

Commission Members,

The proposal for the Harbor Bay Ferry parking includes a number of solid, best practice recommendations, the specific implementation suggestions raise a number of significant policy questions that are not addressed in the staff report. The two biggest:

1. The proposal sets up a two-tier system, whereby areas with HOAs are provided with a different level and cost for services than more traditional neighborhoods.
2. In removing public parking from public streets, there will ultimately be an outcry for more parking,
 - a. Should additional parking be sought, those areas that opt into restricting the use of public streets should fund the additional parking. Tax payers should not pick up the tab for building parking because a neighborhood has been
 - b. There is a potential for reduction in ferry ridership based on the removal of parking, yet no proposal for an evaluation to determine the impact and consider adjustments.

Issue 1: The proposal sets up a two-tier system, whereby areas with HOAs are provided with a different level and cost for services than more traditional neighborhoods.

This is the second time in two years that Harbor Bay HOAs have requested to set up their own government functions, separate of the rest of the city, with their own fees, etc. The last time, the Planning Board rejected the suggestion unanimously. It is surprising to see staff return with yet another proposal of this nature.

In developing a privatized parking program through HOAs, the City is increasing the administrative costs for other potential neighborhood parking programs, which are required to cover their costs by the General Plan. One wonders if the city will turn over parking management to any block or group of blocks that wants to form a parking management district that will be run separate of city staff? If not, why do some groups get to set their own rates and run their own programs, but others have to work directly with city staff?

Additionally, under the city's proposal, enforcement of this private parking proposal is shouldered by all tax-payers, including those who aren't allowed to use the streets. I am hard pressed to recall a time when APD parking enforcement had nothing to do, extending their work area will decrease the work they do in other areas. Addressing the cost of enforcing special parking rules should be covered by the program itself, as envisioned in the general plan:

Consider a fully-funded on-street parking permit program in neighborhoods with chronic parking problems and new developments.

Not funding the enforcement costs for this program is contrary to the guiding city policy document that set up this program to begin with.

Solution 1: If a permit parking is started, it should be city-run, and all residents should have the opportunity to opt into the same program, with the same costs.

Issue 2: removal of street parking will inevitably lead to calls for more off-street public parking

There are two issues that should be considered, but are not addressed in the staff report.

- A) Changes to on-street parking will lead to calls for building more off-street, publicly funded parking. These cries already exist. Should they get worse, and should WETA or the City determine that more parking is needed, that new parking should be funded by the HOA's that are insisting on essentially privatizing the streets in their own neighborhoods and eliminating public use of publicly funded streets. All of the houses in the impacted neighborhoods have multi-car garages and driveways, if more free, on-street parking is needed for residents at a cost to the city, then off-street ferry parking that is built to offset that should be covered by those same benefactors of public resources.

- B) While apparently most HB ferry riders live within easy walking and biking distance of the ferry, it's possible that ridership on the ferry could drop with the removal of 1/4 of the available parking. The decision to institute this program should include 1-2 evaluation periods, in which the city and WETA will mindfully reevaluate the decision and make adjustments to ensure that ridership remains strong. I'm clearly hopeful that there will be no long-term detrimental issues, but from the outcry about lack of parking at the ferry, I wouldn't assume that to be the case.

Solution 2A: include a requirement that should additional off-street parking be sought for the ferry, a review of the parking permit program will undertaken, and if kept, then program participants will fund the new parking.

Solution 2B: Enact a one-year pilot program, evaluate the impact on ferry ridership and calls for additional parking, revamp the program once there is actual data.

Overall, the proposed plan addresses multiple ferry parking issues in a semi-holistic manner, with a few small changes to the staff proposal, the program would run in a fair, efficient and mindful way that protects the interests of all residents and riders and ensures that Alameda will launch its first residential permit parking program without building inequality into it's structure.

Respectfully submitted,

John Knox White