

Baumb, Nelly

From: Lloyd Diamond <tmcdiamond@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 1:19 AM
To: Council, City
Subject: Old Palo Alto RPP

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

Dear City Council,

We will not be able to attend the virtual City Council meeting tonight where you will be voting to extend the pilot phase of the Old Palo Alto Residential Preferential Parking (RPP) Program for twelve months ending on October 31, 2021. We understand that the reason this will be a vote for an extension, and not a final approval, is that Council wants "to further evaluate the program, as the economic downturn related to Covid-19 has significantly impacted travel patterns". However, as resident owners who have had to live with the unbearable burden of the traffic and parking situation for many years, we can attest to the fact that the RPP has certainly improved quality of life in the area. While the COVID pandemic is real and tragic for many, eventually this will be dealt with and things will return to normal, meaning an increased flow of traffic once again. Therefore, we are not sure what more you plan on learning by simply extending the pilot program. We are happy to settle for another year extension but we would recommend approving the RPP and making it permanent as soon as possible.

Best Regards,

Lloyd & Isabelle Diamond

Baumb, Nelly

From: Barbara Carlitz <barbara.carlitz@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 13, 2020 3:11 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Old Palo Alto RPP

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

Dear Council Members,

Just a line to say I support the staff suggestion to defer until next year any decision on success of our new parking program. We've certainly not had a normal year to test this out!

Barbara Carlitz
2291 Ramona St.

Baumb, Nelly

From: Elizabeth Dougherty <paloaltoeditor@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 3:46 PM
To: Council, City
Cc: Cormack, Alison; DuBois, Tom; Filseth, Eric (Internal); Fine, Adrian; Kniss, Liz (internal); Kou, Lydia; Tanaka, Greg; Hur, Mark
Subject: Item #4 on consent calendar: 12-month continuation of the pilot project of OPA RPP

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

Dear Council Member,

Item #4 on the consent calendar would allow a 12-month continuation of the pilot project of the Old Palo Alto Residential Preferential Parking (RPP). Please consider taking it out of the consent calendar and examining the implications in more detail before moving forward. I have either spoken to each of you today or tried to call you to explain my point of view.

The RPP program is emblematic of making our city exclusive—keeping “other” people out—during a time when if we care about equity, we should be exploring every opportunity to be inclusive. My block was eligible to opt into the Old Palo Alto Residential Preferential Parking (RPP) district, but we chose not to precisely because we should be making it easier, not harder, to come to our town.

The program targeted Caltrain commuters and CalAve workers. We don’t know the economic situation of these workers, and the majority of the residents on the 2300 block of Bryant St. prefer to welcome them into our neighborhood and allow them to park on our public streets.

Parking is not and never has been a problem in Old Palo Alto, and the OPA district was established based on dubious data (see agenda Attachment A) at a cost of \$75,500 and a process that makes it far too easy to establish an RPP district. This expensive program in OPA benefits the 93 original houses; the cost to add 17 houses that opted in due to “overflow” parking is not included in that figure. Prior to the pandemic, the estimated annual cost to maintain the district was \$10,000 – \$15,000, per city staff. As the council examines how we’re spending our shrinking revenue, the RPP program is one place to look.

My husband and I have rented a house at the corner of Bryant and Oregon Ave. for nearly 24 years. We have a two-car garage and park our cars in it. A large part of the so-called “parking shortage” comes from owners who remodel houses, convert garages into interior rooms after city inspection, and then feel entitled to park in front of their house. If your house is up to code—and this district is made up of single-family homes—you should be able to park in your garage or on the driveway.

According to the original timeline, the council would not have revisited this issue until the end of October, per my communications with city staff in January. Even with the pandemic making it impossible to collect accurate follow-up data, that length of continuing a costly program that pays to turn public streets into private parking is too long.

Thanks for listening!

Elizabeth Dougherty

Old Palo Alto resident