

From: [Morgan Bellinger](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#)
Cc: [Eric Levitt](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [City Clerk](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Brian McGuire](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-C 2021-1401 Public Hearing on Ordinance on Parking Regulations
Date: Tuesday, November 2, 2021 5:40:51 PM

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice-Mayor Vella and Council Members Knox-White, Herrera Spencer & Daysog,

I applaud staff and the Transportation Commission's efforts to make parking more equitable in this city. I have one request and one comment.

Request - Bike Lockers

Technology is drastically changing bicycling. E-bikes are more prevalent than ever, and have broadened transportation options for those who may not have been able to bicycle before. However, cordless angle grinders are also more prevalent than ever, and have broadened theft options for those who may not have been able to carry 40" bolt cutters before.

In light of this, please consider amending the proposed ordinance to incentivize or require provision of secure bicycle lockers - such as those on the lower level of the Civic Center Parking Garage - for retail, commercial, and industrial uses. It's inconceivable that AMP provides substantial rebates for EV charging, but that the city depends on developers to provide bike lockers without any motivation besides a passing reference at the end of the Bicycle Facility Design Standards.

Comment - Parking and Equality

Some question the proposed ordinance, pointing out that cars are important for access to jobs, and are therefore critical tools for escaping poverty. This spurious claim conveniently leaves out those who are too poor to afford any kind of private automobile - the car itself, or the numerous monthly expenses.

Who should pay for parking? People who use it - not the general public - because parking is a good that only the wealthy can access.

Who should pay for public transportation, travel lanes, and sidewalks? Everyone - because public transportation, travel lanes, and sidewalks can be used by everyone.

Thanks for your time, and for your good work toward removing parking minimums and unbundling spaces.

Morgan Bellinger
Alameda Resident

From: [Andrew Thomas](#)
To: ps4man@comcast.net; [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#)
Cc: [Eric Levitt](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Allen Tai](#); [Brian McGuire](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-C, Nov. 2, 2021 City Council Agenda-Elimination of Minimum Parking Requirements for New Developments
Date: Monday, November 1, 2021 3:03:24 PM

Dear Paul,

I agree with you, better, more environmentally sensitive transportation options are the solution to our traffic and parking issues.

However, we also have housing issues to tackle. As you know, we are in the midst of an affordable housing crisis and we must take actions immediately to bring down the cost of housing construction to address this crisis. The land area needed for a single parking space and the access to that space is the same size as a one bedroom housing unit (there is a nice graphic in the staff presentation), so any minimum parking requirement has a very significant impact on the cost to acquire the land and build a single housing unit.

So, from staff's perspective, if we are serious about facing the affordable housing crisis, we must address the fact that our parking requirements are adding costs to housing in Alameda.

As always, thank you for your interest and participation in these planning issues.

- Andrew

From: ps4man@comcast.net
To: [Andrew Thomas](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#)
Cc: [Eric Levitt](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Allen Tai](#); [Brian McGuire](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-C, Nov. 2, 2021 City Council Agenda-Elimination of Minimum Parking Requirements for New Developments
Date: Monday, November 1, 2021 2:46:03 PM

Mr. Thomas,

I have read your parking management report attached to the Nov. 2 agenda. My concern is with residential parking. Your parking management report is based almost entirely on customer parking on Park and Webster and ferry terminal parking. Your only reference to residential parking in mention of a "future" permit parking program in residential areas.

I believe that Alameda is already in need of permit parking in many of the residential neighborhoods. If Council is going to abandon off street parking requirements for new developments, meeting the parking needs of new residents and those who are now using their garages for storage requires permit parking to be instituted as soon as possible.

Even with permit parking, serving all of these people will be a very difficult task, if it can be done at all. Also, the new state laws that eliminate off street parking requirements for developments close to main bus lines will make much of our new development not subject to minimum parking requirements. To add to this parking burden a city wide elimination of the requirement makes no sense to me.

I firmly believe that we need to move to a modern mass transit system that lets people travel the entire Bay Area quickly on inexpensive mass transit so that cars will become a luxury, rather than a necessity. I personally use mass transit as much as possible, but your proposal puts the cart way before the horse, ignoring the actual state of mass transit in the Bay Area.

Paul Foreman

From: [Andrew Thomas](#)
To: ps4man@comcast.net; [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#)
Cc: [Eric Levitt](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Allen Tai](#); [Brian McGuire](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-C, Nov. 2, 2021 City Council Agenda-Elimination of Minimum Parking Requirements for New Developments
Date: Monday, November 1, 2021 12:00:25 PM

Dear Mr. Foreman:

Thank you for your email to the Council about the Zoning Amendment related to parking requirements on private lands. That Ordinance is consistent with the Climate Action Plan and the Transportation Choices Plan.

You raise the concern that the supply of parking on public streets and public lots will not be sufficient to accommodate low income individuals who must drive to their jobs.

I agree this is a relevant concern, but the other item on the agenda deals with that issue. Please see the item related to **Parking Management** (on public streets and lots) on Tuesday's Council Agenda. As the population of the Bay Area and Alameda grows, the need to do a better job of managing limited public parking supply on streets and public lots will increase. Staff is proposing a much improved Parking Management Program. With good management, everyone who needs a parking space should be able to find one on public streets and in public lots, but that will only work if the City does a good job of parking management.

This concept was ratified by the City Council over 10 years ago when they adopted the 85% occupancy standard for Park Street and Webster street. That standard essentially says that the goal is to price the parking so that there is always at least a few open spaces on every block. It's a way to price parking to manage supply. Also please note the text in the staff report that discusses the importance of pricing facilities to ensure that the pricing is not regressive, and overly burdensome to lower income residents and commuters (e.g. at Ferry Terminals.)

Hope this info is helpful to you.

- Andrew

From: ps4man@comcast.net
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#)
Cc: [Eric Levitt](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-C, Nov. 2, 2021 City Council Agenda-Elimination of Minimum Parking Requirements for New Developments
Date: Monday, November 1, 2021 11:45:07 AM

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice-Mayor Vella and Council Members Knox-White, Herrera Spencer & Daysog:

The proposal to eliminate minimum parking requirements and instead impose maximums is based on reducing the cost of housing and discouraging automobile use. If adopted, it may achieve both goals, but at the cost of aggravating the parking shortage that already exists, ignoring the fact that no matter how many people are discouraged from owning cars a segment of the new residents will bring their cars into our city.

The proposal misses the following point entirely. A car is among the strongest tools families use to escape poverty. "The automobile is a critical factor in moving from welfare to work." [The Automobile, Immigrants, and Poverty: Implications for Immigrant Earnings and Job Access: Urban Geography: Vol 31, No 4 \(tandfonline.com\)](#) Research since 2010 agrees, including *Urban Institute*, [Driving to Opportunity \(2014\)](#); and extensive work by UCLA's Evelyn Blumenberg, director of *Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies*: [Car Access and Long-Term Poverty Exposure \(2017\)](#) and [The Drive to Work: the Relationship Between Transportation Access, Housing Assistance and Employment \(2017\)](#).

Sincerely,

Paul S Foreman

From: [Allen Tai](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Cc: [Nancy McPeak](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Brian McGuire](#)
Subject: FW: Item 7-C 2021-1401 Public Hearing on Ordinance on Parking Regulations
Date: Monday, November 1, 2021 7:41:55 AM

Public correspondence for 7C.

From: Sylvia Martinez [mailto:smartinez@alamedahsg.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2021 5:35 PM
To: Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>; Andrew Thomas <athomas@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Tony Weng <tweng@alamedahsg.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-C 2021-1401 Public Hearing on Ordinance on Parking Regulations

Hello, Allen and Andrew,

The Housing Authority of the City of Alameda would like to support the Ordinance Amending the Citywide Off-Street Parking and Loading Space Regulations, as recommended by the Planning Board. **Generally, off-street parking spaces add to the cost of constructing affordable housing projects and take away valuable useable spaces that could potential be used to construct more units or other uses that would benefit the community.**

As affordable housing developers, we appreciate the efforts of the City Council and Planning Board to provide flexibility, options, and cost-saving measures in the development of multifamily residences. The recommended parking requirements will allow affordable developments, which are located in transit-served and walkable areas, the ability to adjust off street parking and thus streamline our design and construction process. As you know, many affordable developments support the use of transit passes, which is another way to accommodate transportation needs. We also support the ability to waive the EV parking requirements for 100% affordable housing developments due to cost constraints. Residents of affordable housing are much more likely to be users of public transportation or alternate modes of transport.

Thank you for proposing this meaningful change to the parking ordinance.

Sylvia Martinez
Director of Housing Development
Housing Authority of the City of Alameda
701 Atlantic Ave.
Alameda, CA 94501
(510) 747-4343

My pronouns are she/her/hers.

PLEASE NOTE: To help curb transmission of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19), the Housing Authority of the City of Alameda (AHA) is requiring masks to be worn when visiting our offices. Also, offices are only open a limited number of hours and appointments are required before entering the office. Our main offices are open Monday through Thursday 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. by appointment only with masks required.

AHA will provide reasonable accommodations upon request.

DISCLAIMER: The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, forwarding, re-transmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this electronic mail transmission in error, please notify the sender at (510) 747-4343 and delete it.