

**From:** [Mitch B](#)  
**To:** [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Written Copy of 7A Comment for 6/2/26 City Council Meeting  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 2, 2026 12:38:58 PM

---

Hello,

I'm sorry for sending this late and understand if I missed the deadline. The email was sent but wifi firewall prevented it from leaving my outbox.

I will be making a public comment on item 7A for the 6/2/26 City Council Meeting and wanted to share a written copy with linked citations.

I'm happy that we've been able to reduce the number of parking spaces to 50 but I'm disappointed that staff are not considering paid parking, additional parking enforcement, or residential parking permits at this time. Additionally, as someone who does chemical transport and techno-economic modelling for a living, I believe I'm also qualified to criticize the parking model produced by Fehr and Peers and criticize Dixon Resources Unlimited for choosing to treat it as legitimate in further analysis.

For starters, it is assumed that 50% of parents would park for short summer camps but that none of those parents would be visitors themselves. This is a clear oversight. But more importantly, the parking demand model assumes that 90% of visitors would drive for main activities and that carpooling is nearly negligible at 1.1 people per vehicle. It is pretty questionable to expect 90% of visitors to drive when this aquatic center is proposed to be built along the Cross Alameda Trail and an intersection away from Alameda's bus rapid transit stop. But even more shocking is the expectation of 1.1 people per vehicle. This could only be possible if no more than 1 out of 11 main activity visitors is a child as children can't drive. That's a lower child to adult ratio than what you typically see at Almanac Brewery.

Dixon also performed an additional paid parking financial model to show that paid parking would return profit, and while I agree with that prediction, I have some serious concerns about their methodology. They proposed parking at \$0.50/hr which they admittedly claimed was conservative, but even \$1.00/hr would be conservative as that's the cost of parking on Webster which was proven to be too low by the city in 2014 (<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=1810340&GUID=3D393E9C-973F-4994-B88F-72F383AEFCCE&Options=ID%7CText%7C&Search=85%25>). They also assumed 60% compliance and a cost of enforcement, but not a single dollar of revenue from ticketing. If enforcement isn't ticketing then what would we be paying them for?

Lastly, this is a real quote from Dixon's plan: "Limited or uncertain parking availability can reinforce car-dependent travel patterns... increasing overall reliance on driving". If this doesn't make sense to you, it doesn't make sense to me either. Uncertain parking availability discourages people from driving, it doesn't encourage them to drive more. I've read this section over so many times and I'm honestly questioning whether they just never proofread that section.

Regardless, even despite these concerns, Dixon still recommended paid parking which would certainly would be financially responsible considering that the city is asking voters for a bond

measure and this project has already gone \$5 million over budget (<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7992494&GUID=5273284E-3E91-423F-9660-1F38613E2636&Options=&Search=>). I understand the concerns about spillover into nearby neighbourhoods, but as I mentioned in an earlier item, there are already illegally parked cars sitting there every day and a residential parking program like Dixon recommended would be good not only for this neighbourhood but also the many others that are already constrained by non-resident parking.

In summary, it's unlikely that parking demand will exceed on-site capacity, but we can ensure it doesn't if the recommendations for paid parking and residential parking permits are taken.

Thank you,  
-Mitch Ball