

From: [Annette Ross](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Item 9 on the October 4 Agenda
Date: Sunday, October 3, 2021 12:59:14 PM

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

Palo Alto seems determined to mess with programs that work. And waste valuable Staff time in the process of doing that. The report on this item is a bit mind-boggling. As I read it I couldn't help but wonder if it was deliberately written to discourage scrutiny. Using numbers or letters to delineate key points would have been more helpful than the use of bullet points so that one could reference a specific point.

The third bullet in one section references virtual permit options. Is the use of a virtual program really an option? Can residents instead opt to continue with the physical sticker and hang tags for guests? Transitioning to a virtual permit parking program leaves wide open potential for rampant abuse by those who do not own a permit to park in a particular area but choose to park there anyway because it is convenient for them. The physical tags are an immediate indicator that a car is legitimately parked in a given area. When a street is fully parked, that indicator is important.

A consistent argument in the Staff Report on this is that the virtual program is better. The report specifically states that the virtual approach will "streamline operations for staff". While complicating it for residents? How are violations - which can easily become problematic - to be known? Cars obviously won't explode if parked where they ought not to be parked, so how does a virtual program maintain the protections achieved by the existing RPPP? How often and how do the license plate readers get read? What is the additional cost associated with that? Will fees increase so as to maintain the required revenue-neutrality of the program so that costs to operate do not exceed the fees charged? How is the license plate reader program limited so as to be constitutional?

About guest parking - the existing program that requires a hang tag works perfectly well. Requiring residents to go on line and register a guest's vehicle is onerous. Frankly, beyond paying for an annual permit, I cringe at the thought of having to access a City website for anything to do with parking. I base this on problems experienced with the utility website. What safeties will be built into the proposed program to assure that permit holders are not fined b/c the website was not working as it should? And the idea that residents may have to register guests online is offensive. Very Big Brother.

Tech isn't always the answer, as we recently learned with regard to the train track monitoring system. I hope Council will send this proposal back to Staff for serious revision. Or scrap it altogether.

Annette Ross
Palo Alto