighborhoods
5. Elimination of Palo Alto TMA...its usefulness has not materialized and it is more irrelevant than ever. Joint city TMAs could be feasible if they can achieve economies of scale.

PS it is important to remember that there is absolutely no parking shortage in downtown commercial core after 5pm and on weekends. This unused capacity will continue for many months forward. The problem is effective guidance to parking capacity.

Here are questions to ask staff.

1. When will city staff and Council reduce non resident permits authorized for sale in the Mayfield/Evergreen Park neighborhoods? What is the new completion date for California Avenue city garage? Its new capacity will allow a substantial reduction or actual full elimination in non-resident parking permits of residential neighborhoods.

2. What is the city's intent to enforce permit and short-term parking "rules" in the commercial zones? Since April 1 there is unlimited supply of free parking in all RPP neighborhoods. This means unrestricted parking for downtown workers *and Caltrain riders*.

There is no incentive to buy parking permits within the California and University Avenue commercial cores. It is easier and cheaper (zero cost) to park in the neighborhoods than move vehicles within the time limited color zones in the University Avenue commercial core. When Caltrain riders return, then there is incentive to park in neighborhoods especially Old Palo Alto, Downtown North and Professorville. This will displace downtown workers, customers and residents. What happens when Stanford employees, faculty and students return and park just off campus for free and often convenient.

3. Why is commercial parking in the neighborhoods less expensive than the commercial cores? Pricing differentials should be higher in the residential neighborhoods to create incentives to park in the commercial cores and not park on residential streets. Priorities are ignored for traditional business such as retail goods and services. Lower paid workers, especially sales tax generating businesses, should have some access to commercial core parking.

4. In lieu fees are a bargain to developers. Developers paying in lieu fees are granted parking in perpetuity. Most irrational is that cost of city land is not included in the calculation of in lieu fees. In reality this is a gift of public property to developers who completely avoid land costs when they elect in lieu fees. Thus pricing of parking is subsidized and not market driven.

5. After budget cuts, what level of parking programs will be managed by "surviving" staff in the Office of Transportation? If the head count is reduced from 15 to 10, is the OTT a viable "organization for one of our top priorities or just a homeless section within the Planning Department.

6. There has no parking shortage whatsoever in evenings and nights within the cores of both downtowns. Finding parking is the problem. The mid-day Monday to Friday parking crunch is real and a direct result of chronic under-management by city staff and Council.

Bottom line: RPPs cannot survive if enforcement is suspended for more than a few months. RPPs took almost 20 years to establish and they cannot be silently killed without Palo Altans even knowing what is going on!

Re-establish RPP enforcement within 90 days in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan which states *city policy to promote commerce but not at the expense of residential neighborhoods*.

Baumb, Nelly

From: Linda Anderson <andersonlinda911@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 11:53 AM
To: Council, City
Subject: Fwd: May 13 City Council Meeting Parking

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

I moved to downtown north in 1984 and have lived here since. I strongly support Neilson Buchanan's message below. Before the RPP daytime parking was a disaster. Implementation of the RPP allowed an improvement. Your proposals will affect residential parking in several areas of Palo Alto. Effective use of existing public spaces should be your first approach.

RPP enforcement is essential.

Linda Anderson
Redacted
formerly 267 Bryant Street

Below is a reasonable set of questions reflecting a strong consensus among experienced resident leaders who understand deeply rooted parking issues in the commercial cores and neighborhoods.

The root problem is under-management of the public and private parking assets within the commercial cores. For example, there is absolutely no shortage of parking after 5pm weekdays and weekends. The issue is modern signage to the garages and then guidance to spaces within the garages.

In my opinion City Councils and City Managers have politically mismanaged parking policy by making certain there was no real understanding among city staff. Therefore, the commercial core/residential neighborhood parking can was kicked down the road with advantage tipped for the landlords and tenants of office spaces.

Looking backwards won't help. However, if developer pressures of today's council are successful in weakening the new Office of Transportation we will lose professional staff and the opportunity to harmonize public and private assets within the commercial cores and neighborhoods.

Wednesday's Council key decisions are the following:

1. Staffing levels in the Office of Transportation
2. Guidance systems within the city garages
3. Modern signage to find garages and surface lots

4. Parking permit managements system integrated for commercial core and neighborhoods
5. Elimination of Palo Alto TMA...its usefulness has not materialized and it is more irrelevant than ever. Joint city TMAs could be feasible if they can achieve economies of scale.

PS it is important to remember that there is absolutely no parking shortage in downtown commercial core after 5pm and on weekends. This unused capacity will continue for many months forward. The problem is effective guidance to parking capacity.

Here are questions to ask staff. I have great confidence in Philip Kamhi who leads the Office of Transportation.

1. When will city staff and Council reduce non resident permits authorized for sale in the Mayfield/Evergreen Park neighborhoods? What is the new completion date for California Avenue city garage? Its new capacity will allow a substantial reduction or actual full elimination in non-resident parking permits of residential neighborhoods.
2. What is the city's intent to enforce permit and short-term parking "rules" in the commercial zones? Since April 1 there is unlimited supply of free parking in all RPP neighborhoods. This means unrestricted parking for downtown workers *and Caltrain riders*.

There is no incentive to buy parking permits within the California and University Avenue commercial cores. It is easier and cheaper (zero cost) to park in the neighborhoods than move vehicles within the time limited color zones in the University Avenue commercial core. When Caltrain riders return, then there is incentive to park in neighborhoods especially Old Palo Alto, Downtown North and Professorville. This will displace downtown workers, customers and residents. What happens when Stanford employees, faculty and students return and park just off campus for free and often convenient.

3. Why is commercial parking in the neighborhoods less expensive than the commercial cores? Pricing differentials should be higher in the residential neighborhoods to create incentives to park in the commercial cores and not park on residential streets. Priorities are ignored for traditional business such as retail goods and services. Lower paid workers, especially sales tax generating businesses, should have some access to commercial core parking.
4. In lieu fees are a bargain to developers. Developers paying in lieu fees are granted parking in perpetuity. Most irrational is that cost of city land is not included in the calculation of in lieu fees. In reality this is a gift of public property to developers who completely avoid land costs when they elect in lieu fees. Thus pricing of parking is subsidized and not market driven.
5. After budget cuts, what level of parking programs will be managed by "surviving" staff in the Office of Transportation? If the head count is reduced from 15 to 10, is the OTT a viable "organization for one of our top priorities or just a homeless section within the Planning Department.
6. There has no parking shortage whatsoever in evenings and nights within the cores of both downtowns. Finding parking is the problem. The mid-day Monday to Friday parking crunch is real and a direct result of chronic under-management by city staff and Council.

Bottom line: RPPs cannot survive if enforcement is suspended for more than a few months. RPPs took almost 20 years to establish and they cannot be silently killed without Palo Altans even knowing what is going on!

Re-establish RPP enforcement within 90 days in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan which states *city policy to promote commerce but not at the expense of residential neighborhoods.*

Neilson Buchanan
Redacted
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

Baumb, Nelly

From: Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 11:14 AM
To: Council, City
Cc: Shikada, Ed; Kamhi, Philip; Hur, Mark; Baird, Nathan; Planning Commission
Subject: May 13 City Council Meeting Parking

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Below is a reasonable set of questions reflecting a strong consensus among experienced resident leaders who understand deeply rooted parking issues in the commercial cores and neighborhoods.

The root problem is under-management of the public and private parking assets within the commercial cores. For example, there is absolutely no shortage of parking after 5pm weekdays and weekends. The issue is modern signage to the garages and then guidance to spaces within the garages.

In my opinion City Councils and City Managers have politically mismanaged parking policy by making certain there was no real understanding among city staff. Therefore, the commercial core/residential neighborhood parking can was kicked down the road with advantage tipped for the landlords and tenants of office spaces.

Looking backwards won't help. However, if developer pressures of today's council are successful in weakening the new Office of Transportation we will lose professional staff and the opportunity to harmonize public and private assets within the commercial cores and neighborhoods.

Wednesday's Council key decisions are the following:

1. Staffing levels in the Office of Transportation
2. Guidance systems within the city garages
3. Modern signage to find garages and surface lots
4. Parking permit managements system integrated for commercial core and neighborhoods
5. Elimination of Palo Alto TMA...its usefulness has not materialized and it is more irrelevant than ever. Joint city TMAs could be feasible if they can achieve economies of scale.

PS it is important to remember that there is absolutely no parking shortage in downtown commercial core after 5pm and on weekends. This unused capacity will continue for many months forward. The problem is effective guidance to parking capacity.

Here are questions to ask staff. I have great confidence in Philip Kamhi who leads the Office of Transportation.

1. When will city staff and Council reduce non resident permits authorized for sale in the Mayfield/Evergreen Park neighborhoods? What is the new completion date for California Avenue city garage? Its new capacity will allow a substantial reduction or actual full elimination in non-resident parking permits of residential neighborhoods.

2. What is the city's intent to enforce permit and short-term parking "rules" in the commercial zones? Since April 1 there is unlimited supply of free parking in all RPP neighborhoods. This means unrestricted parking for downtown workers *and Caltrain riders*.

There is no incentive to buy parking permits within the California and University Avenue commercial cores. It is easier and cheaper (zero cost) to park in the neighborhoods than move vehicles within the time limited color zones in the University Avenue commercial core. When Caltrain riders return, then there is incentive to park in neighborhoods especially Old Palo Alto, Downtown North and Professorville. This will displace downtown workers, customers and residents. What happens when Stanford employees, faculty and students return and park just off campus for free and often convenient.

3. Why is commercial parking in the neighborhoods less expensive than the commercial cores? Pricing differentials should be higher in the residential neighborhoods to create incentives to park in the commercial cores and not park on residential streets. Priorities are ignored for traditional business such as retail goods and services. Lower paid workers, especially sales tax generating businesses, should have some access to commercial core parking.

4. In lieu fees are a bargain to developers. Developers paying in lieu fees are granted parking in perpetuity. Most irrational is that cost of city land is not included in the calculation of in lieu fees. In reality this is a gift of public property to developers who completely avoid land costs when they elect in lieu fees. Thus pricing of parking is subsidized and not market driven.

5. After budget cuts, what level of parking programs will be managed by "surviving" staff in the Office of Transportation? If the head count is reduced from 15 to 10, is the OTT a viable "organization for one of our top priorities or just a homeless section within the Planning Department.

6. There has no parking shortage whatsoever in evenings and nights within the cores of both downtowns. Finding parking is the problem. The mid-day Monday to Friday parking crunch is real and a direct result of chronic under-management by city staff and Council.

Bottom line: RPPs cannot survive if enforcement is suspended for more than a few months. RPPs took almost 20 years to establish and they cannot be silently killed without Palo Altans even knowing what is going on!

Re-establish RPP enforcement within 90 days in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan which states *city policy to promote commerce but not at the expense of residential neighborhoods*.

Neilson Buchanan
Redacted
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

Baumb, Nelly

From: Caryn Huberman <yackybooks@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 10, 2020 6:06 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Keep the Ban: VOTE NO

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

To the City Council:

Please vote NO on letting the ban on in lieu fees expire.

We want and need more housing in Palo Alto, not yet more encouragement for yet offices.

A NO VOTE is in order.

Sincerely,
Caryn Huberman
Redacted
Palo Alto, 94301
650-326-0600

Baumb, Nelly

From: Wolfgang Dueregger <wolfgang.dueregger@alumni.stanford.edu>
Sent: Sunday, May 10, 2020 10:31 PM
To: Council, City; Shikada, Ed
Cc: Neilson Buchanan; Paul & Karen Machado; David Schrom; Carol Scott; Christian Pease; John Guislin; Chris Robell; Terry Holzemer; Irene Au; Tim Mealiffe
Subject: Palo Alto RPPs

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

To City Council; City Manager:

1. When will city staff and Council reduce non resident permits authorized for sale in the Mayfield/Evergreen Park neighborhoods? What is the new completion date for California Avenue city garage. Its new capacity will allow a substantial reduction or actual full elimination in non-resident parking permits.

2. What is the city's intent to enforce permit and short-term parking "rules" in the commercial zones? Since April 1 there is unlimited supply of free parking in the RPP Districts. This means unrestricted parking for downtown workers and Caltrain riders.

There is no incentive to buy parking permits within the California and University Avenue commercial cores. It is easier to park in the neighborhoods than move vehicles within the time limited color zones in the University Avenue commercial core. When Caltrain riders return, then there is incentive to park in neighborhoods especially Old Palo Alto, Downtown North and Professorville. This will displace downtown workers, customers and residents. What happens when Stanford employees, faculty and students return and park just off campus for free and often convenient.

Many residents paid money to City of Palo Alto to buy these permits. Why is this money no longer being used to enforce the RPPs? If this money is no longer used for enforcing/administering the RPPs, you owe all the residents an explanation about where this money got diverted to. We await your response!

3. Why is commercial parking in the neighborhoods less expensive than the commercial cores? Pricing differentials should be higher in the residential neighborhoods to create incentives to park in the commercial cores and not park on residential streets. Priorities are ignored for traditional business such as retail goods and services. Lower paid workers, including restaurants, should have some access to commercial core parking.

4. In lieu fees are a bargain to developers. Developers paying in lieu fees are granted parking in perpetuity. Most irrational is that cost of city land is not included in the calculation of in lieu fees. In reality this is a gift of public property to developers who completely avoid land costs when they elect in lieu fees. Thus pricing of parking is subsidized and not market driven.

5. After budget cuts, what level of parking programs will be managed by "surviving" staff in the Office of Transportation? If the head count is reduced from 15 to 10, is the OTT available "department or just a homeless section within the Planning Department.

6. There has no parking shortage whatsoever in evenings and nights within the cores of both downtowns. Finding parking is the problem. The mid-day Monday to Friday parking crunch is real and a direct result of chronic under-management by city staff and Council.

Bottom line: RPPs cannot survive if enforcement is suspended for more than a few months. RPPs took almost 20 years to establish and they cannot be silently killed without Palo Altans even knowing what is going on! This is extremely disappointing and many people are upset that city staff rushes these decisions through without proper public input! We said it before and say it again: Be transparent in your decisions. We will hold you accountable.

Also, casually restarting these RPPS with no experienced city staff, how is this going to work? Now is the time to manage commercial parking for the benefit of commercial core stakeholder without massive intrusion of commercial parking into residential neighborhoods.

Re-establish RPP enforcement within 90 days in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan which states *city policy to promote commerce but not at the expense of residential neighborhoods.*

Regards

Wolfgang Dueregger

Baumb, Nelly

From: Karen Machado <karen.machado@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 1:03 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Fwd: Continuation of RPPs

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear City Council members,

Many residents of Downtown North, Evergreen Park and Mayfield, College Terrace and Southgate and other areas with current RPPs are very concerned about insuring that they continue and are enforced even in the face of the budget cuts you are considering. While the City may need to pursue different enforcement mechanisms but it is essential that these programs, which many of us have fought so hard over several years to obtain, are not terminated now. We realize that budget cuts may be needed but we hope that this current crisis will not be used as an excuse to end programs that are vital for the quality of life of the residents of the City. It is clear that some elected leaders are using the pandemic to further their political interests and that of their financial contributors such as the developers at the expense of the citizens. We hope that this will not happen in Palo Alto.

Thanks for your help.
Karen Machado

I support this message from Neilson Buchanan:

Below is a reasonable set of questions reflecting a strong consensus among experienced resident leaders who understand deeply rooted parking issues in the commercial cores and neighborhoods.

The root problem is under-management of the public and private parking assets within the commercial cores. For example, there is absolutely no shortage of parking after 5pm weekdays and weekends. The issue is modern signage to the garages and then guidance to spaces within the garages.

In my opinion City Councils and City Managers have politically mismanaged parking policy by making certain there was no real understanding among city staff. Therefore, the commercial core/residential neighborhood parking can was kicked down the road with advantage tipped for the landlords and tenants of office spaces.

Looking backwards won't help. However, if developer pressures of today's council are successful in weakening the new Office of Transportation we will lose professional staff and the opportunity to harmonize public and private assets within the commercial cores and neighborhoods.

Wednesday's Council key decisions are the following:

1. Staffing levels in the Office of Transportation
2. Guidance systems within the city garages
3. Modern signage to find garages and surface lots
4. Parking permit managements system integrated for commercial core and neighborhoods

5. Elimination of Palo Alto TMA...its usefulness has not materialized and it is more irrelevant than ever. Joint city TMAs could be feasible if they can achieve economies of scale.

PS it is important to remember that there is absolutely no parking shortage in downtown commercial core after 5pm and on weekends. This unused capacity will continue for many months forward. The problem is effective guidance to parking capacity.

Here are questions to ask staff. I have great confidence in Philip Kamhi who leads the Office of Transportation.

1. When will city staff and Council reduce non resident permits authorized for sale in the Mayfield/Evergreen Park neighborhoods? What is the new completion date for California Avenue city garage? Its new capacity will allow a substantial reduction or actual full elimination in non-resident parking permits of residential neighborhoods.

2. What is the city's intent to enforce permit and short-term parking "rules" in the commercial zones? Since April 1 there is unlimited supply of free parking in all RPP neighborhoods. This means unrestricted parking for downtown workers *and Caltrain riders*.

There is no incentive to buy parking permits within the California and University Avenue commercial cores. It is easier and cheaper (zero cost) to park in the neighborhoods than move vehicles within the time limited color zones in the University Avenue commercial core. When Caltrain riders return, then there is incentive to park in neighborhoods especially Old Palo Alto, Downtown North and Professorville. This will displace downtown workers, customers and residents. What happens when Stanford employees, faculty and students return and park just off campus for free and often convenient.

3. Why is commercial parking in the neighborhoods less expensive than the commercial cores? Pricing differentials should be higher in the residential neighborhoods to create incentives to park in the commercial cores and not park on residential streets. Priorities are ignored for traditional business such as retail goods and services. Lower paid workers, especially sales tax generating businesses, should have some access to commercial core parking.

4. In lieu fees are a bargain to developers. Developers paying in lieu fees are granted parking in perpetuity. Most irrational is that cost of city land is not included in the calculation of in lieu fees. In reality this is a gift of public property to developers who completely avoid land costs when they elect in lieu fees. Thus pricing of parking is subsidized and not market driven.

5. After budget cuts, what level of parking programs will be managed by "surviving" staff in the Office of Transportation? If the head count is reduced from 15 to 10, is the OTT a viable "organization for one of our top priorities or just a homeless section within the Planning Department.

6. There has no parking shortage whatsoever in evenings and nights within the cores of both downtowns. Finding parking is the problem. The mid-day Monday to Friday parking crunch is real and a direct result of chronic under-management by city staff and Council.

Bottom line: RPPs cannot survive if enforcement is suspended for more than a few months. RPPs took almost 20 years to establish and they cannot be silently killed without Palo Altans even knowing what is going on!

Re-establish RPP enforcement within 90 days in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan which states *city policy to promote commerce but not at the expense of residential neighborhoods.*

Baumb, Nelly

From: William Courington <billcour@sonic.net>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 10:18 AM
To: Council, City
Subject: Save money by completely dropping the downtown parking garage

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Even without the current pandemic, drawing more cars downtown because parking capacity is available, leads to greater congestion on the routes in and out.

It's likely that one effect of the pandemic will be to reduce the density of employees in office spaces. Close extended contact in a poorly ventilated area is the ideal venue for disease transmission. An open plan office, with adjacent workspaces, is just such a venue. Such office arrangements, which have been a popular way to increase employee density in expensive buildings, may disappear. Working from home at least part time is likely to continue. The result of both changes is fewer employees traveling into downtown to work, meaning less demand for parking, less justification for a fourth downtown garage.

I urge the Council to save another \$5 million by eliminating the downtown garage project.

William Courington, Byron St.

Baumb, Nelly

From: Pat Burt <patburt11@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 12:52 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: May 11 CC Item 8: Downtown In-Lieu Parking

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear City Council,

I encourage you to defer this item and instead focus your attention on the great budgetary challenges we face due to the city's fiscal crisis. The COVID emergency should not be used as a rationalization to change policy directions on relatively unrelated and politically driven matters.

Whether you consider this item tonight or at a later date, the following issues should be considered.

In the broad context, zoning decisions should be based on an assumption the economic downturn will be for more than just a year or so. Key considerations before reversing the current council direction:

- What type of housing do we want and where in the city do we want it? Is the Downtown still a focus area for new housing?
- If we will still want to encourage housing downtown, we undermine that plan by actions like re-instating in lieu parking for offices that would re-incentivize office development and make housing projects less viable alternatives.
- Nearly all mixed-use office/residential development has added more jobs than housing, thereby exacerbating our jobs:housing imbalance and worsening our housing shortage. Consequently, mixed-use projects harm rather than help the housing shortfall.
- Instead, in the coming months, the council should consider if there are additional incentives needed for Downtown housing beyond the recent PC changes?
- In the nearer term, the council and staff will want to consider new trends:
 - A higher percentage of commuters may be single-occupancy vehicle commuters due to COVID fears of transit use.
 - Office vacancies in the downtown will reduce any near-term office project developments, but reinstating the advantages of office development (through in-lieu parking) will be a headwind against housing development by retaining office as the highest ROI in the longterm.

In the February 3rd report to Council on the City's housing Workplan, staff noted that they were unable to schedule this item for PTC review within the Council-directed timeframe due to staff vacancies in the long-range planning program and with available resources advancing other Council priorities. Why would failure to have the PTC review the policy cause the CC policy to be reversed rather than extended until PTC and CC review?

In light of recent circumstances associated with the pandemic and economic impacts, staff recommends this ban be allowed to expire restoring the municipal code to its prior (April 1, 2019) standard allowing all commercial uses to continue participating in the in-lieu parking program. There is not yet any understanding of how or whether the economic impacts of COVID affect this policy?

The current staff report states that "Downtown Palo Alto has seen little housing development in recent years. Office rental rates in this area are among the highest in the nation and the return on commercial office investment far outpaces any return on residential housing. Historically, there has been little incentive for a downtown property owner to redevelop their property into housing. **Enacting the ban on commercial office spaces from participating in the City's in-lieu parking program was seen, when combined with the housing policies enacted last year, as a possible strategy to begin to tip the balance toward home production and away from office development.**" In-lieu parking is an

incentive for office development. Why would the city want to incentivize office downtown when we are trying to encourage housing which otherwise has a lower ROI?

And, before the County's shelter in place order, staff was preparing to send a draft ordinance to the PTC extending the ban, which expires on May 1, for one year. Why would the shelter in place order obviate the need to extend the ban?

The report also states that "the ban creates uncertainty for downtown property owners and developers who are unable or unwilling to move forward on projects until their ability to participate in the in-lieu parking program is resolved." The only uncertainty is whether the ban will be rescinded, which would enable office ROI's to return to higher levels than residential development. This argument acknowledges that the in-lieu ban causes property owners to consider housing over the office, but that the prospect of overturning the ban holds back property owners from moving forward with housing. By making the ban permanent, the city provides the clarity for the market to adjust toward housing development.

The recent Council action to allow planned community (PC) zoning for housing projects provides the additional element to spur housing over office. Staff told the council in February that the other housing plan changes had made housing nearly preferable for developers over office and that adding some PC discretion would result in housing projects when combined with the prior changes. Rescinding the ban undermines the value of the PC discretion to further incentivize housing.

If you truly believe in adding housing downtown and balancing jobs with housing, you should continue the current policy.

Best regards,
Pat Burt