

**Baumb, Nelly**

---

**From:** Dick Heermance <rheermance@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 14, 2020 8:28 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** Old Palo Alto RPP on the consent calendar 11-16-2020

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

---

To Members of the Palo Alto City Council:

We want to urge you to approve the Old Palo Alto RPP on the consent calendar on Monday, November 16, 2020. The program has been very successful, and we are pleased that you voted to make it permanent.

Thank you,

Richard and Carol Heermance  
208 N. California Ave.

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Shaila Sadrozinski <sadro@pacbell.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 11, 2020 1:55 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission; Council, City  
**Cc:** Baird, Nathan; Hur, Mark  
**Subject:** residential parking permit program changes

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

---

Dear Members of the City Council and the Planning & Transportation Commission,

As a resident of the Southgate neighborhood, where we have the parking permit program, I am very upset to learn that the Office of Transportation is converting to an all-digital permitting program and considering eliminating the physical hang-tag permits that residents are able to use for guests.

Having only daily online access to acquiring guest permits not only makes this an unnecessary burden to residents, but also represents a significant increase in cost. Until now, the hang-tags cost the same and were valid for the same period as the sticker permits; if a resident had two different guests at different times on the same day, no additional permit was needed.

When we had out-of-town guests visiting for a few days, we could have them use the same hang-tag; under the new proposal, we would have to remember to go online every day to get another daily permit.

I am a senior citizen, not very comfortable with doing things online, and having to remember to go online every time I need a permit for an unexpected guest will be an unacceptably stressful situation. Some elderly residents have caregivers coming to the home every day and they may not have easy access to the internet; some older residents may not even have a computer.

I have already written to Nathan Baird and Mark Hur, but am bringing these points to your attention, so that you are aware of these concerns before new rules are set in stone.

Thank you,

Shaila Sadrozinski, 62 Churchill Ave

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Carol Scott <cscott@crossfieldllc.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 9, 2020 10:04 AM  
**To:** iz.kniss@cityofpaloalto.org; Fine, Adrian; Greg Tanaka; Filseth, Eric (external); alisonlcormack@gmail.com; Kou, Lydia; Tom DuBois  
**Cc:** Council, City; Shikada, Ed; Kamhi, Philip; Baird, Nathan; Pat Burt; Greer Stone; Neilson Buchanan; Wolfgang Dueregger; Paul Machado; John Guislin  
**Subject:** Staff Report on the New California Ave Garage  
**Attachments:** Revised Letter to Council 11-9-2020.docx

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

---

Dear Council Members,

Attached please find a letter from residents of several Palo Alto neighborhoods regarding the proposed allocation of parking spaces in the new California Aven garage on Sherman Ave.

We respectfully request that the current Staff Report be sent back to for revision to:

- 1) move all non-employee parking permits in the Evergreen Park/Mayfield RPP area to the new garage as was anticipated at the time that we supported the construction of the garage at taxpayer expense and as is consistent with other RPPs adjacent to California Ave and Evergreen Park/Mayfield, and
- 2) propose actions necessary to allow low-wage workers to buy discounted parking permits in the new garage. Failure to provide space for these low-wage workers is also inconsistent with the motivation for building the garage and guarantees that the new garage will simply be another free gift to commercial office space workers who should be incentivized to commute to the area via public transportation to reduce both traffic and demand for parking in the area.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carol

--

Carol Scott

To: Palo Alto City Council, Palo Alto City Manager, Philip Kahmi, Nathan Baird  
Cc: Council Members- Elect Pat Burt, Greer Stone

RE: Item 12, City Council Meeting, Monday, November 9, 2020: California Avenue Garage

Dear Council Members, City Manager, and City Staff,

City Staff is recommending that 120 of the 250 available non-resident (employee) permits sold in the Evergreen Park/Mayfield RPP residential zones<sup>1</sup> be moved to the new garage. The remaining 130 all-day non-resident permits in the residential areas are targeted to be eliminated at some point in the future.

We, residents of multiple Palo Alto neighborhoods urge the Council to reject this recommendation and instead, direct the Staff to move all of the non-resident permits from the Evergreen Park/Mayfield (EPM) RPP into the new California Ave garage as soon as it is opened.

This request to use the opening of the California Avenue garage to eliminate all non-resident parking permits in our RPP is supported by the following:

1. The City's Comprehensive Plan states that City policies should be guided by the goal to "promote commerce but not at the expense of residential neighborhoods." This implies that commercial parking, which comes at the expense of the quality of life in residential neighborhoods, should be eliminated. The new California Avenue garage was built to provide sufficient parking for community-serving small businesses including restaurants and personal service offices, and therefore follows through on this stated policy.
2. At the time City Council considered the construction of the garage, residents of Evergreen Park and Mayfield who had been working with local businesses and medical and dental offices in the area argued in support of building the garage at taxpayer expense with the expectation that all employee parking permits would then be accommodated within the new garage.

You will recall that the impetus for constructing the garage was that local business and medical and dental office employees were being squeezed out of parking due to the increased number of commercial office workers – especially those working for software companies. Residents did not support the construction of the garage at taxpayer expense in order to provide additional parking to commercial office workers, many of whom work in under-parked office buildings that should have TDM agreements that promised to

---

<sup>1</sup> There are six parking zones in the Evergreen Park /Mayfield (EPM) residential areas, i.e., zones A, B, C, and D in the Evergreen Park neighborhood, and zones E and F in Mayfield. In addition there is one zone, "G" that was created along El Camino with permission from the State who controls that area. In the Staff recommendations, the 40 non-resident permits in Zone G along El Camino Real will continue to be sold as they are now. Only the 250 total permits currently sold in Evergreen Park and Mayfield are discussed as targets of change in the Staff Report and this email.

eliminate the need for workers to use public parking in the California Ave Business District (CABD) or residential areas.

3. In fact, the proposal by the Staff actually excludes the very employees, i.e., the lower-income employees of locally serving retailers, restaurants, and medical and dental offices, for which the new garage was intended. These employees are not currently allowed to purchase employee permits in City-owned garages and lots (p. 5), apparently including the new garage. The only permits that lower-income employees can purchase at a discounted price are in the residential zones of the EPM RPP. Thus, the garage is, de facto, being allocated to commercial office space workers that were not intended to be gifted with additional taxpayer-paid parking. This practice of excluding lower-income employees from purchasing low cost permits in City lots and garages will continue unless it is changed by a proposal to the Finance Committee and ultimately approved by the City Council “at some future date” (Staff Report, p. 5). Council should direct that such a proposal be submitted now.
4. Although the Staff report states that employee permits in EPM will be phased out over the next two years, the current Staff report contains many hedges on this promise such that it is no promise at all. Staff already has concerns about moving 250 employee permits out of EPM<sup>2</sup> because of a stated need to accommodate employees on a so-called waiting list and the proposed in-lieu permit program (p. 5). However, for the past eight months many of these office workers have been working from home because of COVID-19, and no one can be sure how many will ever come back. “Reserving” parking spots in the new garage and in residential neighborhoods for them is the wrong thing at the wrong time. If those workers ever come back, they should be incentivized to commute in and out using Cal Train or other public transportation.
5. The City and the California Avenue Business District businesses – with no input from or consideration given to residents of EPM – recently elected to eliminate approximately 60+ parking spaces along California Avenue and the side streets due to the Summer Streets/Uplift Local programs. EPM should not be asked to absorb those lost parking spaces. If the businesses felt they did not need these parking spaces now, then presumably they will not need to replace them once the new garage is opened. It is time to insist that businesses in the CABD live within their parking space means, especially now that they are being given, at no cost to them, a large new garage.
6. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, removing all of the employee permits in EPM is simply a matter of equity for the taxpaying residents that live in this area with respect to their neighbors in two adjacent RPPs. Neither the oldest RPP (College Terrace), nor the newest RPP (Old Palo Alto) accept any employee parking permits.<sup>3</sup> On what basis has the City decided that some taxpayers are entitled to protection from commercial encroachment and some are not? EPM should not be asked to carry a burden that other

---

<sup>2</sup> There is no need to move the 40 permits from El Camino Real to the new garage.

<sup>3</sup> In fact, several streets in EPM are farther away from California Avenue than some streets in Old Palo Alto and College Terrace.

neighborhoods are not. EPM residents deserve to be treated equally as a matter of principle, and perhaps even a matter of law.

Give the above, the undersigned ask that City Council direct the Staff to move all employee-permits now allocated to the residential zones of the EPM RPP (i.e., zones A, B, C, D, E, and F) to the new California Avenue garage upon its opening.

Thank you.

Wolfgang Dueregger, Evergreen Park

John Guislin, Crescent Park

Paul Machado, Evergreen Park

Neilson Buchanan, Downtown

Carol Scott, Evergreen Park

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 9, 2020 8:24 AM  
**To:** Council, City; Clerk, City  
**Cc:** Shikada, Ed; Kamhi, Philip; Baird, Nathan; Carol Scott; Wolfgang Dueregger; Paul Machado; Chris Robell; Allen Akin; Holzemer/hernandez; Mary Gallagher; Mary Dimit; Rebecca Sanders; Christian Pease; Sallyann Rudd; Malcolm Roy Beasley  
**Subject:** Evergreen Park RPP and equity to retail employees and employers

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

---

I hope you can clearly see this injustice to low-wage workers.

Tonight's staff report reveals two long-time, serious policy failures to protect residential neighborhoods and lower wage workers.

#1 A low wage worker can only buy a low-cost, non-resident permits in the adjacent neighborhoods. Low wage workers are explicitly excluded *by pricing* from competition for public parking in both California and University Avenue commercial cores.

#2 During the past ten years residents have pointed this class inequity out repeatedly to staff and Council, but there has been little willingness of staff to acknowledge the situation.

Tonight city staff is proposing to reduce the number of non-resident permits to be sold in the Evergreen Park/Mayfield RPP districts; however, these low-wage workers do not have *ANY* opportunity to buy permits in public parking lots and garages. Please do not let this form of discrimination continue.

I urge the Council to direct staff to return to Council in a week with a option and fee so that low-wage workers can buy permits in public parking lots and garages. These workers and their employers deserve reasonable access to public parking. This is essential if the Council truly want to boost viability of "retail" within California and University Avenue commercial cores.

Finally, the higher paid office workers who do not have on-site parking deserve the opportunity to walk a bit further to the neighborhoods, only *if the Council determines there is a shortage of public parking*.

- There is no shortage of public parking\* in California Avenue with the new parking garage.
- There is no shortage of public parking\* in the University Avenue commercial core. The Cowper/Webster public parking garage has never been fully utilized.

\* informal surveys reveal that private parking capacity is under-utilized

Neilson Buchanan  
155 Bryant Street

Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484

650 537-9611 cell

[cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com](mailto:cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com)



## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Jeff Deaton <jdeaton@alhousedeaton.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 9, 2020 1:45 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** RE: California Avenue Parking Garage -- Stop the Allocation of Parking Spaces to former RPP Employee Parking Holders!

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

---

Dear City Council,

I have just learned about a parking change in the California Avenue District that will restrict the use of the new parking garage off Sherman Avenue. I believe that the promises made by the city in the past concerning the new garage was to provide customer parking along with parking for the new public safety building/headquarters. To take on/force the load of residential parking permits currently used by employees that work near the Cal Ave Business District and restrict their use to the new parking garage is simply kicking the can down the road. Where will the public safety building employees park each day if the neighborhood permit plan is shifted to the new garage? This scheme resembles a classic bait and switch maneuver. Send the plan back to staff to find a plan somewhere in between...but ideally adhering to the original plan.

Respectfully,

**Jeff Deaton**

Chief Executive Officer  
Lic.#01521031

(o) 650-857-1792  
(c) 650-269-9161

📍 230 California Avenue, Suite 212  
Palo Alto, California 94306



## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Larry Alton <lalton@pacbell.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 9, 2020 11:33 AM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** the proposed allocation of parking spaces in the new California Avenue garage on Sherman Ave.

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

---

Dear Council Members,

*I respectfully request that the current Staff Report be sent back to for revision to:*

1) move all non-employee parking permits in the Evergreen Park/Mayfield RPP area to the new garage as was anticipated at the time that we supported the construction of the garage at taxpayer expense and as is consistent with other RPPs adjacent to California Ave and Evergreen Park/Mayfield, and

2) propose actions necessary to allow low-wage workers to buy discounted parking permits in the new garage. Failure to provide space for these low-wage workers is also inconsistent with the motivation for building the garage and guarantees that the new garage will simply be another free gift to commercial office space workers who should be incentivized to commute to the area via public transportation to reduce both traffic and demand for parking in the area.

Thank you for your consideration.  
Larry Alton

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Shikada, Ed  
**Sent:** Monday, November 9, 2020 11:04 AM  
**To:** Larry Alton  
**Cc:** Council, City  
**Subject:** RE: new garage parking

Hello Mr. Alton –

It appears your letter was not attached, if you intended there to be an attachment. If so, please resend.

Thank you,

--Ed



CITY OF  
**PALO  
ALTO**

**Ed Shikada**  
City Manager  
250 Hamilton Avenue  
Palo Alto, CA 94301  
(650) 329-2280  
[ed.shikada@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:ed.shikada@cityofpaloalto.org)

---

**From:** Larry Alton <lalton@pacbell.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 9, 2020 10:53 AM  
**To:** Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>  
**Subject:** new garage parking

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

---

Dear Council Members,

Attached please find a letter from residents of several Palo Alto neighborhoods regarding the proposed allocation of parking spaces in the new California Avenue garage on Sherman Ave.

We respectfully request that the current Staff Report be sent back to for revision to:

- 1) move all non-employee parking permits in the Evergreen Park/Mayfield RPP area to the new garage as was anticipated at the time that we supported the construction of the garage at taxpayer expense and as is consistent with other RPPs adjacent to California Ave and Evergreen Park/Mayfield, and
- 2) propose actions necessary to allow low-wage workers to buy discounted parking permits in the new garage. Failure to provide space for these low-wage workers is also inconsistent with the motivation for building the garage and guarantees that the new garage will simply be another free gift to commercial office space workers who should be incentivized to commute to the area via public transportation to reduce both traffic and demand for parking in the area.

Thank you for your consideration.  
Larry Alton

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Mike Meffert <mmeffert@alhousedeaton.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 9, 2020 10:34 AM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** California Avenue Parking Garage -- Stop the Allocation of Parking Spaces to former RPP Employee Parking Holders!

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

---

Dear City Council,

The California Avenue District recently discovered that the new parking garage will allocate almost all new parking spaces to employees that previously could park in the neighborhood under the RPP program, thereby effectively reducing parking to 10 new spaces. This is completely contrary to the stated intent of the new garage, and gives the merchants and property owners next to no advance notice to object. I own commercial property in the California Avenue District and work there. While Covid-19 has gutted the California Avenue District, once employees and customers return to the area this parking allocation will be like putting a knee on the throat of the business district and it will suffocate. Customers will go elsewhere to shop. Businesses will choose to go elsewhere for their office needs. This action must stop!

Sincerely,

**Mike Meffert** | Commercial Real Estate Salesperson | DRE# 01361294  
230 South California Avenue, #212 | Palo Alto | California 94306  
(c) 650-207-4754 | (f) 650-852-0361  
[www.alhousedeaton.com](http://www.alhousedeaton.com)



## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Opus Arcade <opusarcade@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 9, 2020 10:31 AM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Cc:** Kleinberg, Judy  
**Subject:** Evergreen Park/Mayfield (EPM) permit street parking proposal

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

---

Dear Members of Palo Alto City Council,

I'm writing on behalf of myself, MyLan Biermann, and the stylists that work at Opus Arcade at 460 Cambridge Ave. We have great concern about this proposal. We do not see how this would benefit the neighborhood and business community. From what we understand, the idea is to cancel permits and move them to the new parking garage. However, there doesn't seem to be a clear plan for that and the idea of canceling permits with a proposed transfer to the new parking structure, even with a clear timeline, doesn't suit the needs of the business community that is not adjacent to the new parking structure.

That structure seems to best suit the high traffic area of visitors and customers that support businesses along Cal Ave and the intersecting streets that are full of restaurants and other businesses. Making the working/permitted community park in the structure would crowd availability for visitors and would seem to have been built primarily for permit parking holders. We believe this would create convenience issues and hardships that are already heightened through this pandemic, and would lower the morale of all to have to adjust to an unnecessary shift that ultimately does not serve the visiting customer's needs most, who we would like to continue to attract and accommodate, in addition to whomever is still able to find work here in the area.

There has been a lot of wonderful effort by the City of Palo Alto that we appreciate and are very appreciative of. You have responded to the needs of the community in a very timely manner through these times. We appreciate the idea, but upon further discussion, it doesn't seem clear and, even a best case scenario with timelines, doesn't serve the needs of visiting customers who want to support our working business community as well as the workers and businesses who are already struggling to make it through these times.

We appreciate the thoughtful effort you put in to serve our community. We hope you continue to think of this through a variety of lenses and appreciate being able to share our view and the potential negative impact this would have on many of us.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration of us all.

Best Regards,  
MyLan Biermann  
Opus Arcade, Inc  
460 Cambridge Ave

**Baumb, Nelly**

---

**From:** Larry Alton <lalton@pacbell.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 9, 2020 10:53 AM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** new garage parking

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

---

Dear Council Members,

Attached please find a letter from residents of several Palo Alto neighborhoods regarding the proposed allocation of parking spaces in the new California Avenue garage on Sherman Ave.

We respectfully request that the current Staff Report be sent back to for revision to:

- 1) move all non-employee parking permits in the Evergreen Park/Mayfield RPP area to the new garage as was anticipated at the time that we supported the construction of the garage at taxpayer expense and as is consistent with other RPPs adjacent to California Ave and Evergreen Park/Mayfield, and
- 2) propose actions necessary to allow low-wage workers to buy discounted parking permits in the new garage. Failure to provide space for these low-wage workers is also inconsistent with the motivation for building the garage and guarantees that the new garage will simply be another free gift to commercial office space workers who should be incentivized to commute to the area via public transportation to reduce both traffic and demand for parking in the area.

Thank you for your consideration.  
Larry Alton

**Baumb, Nelly**

---

**From:** Linda Anderson <andersonlinda911@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 9, 2020 1:18 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** New California Avenue Garage

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

---

I support the request from the Evergreen Park community as outlined in a letter to the Council and encourage you to adjust plans accordingly.

Linda Anderson  
Downtown



## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Filseth, Eric (Internal)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 10, 2020 4:09 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** RE: Hang-Tag Permits Redux

Sorry, did not mean to cc Council on this.

---

**From:** Filseth, Eric (Internal)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 10, 2020 4:08 PM  
**To:** Baird, Nathan <Nathan.Baird@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Hur, Mark <Mark.Hur@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Kamhi, Philip <Philip.Kamhi@CityofPaloAlto.org>  
**Cc:** Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>  
**Subject:** Hang-Tag Permits Redux

I keep getting these “discontinuing hang tag” emails too ... I assume that’s not correct because I asked it awhile ago. So any idea why this meme is floating around?

Eric

---

**From:** [mike.forster@alumni.usc.edu](mailto:mike.forster@alumni.usc.edu) <[mike.forster@alumni.usc.edu](mailto:mike.forster@alumni.usc.edu)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 10, 2020 3:35 PM  
**To:** Baird, Nathan <[Nathan.Baird@CityofPaloAlto.org](mailto:Nathan.Baird@CityofPaloAlto.org)>; Hur, Mark <[Mark.Hur@CityofPaloAlto.org](mailto:Mark.Hur@CityofPaloAlto.org)>  
**Cc:** Council, City <[city.council@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:city.council@cityofpaloalto.org)>  
**Subject:** Keep physical visitor hang tags in RPP zones  
**Importance:** High

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

---

November 10, 2020

Dear Mr. Hur, Mr. Baird and city council members:

I concur with other letters I have seen: the Palo Alto RPP should retain the physical hangtags for visitor parking, both for long-term and daily parking.

The online system to order hangtags is simple enough (although it has a few glitches). One the hangtags are obtained, using them is the simplest way for residents to enable visitors to park, as well as being very flexible, with almost no points of failure.

From what I understand, a digital system would require the resident to log in every day to initiate or renew a single-day visitor parking permit for a particular vehicle. This would be more complex - logging in, going through online forms, etc. would take some minutes, compared with literally seconds to hand someone a hangtag. This also would introduce multiple possible points of failure: 1) computer or network glitches on the resident's or city's side; 2) mistyping a license plate number; 3) simply forgetting to do this every evening or morning for a multi-day visitor; and 4) the permit information getting being recorded in time for the parking monitor to access it. Also, some residents might not have computer access or computer knowledge - with the help of friends or family members, this can be overcome once a year, but not daily.

I was unable to determine exactly what problem was intended to be solved by changing from hangtags to daily digital online requests. I was able to pretty quickly find residents' letters at the city website, but not the staff recommendation that led to the discussion that led to the letters. So far, I see little benefit for this much more complex approach.

Often, the simplest procedure is best. That is the situation in this case - a hangtag system is simple and nearly failure-proof. A daily online digital request system has many points where it could fail. Keep the simple system.

Mike Forster  
Senior Manager, System & Software Engineering (retired)  
Systems Procedures IT Consultant (retired)  
Evergreen Park, Palo Alto

420 Stanford Avenue  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
650 464 9425

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** mike.forster@alumni.usc.edu  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 10, 2020 3:35 PM  
**To:** Baird, Nathan; Hur, Mark  
**Cc:** Council, City  
**Subject:** Keep physical visitor hang tags in RPP zones

**Importance:** High

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

---

November 10, 2020

Dear Mr. Hur, Mr. Baird and city council members:

I concur with other letters I have seen: the Palo Alto RPP should retain the physical hangtags for visitor parking, both for long-term and daily parking.

The online system to order hangtags is simple enough (although it has a few glitches). One the hangtags are obtained, using them is the simplest way for residents to enable visitors to park, as well as being very flexible, with almost no points of failure.

From what I understand, a digital system would require the resident to log in every day to initiate or renew a single-day visitor parking permit for a particular vehicle. This would be more complex - logging in, going through online forms, etc. would take some minutes, compared with literally seconds to hand someone a hangtag. This also would introduce multiple possible points of failure: 1) computer or network glitches on the resident's or city's side; 2) mistyping a license plate number; 3) simply forgetting to do this every evening or morning for a multi-day visitor; and 4) the permit information getting being recorded in time for the parking monitor to access it. Also, some residents might not have computer access or computer knowledge - with the help of friends or family members, this can be overcome once a year, but not daily.

I was unable to determine exactly what problem was intended to be solved by changing from hangtags to daily digital online requests. I was able to pretty quickly find residents' letters at the city website, but not the staff recommendation that led to the discussion that led to the letters. So far, I see little benefit for this much more complex approach.

Often, the simplest procedure is best. That is the situation in this case - a hangtag system is simple and nearly failure-proof. A daily online digital request system has many points where it could fail. Keep the simple system.

Mike Forster  
Senior Manager, System & Software Engineering (retired)  
Systems Procedures IT Consultant (retired)  
Evergreen Park, Palo Alto

420 Stanford Avenue  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
650 464 9425

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Baird, Nathan  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 10, 2020 2:18 PM  
**To:** Susan C; Hur, Mark  
**Cc:** Council, City  
**Subject:** RE: Keep physical long-term hang tags in RPP zones

Hello Susan C,

Thank you for contacting us about possible changes to the RPP program. An online permit portal has been rolled out in the College Terrace and Crescent Park districts, and is planned for the remaining districts for the next sales cycle in the Spring. You are correct that this will involve a change to how guest permits work. We certainly take note of how useful the physical guest hang tags have been for you. We will investigate whether there are any ways to replicate, match, or better that experience. There will be additional opportunities for feedback in the near future, but we also appreciate your sending us an email.

Thank you,  
Nate Baird  
Parking Manager

---

**From:** Susan C <teachinator@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 10, 2020 1:40 PM  
**To:** Baird, Nathan <Nathan.Baird@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Hur, Mark <Mark.Hur@CityofPaloAlto.org>  
**Cc:** Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>  
**Subject:** Keep physical long-term hang tags in RPP zones

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

---

Dear Mr. Hur, Mr. Baird and city council members,

I am a resident of the Evergreen Park neighborhood. I join what I believe is the majority of affected residents of all RPP neighborhoods in asking that Palo Alto retain a system of physical, transferable, visitor hang tags in areas that are part of the Residential Parking Permit program.

Requiring a daily digital permit purchase for visitors will be time-consuming, potentially very expensive, intrusive (if specific vehicle information must be entered), and prone to forgetfulness and error. It will also be very burdensome to those who have no easy way to go online and if required, to print a permit. In short, there are no benefits to the primary stakeholders – the residents at whose request the RPP was originally established.

Purchasing an annual or semi-annual hang tag, as we have been doing, gives residents the flexibility to provide temporary parking access to guests and contractors on an as-needed basis in a way that is convenient and non-intrusive.

This being the case, it was troubling to read from Mr. Hur's correspondence with one neighbor that "regulations have been finalized" and that "the new permitting system's transition comes at the request of many stakeholders." It's not clear what is meant by "many stakeholders," but decisions that affect all residents should not be in the hands of an activist few. The main stakeholders, residents of the affected neighborhoods, were not consulted or canvassed in any meaningful way prior to the making of this premature decision.

Again I ask the Office of Transportation, and if necessary to city council, to reverse this decision and retain the system of long-term, transferable hang tags for guest parking in RPP areas.

Sincerely,

Susan Cole  
420 Stanford Avenue

,

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Susan C <teachinator@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 10, 2020 1:40 PM  
**To:** Baird, Nathan; Hur, Mark  
**Cc:** Council, City  
**Subject:** Keep physical long-term hang tags in RPP zones

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

---

Dear Mr. Hur, Mr. Baird and city council members,

I am a resident of the Evergreen Park neighborhood. I join what I believe is the majority of affected residents of all RPP neighborhoods in asking that Palo Alto retain a system of physical, transferable, visitor hang tags in areas that are part of the Residential Parking Permit program.

Requiring a daily digital permit purchase for visitors will be time-consuming, potentially very expensive, intrusive (if specific vehicle information must be entered), and prone to forgetfulness and error. It will also be very burdensome to those who have no easy way to go online and if required, to print a permit. In short, there are no benefits to the primary stakeholders – the residents at whose request the RPP was originally established.

Purchasing an annual or semi-annual hang tag, as we have been doing, gives residents the flexibility to provide temporary parking access to guests and contractors on an as-needed basis in a way that is convenient and non-intrusive.

This being the case, it was troubling to read from Mr. Hur's correspondence with one neighbor that "regulations have been finalized" and that "the new permitting system's transition comes at the request of many stakeholders." It's not clear what is meant by "many stakeholders," but decisions that affect all residents should not be in the hands of an activist few. The main stakeholders, residents of the affected neighborhoods, were not consulted or canvassed in any meaningful way prior to the making of this premature decision.

Again I ask the Office of Transportation, and if necessary to city council, to reverse this decision and retain the system of long-term, transferable hang tags for guest parking in RPP areas.

Sincerely,

Susan Cole  
420 Stanford Avenue

,

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Hamilton Hitchings <hitchingsh@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 9, 2020 10:26 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** Today's Agenda Item 12 Input

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

---

Dear Council,

The Cal Ave garage was designed to offset the parking that will be lost by the new public safety building, pull employee parking out of the residential neighborhoods and add area parking capacity to support local retail and restaurants. Thus the plan to move RPP permits to the garage is great. However, the proposal to use 200 of the spots for in-lieu of parking sounds potentially problematic. As long as it was for moving from one type of retail to another, e.g. from a store to restaurant, ice cream shop, etc... that would be fine, but for moving to office, even customer serving medical, law, real-estate or tax offices would be very counter productive.

Hamilton Hitchings



## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Jorel Mee <jorelmee@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 9, 2020 5:05 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** Fwd: Evergreen Park/Mayfield (EPM) permit street parking proposal

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

---

**Subject: Evergreen Park/Mayfield (EPM) permit street parking proposal**

Dear City Council,

My name is Jorel Mee and I rent a chair at a salon on Cambridge Ave., in the small downtown area. I have just heard that there is a possibility that the City of Palo Alto is planning to decrease the number of parking permits allotted to downtown workers. Having a parking permit is necessary for me to work in Palo Alto. I am a hair color specialist. I do not have the ability to move my car every two or three hours to a new parking space. Public transportation is not a possibility for me as I am always laden with bag upon bag of color and supplies. It is a health and safety risk for me to apply color to a client and then step out of the salon to go and move my car. It is a financial hardship to have to schedule 2-3 blocks of time a day to move my car. I followed the rules and waited on the wait list for over a year to get my permit. I have had it for at least 10 years now, happily paying for the permit to do my part to contribute to the city. Hair dressers play an important role to the downtown area. We send other businesses our clients as we are big promoters of other stores and restaurants in the local area. We bring so much business to the local area, it feels like a slap in the face to deprive us of the ability to park near our work. I also want to note that the city of Palo Alto has Stanford to thank for a lot of the residential parking problems. Stanford charges exorbitant parking permit fees for their students and employees. To avoid paying those fees, many cross El Camino and park in residential areas or in the downtown area. Perhaps a better way to come up with more parking availability would be to work with Stanford. They can afford to lower their permit rates for their campuses, they own all the land. The people of Palo Alto should not be forced to continue utilizing tax dollars to create new parking spaces because of Stanford's greed.

Many thanks for considering my letter,  
Jorel Mee

Sent from my iPhone