

DRAFT MEMORANDUM TO CITY COUNCIL

DATE: October 14, 2008
SUBJECT: Paid Parking Programs
TO: City Council
FROM: Planning & Zoning Commission

The Planning and Zoning Commission would like to extend its appreciation for the opportunity to provide recommendations and comments regarding the question of paid parking program(s) within the City of Albany. The Commission initially reviewed this topic at its July 8, 2008 meeting and provided feedback to staff. This memorandum was discussed again on September 9, 2008 and finalized at the Commission's July 22, 2008 meeting.

In general, the Planning and Zoning Commission is in support of exploring the establishment of a paid parking program along Solano Avenue, but only if this were one part of a comprehensive parking program that also included the implementation of a residential permit parking zone for residential side streets adjacent to Solano Avenue. The installation of parking meters along our commercial corridors could have many positive and negative impacts, which the City of Albany should try to identify prior to any project implementation.

Following is a generalization of the Commission's responses in regard to the paid parking question, as well as the topics of "Residential Permit Parking Zones" and "Parking Space Requirement Adjustment", which the Commission believes are directly related to the discussion of paid parking. For a more in-depth review, a complete inventory of each Commissioner's responses to the specific questions contained in the July 8th Planning and Zoning Commission staff report is attached to this memo.

PAID PARKING IN COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS

The Planning and Zoning Commission is in favor of paid parking along Solano Avenue, with the following considerations:

- Full cost/benefit analysis and further public discussion. Issues such as where funds from a paid parking program would be allocated, potential fiscal impacts on commercial uses, etc, should be considered. Revenue figures from the City of Berkeley regarding their paid parking program may be helpful in review.
- Meters should continue to allow parking for a long time-period (90 minutes or more)
- Meter hours should be expanded to include evenings and Sundays, as evenings are typically the busiest parking hours along Solano Ave.
- Specific parking spaces should be reserved for city car share and zero emission vehicles.
- Meter funds should go into General Fund, but with priority that money be used for commercial district improvements.
- Appropriate places for paid parking program (i.e. Solano Avenue and San Pablo Avenue, or solely Solano Avenue). Consideration of "peak parking hours" and parking habits/patterns should be considered.

One likely positive impact of such a program would be that it encourages walking and bicycling instead of driving to Solano Avenue.

RESIDENTIAL PARKING PERMIT PROGRAM

The Commission is of the belief that the introduction of parking meters along Solano Ave would result in drivers looking for free parking in residential areas adjacent to Solano and San Pablo Aves. In order for this impact to be mitigated, residential permit parking zones could be required to be implemented in the adjacent residential neighborhoods. This is an important consideration, as there are a total of 31 blocks immediately adjacent to Solano Ave between San Pablo Ave and Tulare Ave. A study of how side (residential) streets and areas surrounding schools are affected by such a program may be appropriate. This may be an appropriate time to explore further increasing the pedestrian-friendliness of side streets by improving lighting and bicycle racks.

RESIDENTIAL PARKING SPACE REQUIREMENT (MEASURE D)

Measure D was passed in 1978, and one of its most important aspects was that all new housing units are required to provide 2 off-street parking spaces. The Commission believes that the impacts of Measure D should be assessed, with the potential to request an initiative that would adjust the requirements so that studio- and 1-bedroom units are required to provide 1 off-street parking space and 2+ bedroom units are required to provide 2 off-street parking spaces. As the other provisions related to single-family homes have been in place for thirty years.

The Commission does not recommend major changes; however, if encouragement of second-units in R-1 districts becomes a component of the Housing Element, modification of this portion of Measure D may be necessary.

Attachments

1. September 9, 2008 Staff Report, with all Attachments
2. Commissioner Gardner Comments

City of Albany
Planning and Zoning Commission
Staff Report

Meeting Date: September 9, 2008

Prepared by: _____

Agenda Item: 6a

Reviewed by: _____

Subject: City Council request for comments and recommendations on establishing Paid Parking Program(s).

Recommendation

Based on comments received from the Commissioners, staff has prepared the attached memorandum from the Planning and Zoning Commission to the City Council. The intent of the memorandum is to be a generalization of the Commission's responses to the questions posed in the July 8th staff report. In addition, a compilation of all of the specific answers will be included as an attachment to the memorandum, allowing the city council a more in-depth review of the Commission's comments.

The Commission initiated discussion of the parking issue and took public comment but did not complete the discussion. The public testimony expressed opposition to parking meter program. Staff requests that the Commission review the draft memo to the City Council and provide additional comments for inclusion in the final version.

Attachments:

1. Draft memorandum to the City Council
2. Compilation of Planning and Zoning Commission responses (revised)
3. Commissioner Maass's Comments
4. June 24, 2008 Staff Report

ATTACHMENT #1

ATTACHMENT 1 - DRAFT MEMORANDUM TO CITY COUNCIL

DATE: July 22, 2008
SUBJECT: Paid Parking Programs
TO: City Council
FROM: Planning & Zoning Commission

The Planning and Zoning Commission would like to extend its appreciation for the opportunity to provide recommendations and comments regarding the question of paid parking program(s) within the City of Albany. The Commission initially reviewed this topic at its July 8, 2008 meeting and provided feedback to staff. This memorandum was discussed and finalized at the Commission's July 22, 2008 meeting.

In general, the Planning and Zoning Commission is in support of the establishment of a paid parking program along Solano Avenue, but only if this were one part of a comprehensive parking program that also included the implementation of a residential permit parking zone for residential side streets adjacent to Solano Avenue. The installation of parking meters along our commercial corridors could have many positive and negative impacts, which the City of Albany should try to identify prior to any project implementation.

Following is a generalization of the Commission's responses in regard to the paid parking question, as well as the topics of "Residential Permit Parking Zones" and "Parking Space Requirement Adjustment", which the Commission believes are directly related to the discussion of paid parking. For a more in-depth review, a complete inventory of each Commissioner's responses to the specific questions contained in the July 8th Planning and Zoning Commission staff report is attached to this memo.

PAID PARKING IN COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS

The Planning and Zoning Commission is in favor of paid parking along Solano Avenue, with the following considerations:

- Meters should continue to allow parking for a long time-period (90 minutes or more)
- Meter hours should be expanded to include evenings and Sundays, as evenings are typically the busiest parking hours along Solano Ave.
- Specific parking spaces should be reserved for city car share and low emission vehicles.
- Meter funds should go into General Fund, but with priority that money be used for commercial district improvements.

RESIDENTIAL PARKING PERMIT PROGRAM

The Commission is of the belief that the introduction of parking meters along Solano Ave would result in drivers looking for free parking in residential areas adjacent to Solano and San Pablo Aves. In order for this impact to be mitigated, residential permit parking zones could be required to be implemented in the adjacent residential neighborhoods. This is an important consideration, as there are a total of 31 blocks immediately adjacent to Solano Ave between San Pablo Ave and Tulare Ave.

RESIDENTIAL PARKING SPACE REQUIREMENT (MEASURE B)

Measure D was passed in 1978, and one of its most important aspects was that all new housing units are required to provide 2 off-street parking spaces. The Commission believes that the impacts of Measure D should be assessed, with the potential to request an initiative that would adjust the requirements so that studio- and 1-bedroom units are required to provide 1 off-street parking space and 2+ bedroom units are required to provide 2 off-street parking spaces.

Attachments

1. Planning and Zoning Commission Responses
2. Commissioner Maass Comments
3. June 24, 2008 Staff Report to the Planning and Zoning Commission

ATTACHMENT 2 – COMPILATION OF P&Z COMMISSION RESPONSES

Paid Parking in Commercial Districts

Questions

- Should parking meters be installed on both Solano and San Pablo Avenues?
 - P Moss Yes
 - L Panian Yes
 - D Arkin Yes (on Solano Ave only)
 - P Maass Yes (possibly on San Pablo)
 - A Gardner Yes (on Solano Ave only)

- Should parking enforcement hours be expanded to include evenings and Sundays?
 - P Moss – Yes to parking enforcement, no to meters.
 - L Panian - No
 - D Arkin - No (Meters could if not limited, i.e. able to go ~3 hours)
 - A Gardner No (Metered or unmetered, evening and Sunday enforcement is very rare; the only place I know of in the Bay Area is “downtown” Sausalito)

- Should paid parking be implemented along side streets in areas directly in front of commercial uses?
 - P Moss - Yes
 - L Panian No
 - D Arkin Yes (Perhaps further down each block, with passes for residents.)
 - A Gardner Yes (If paid parking is implemented)

- Should parking meters have variable rates, so that high use areas cost more per hour?
 - P Moss No
 - L Panian Yes
 - D Arkin No (Albany is small enough that one rate will suffice)
 - A Gardner No (The potential area for metering is small relative to other cities; variable rates will be confusing, especially at the beginning.)

- Should parking meters have a time limit or allow unlimited time?
 - P Moss Unlimited
 - L Panian Limit
 - D Arkin Unlimited initially. Provide up to 3 hours, with ability to renew.
 - A Gardner Limit similar to the current parking limits.

- Should funding go back to paid parking area only, or to general fund?
 - P Moss General Fund
 - L Panian General Fund
 - D Arkin General Fund, with priority placed on commercial district improvements.
 - A Gardner Funds should be used to provide transit/ transportation benefits – facilities supporting biking, walking, or transit anywhere in the city, or road maintenance or off-street parking improvements in the area of paid parking.

- Should the process to allow for an adjustment for shared off-street parking be revised?
 - P Moss Yes
 - L Panian Maybe
 - D Arkin Yes, anything to make it easier.

- Should specific locations be reserved for low emission vehicles or city car share members?
 - P Moss Yes
 - L Panian Yes
 - D Arkin Yes, for car share and Zero emission vehicles, not for hybrids.
 - A Gardner Yes for car share members. No for low emission vehicles. (The goal is to have fewer cars on the street and less miles driven; rewarding low emission vehicles doesn't help that.)

Comments/Recommendations

- Review the effect parking meters will have on neighborhood cross streets. If the effect is negative, would implementing a permit parking zone be a mitigation?
 - L Panian Maybe
 - D Arkin Yes, probably have to be implemented at the same time, or parking would be pushed further into residential zones.
 - P Maass Yes. Consider a citywide residential parking permit program. (See Commissioner Maass's memo, Attachment 3, for more detailed information.)
 - A Gardner Yes.
- Obtain revenue figures from the City of Berkeley regarding paid-parking on Solano Ave.
 - D Arkin Also general cost/ benefit info on which types of paid parking work best.
 - A Gardner Would be interested in some of the consequences that might have occurred when the Berkeley program was implemented. Was there a local reduction in customers or other negative consequences on the businesses? What became of the "excess" parking demand?
- Comment from Commissioner Arkin – If commercial applicants are asking for a waiver of parking spaces, and the waiver is warranted given a survey of available parking, the waived spaces should still cost the applicant a nominal fee that can be paid into a specific fund for the general improvement of transit opportunities. (Not limited to building parking...moneys could go toward bicycle racks, restriping streets for more spaces, a trolley-like local bus, etc.)

Also, if a commercial applicant wants to provide MORE parking than is required by our ordinance, that additional parking needs to be made available to the public.

Residential Permit Parking Zones

Questions

- In commercial areas, should residential permit parking zones have a mixture of residential and paid parking?
 - P Moss No
 - L Panian Maybe
 - D Arkin Yes on side streets
- Is the requirement that the occupancy rate be at least 75% during the peak parking period adequate or too high?
 - L Panian Adequate
 - D Arkin Need to be able to pay for enforcement, so some minimum amount of parking pressure may be warranted.
 - A Gardner Adequate (would suggest higher. Notes that the peak period may be different in different areas).

- To ensure that there is adequate street parking in residential zones, should the city contemplate code enforcement of existing private parking (e.g. illegally converted garages)?
 - P Moss Yes
 - L Panian Maybe
 - D Arkin Not sure if this is right priority. What if a household does not own a car and their garage is full of bicycles? Thinks this could be better addressed through worse parking conditions. If street parking is difficult, homeowners will find a way to park vehicles on their lots. Would support the enforcement of illegally converted front porches first.
 - A Gardner No. Illegally converted garages are likely rare; real issue is that everyone uses their garage for storage. Doesn't think there is an enforcement action to take. Can be balanced by requiring a higher occupancy rate before implementing a permit parking zone.

Comments / Recommendations

- If a permit parking zone includes a school, how would parking be impacted, as many of the schools do not have adequate student or employee parking?
 - P Moss Waivers
 - D Arkin Permit parking zone would inspire alternative transit, and broader distribution of parking pressure, thereby relieving those otherwise impacted most.
 - A Gardner School issues need to be addressed separately through programs such as park and ride, vanpool, carpool, and bike incentives. A comprehensive school transit program should be done with significant involvement from the faculty/student body.
- Automobile repair uses often use residential streets to park cars. What impacts would a Residential Parking Permit have on these uses?
 - P Moss Use of residential streets to park cars is illegal.
 - D Arkin Would require them to find commercially available parking as an alternative, for example at a local apartment building that has available parking during daytime hours.
 - A Gardner I suggest each repair shop receive a limited number of parking permits (for daytime parking); they are gradually losing their commercial parking areas, and are an important component of Albany's local businesses.
- If only one permit parking zone is allowed to be created per year, determine a prioritization system.
 - P Moss Not a good idea.
 - A Gardner By occupancy (higher occupancy gets priority).

Residential Parking Space Requirement Adjustment (Measure D)

Questions

- Would an adjustment to the requirements of Measure D be beneficial (e.g. alter parking requirements so that studio- and 1-bedroom units are only required to provide 1 off-street parking space and 2+ bedroom units are required to provide 2 off-street parking spaces)?
 - P Moss Yes
 - L Panian Impacts of Measure D should be formally assessed. Proposed changes should be considered in the context of changing patterns of development and car use over the 30 years since Measure D has been in effect.

- D Arkin Yes. This would incentivize smaller residential units, and development of housing in general.
 - P Maass Yes.
 - A Gardner Maybe. Measure D is not consistent with the community's overall values of sustainability and reducing car use. Changes in the parking requirements may be part of appropriate adjustments, but more analysis is needed. Other options could include financial contributions to a fund that would construct shared off-street parking, or development of a comprehensive car-share program.
- Should parking requirements stay to ensure adequate off-street spaces for residents?
 - D Arkin In fairness to applicants over the past 30 years, we should continue to require 2 off-street spaces at R-1 properties (with exceptions and no requirements that the spaces actually be used). We should not require any additional parking for secondary residential units, or create a 'bicycle only' second unit option.
 - A Gardner Maybe (same response as above question).
- If an adjustment is recommended, should it apply only to specific projects such as Senior Housing?
 - D Arkin Senior housing and similar projects could contemplate further reductions and these should be written into the adjustment.
 - A Gardner Maybe (same response as above question)

**Comments and Recommendations
on establishing a Paid Parking Program,
Measure D adjustments, and
Residential Parking Permits.**

Paid Parking Program/Residential Parking Permits?

The short answer is YES. I'm in favor of establishing parking meters on Solano and possibly on San Pablo near it's intersection with Solano. I see this as an interim solution which would be part of a larger, long-term plan. Given that San Pablo is also State highway 123(with a number of Cal Trans complications), most of my comments are directed towards the parking situation on Solano.

The staff report and Donald Stoup's writings ("The High Cost of Free Parking"), make a convincing argument that market priced curb parking opens up spaces which in turn cuts back on unnecessary green house gas producing parking behavior. Revenues beyond the cost of buying and running the system can in turn be used for business district improvements. I'm not sure if the Albany's parking situation has hit the critical congestion levels needed to justify the cost of meters, but for the sake of this discussion, I will presume that it has.

Putting meters on Solano and/or parts of San Pablo is likely to have consequences both intended and unintended, for parking on Albany's residential streets and so doing such will require a residential parking permit system to protect residential neighbors from "parking cruisers". Given the size of Albany, the City should consider a citywide residential parking permit program. Each household would be eligible for one free or very low cost permit. Additional permits would be available but on a sliding fee scale. The second permit might cost just enough to cover the cost of running the program. The third permit price would double, etc. Visitor passes would be available for each household. Construction permits could be purchased from the Building Department. Businesses and Schools, etc., would also be able to obtain employee parking passes from the city.

A fairly structured Residential Parking Permit system would address much of the argument for Measure D, and in doing so politically allow for what I feel are necessary changes in it's parking requirements. Cutting the two space requirement for studios and one bedroom apartments would be a minimal first step.

Any proposal for either meters or residential permits, will be met by a storm of resistance and so should only be considered after a larger long term plan/goal/vision for Albany's commercial corridors has been established. A future parking plan for Solano and San Pablo avenues should reflect a denser urban environment. Allowing an increase in density along Solano and San Pablo allows Albany to address two of our greatest challenges, housing supply (both low and moderate income) and finding mitigations for climate change.

For me the ultimate vision will include a greatly reduced auto traffic flow on Solano Ave. Widened sidewalks with landscaping that will make the street more Pedestrian and Bicycle friendly and dedicated bus or trolley lanes. Two lanes would still exist for vehicle traffic, but there would only be zones for deliveries and passenger pickup/drop-off. Auto parking

would be minimal on the street, perhaps it can be directed to subterranean lots, like the one proposed by Safeway or parking structures such as the one proposed by Whole Foods.

Income from parking meters/parking permit program, fees charged for residential and commercial parking variances (an idea proposed by Commissioner Moss) and a system of concessions/requirements for developers might begin to develop and fund such an alternative.

Parking meters, residential permits, changes in Measure D, increased density, and underground parking!!!! YIKES!!! In small town Albany!?! Common sense might say that these are not likely to be popular political positions, but it's also true that that we are very progressive and environmentally oriented. A recent study by researchers at UCLA claims we are the "Greenest" City in the State. Perhaps it's time to consider these ideas.

Peter Maass

City of Albany
Planning and Zoning Commission
Staff Report

Meeting Date: June 24, 2008 Prepared by: _____
Agenda Item: 6e Reviewed by: _____
Subject: City Council request for comments and recommendations on establishing
Paid Parking Program(s).

Recommendation

Provide initial comments and recommendations to assist the City Council in its discussion regarding the potential of establishing a paid parking program in the City of Albany.

Background

As stated in the April 12, 2008 memorandum from the City Administrator to the Planning and Zoning Commission (Attachment 1), the City Council has expressed interest in exploring paid parking program(s) in Albany. The Council has requested comments and/or recommendations be received by June 30, 2008.

This staff report is structured to provide a brief discussion of specific parking topics, followed by a preliminary list of comments/recommendations that staff has identified. In addition to the topic of "Paid Parking in Commercial Districts", staff has also included two other parking topics, "Residential Permit Parking Zones" and "Residential Parking Space Requirement Adjustment" that are related to the discussion of paid parking within the city. Staff is requesting that the Commission give initial feedback and provide further comments/recommendations for each of the topics. These comments/recommendations will be forwarded to the City Council in a memorandum.

Paid Parking in Commercial Districts

Background Information

Currently, all commercial parking spaces within the city are free for a specified amount of time, primarily 90 minutes, from 9am to 6pm. If a vehicle is parked in a space for longer than the specified time, the vehicle may receive a parking violation ticket, which includes a \$32 fine.

Studies have shown that implementing a paid parking program can be beneficial in terms of creating adequate parking availability in a commercial area and providing revenue to the commercial area. The most publicized example is the City of Pasadena, which installed parking meters in the Old Pasadena neighborhood. The meters are priced so that the occupancy rate is approximately 85% at all times. All of the revenue from the parking meters is returned to the neighborhood; the only money that the city receives is from overtime fines. To gain support for the project, the city created a marketing campaign (including signs on the parking meters) that informed the public what the meter money was funding.

Many cities, including Pasadena as discussed above, consider an 85% occupancy rate as preferred for on-street parking. The 85% rate is considered the "effective capacity" for street parking, resulting in at least 1 parking space being available on a block at any given time. If the parking in an area is free and exceeds the effective capacity, drivers are more likely to drive around the block waiting for a vacant space. Paid parking that is set at a sufficient price discourages drivers from circling around. This has been shown to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

The Community Development Department completed a Solano Ave Parking Study in July 2000, and the findings of that study show that certain areas of Solano Ave frequently exceed the effective capacity threshold. Subsequent parking counts completed in recent months have shown that parking usage rates have not changed significantly. A sample of the findings that were made as part of that survey include:

- Two peak occupancy time-periods. During the time-period around 1:00pm, 50% of the blocks were filled to effective capacity. During the 8:00pm time-period, 58% of the blocks were filled to effective capacity.
- On-street parking reaches "effective capacity" on most days for about 3-5 hours in two general locations along Solano – San Pablo to Cornell and Ramona to Tulare.
- In the two peak congestion zones, there are a higher number of restaurants and retail shops. Areas with medical offices and residential buildings had the least parking demand.

Questions

- Should parking meters be installed on both Solano and San Pablo Avenues?
- Should parking enforcement hours be expanded to include evenings and Sundays?
- Should paid parking be implemented along side streets in areas directly in front of commercial uses?
- Should parking meters have variable rates, so that high use areas cost more per hour?
- Should parking meters have a time limit or allow unlimited time?
- Should funding go back to paid parking area only, or to general fund?
- Should the process to allow for an adjustment for shared off-street parking be revised?
- Should specific locations be reserved for low emission vehicles or city car share members?

Comments/ Recommendations

- Review the effect parking meters will have on neighborhood cross streets. If the effect is negative, would implementing a permit parking zone be a mitigation?
- Obtain revenue figures from the City of Berkeley regarding paid-parking on Solano Ave.

Residential Permit Parking Zones

Background Information

The City of Albany currently has regulations regarding Residential Permit Parking under Section 9, "Motor Vehicle and Traffic". Permit parking zones may be established by two separate processes; the City Council may designate certain residential streets as permit parking zones by resolution, or any resident of Albany may request consideration of a permit parking zone by submitting an application to the City Council.

The ordinance also stipulates evaluation criteria to be used when approving/ denying a permit parking zone. Their basic criteria are as follows:

1. The extent of the desire and need of the residents for permit parking and their willingness to bear the costs associated therewith. (One of the requirements for a resident to submit an application is that they have a petition signed by residents of 50% or more of the dwelling units in the proposed zone.)
2. The extent to which legal on-street parking spaces are occupied by motor vehicles during the period(s) proposed for parking restrictions. (The occupancy rate during the "peak parking period" must be at least 75% to be considered further.)
3. The extent to which vehicles parking in the area during the period(s) proposed for parking restriction are vehicles belonging to nonresidents rather than residents.
4. The extent to which motor vehicles registered to residents in the area cannot be accommodated by the number of available off-street parking spaces.
5. The location and number of spaces available as alternative parking locations for vehicles or nonresidents which are to be displaced in the proposed permit parking area.

The approval process includes staff evaluation, then a public hearing before the Traffic and Safety Commission, who gives a recommendation to the City Council for their consideration at a subsequent public hearing.

One other interesting aspect of the ordinance is that only one parking zone can be created per year. This could impact implementation of paid parking programs within the city.

Questions

- In commercial areas, should residential permit parking zones have a mixture of residential and paid parking?
- Is the requirement that the occupancy rate be at least 75% during the peak parking period adequate or too high?
- To ensure that there is adequate street parking in residential zones, should the city contemplate code enforcement of existing private parking (e.g. illegally converted garages)?

Comments/Recommendations

- If a permit parking zone includes a school, how would parking be impacted, as many of the schools do not have adequate student or employee parking?
- Automobile repair uses often use residential streets to park cars. What impacts would a Residential Parking Permit have on these uses?
- If only one permit parking zone is allowed to be created per year, determine a prioritization system.

Residential Parking Space Requirement (Measure D)

Background Information

Measure D was passed in 1978, and one of its most important aspects was that all new housing units are required to provide 2 off-street parking spaces.

Questions

- Would an adjustment to the requirements of Measure D be beneficial (e.g. alter parking requirements so that studio- and 1-bedroom units are only required to provide 1 off-street parking space and 2+ bedroom units are required to provide 2 off-street parking spaces)?
- Should parking requirements stay to ensure adequate off-street spaces for residents?
- If an adjustment is recommended, should it apply only to specific projects such as Senior Housing?

Comments/Recommendations

- Review program

UAttachments:

1. April 12, 2008 memo from City Administrator

Paid Parking Program Input

TO: Jeff
Amber Curl

FROM: Andrea Gardner

DATE: July 25, 2008

Paid Parking in Commercial Districts

- *Should parking meters be installed on both Solano and San Pablo Avenues? **Solano only.*** Portions of Solano on Berkeley are metered; however, I don't know if any portion of San Pablo that is metered.
- *Should parking enforcement hours be expanded to include evenings and Sundays? **No.*** Metered or unmetered, evening and Sunday enforcement is very rare; the only place I know of in the Bay Area is "downtown" Sausalito.
- *Should paid parking be implemented along side streets in areas directly in front of commercial uses? **Yes,*** if paid parking is implemented.
- *Should parking meters have variable rates, so that high use areas cost more per hour? **No.*** The potential area for metering is small relative to other cities; variable rates will be confusing, especially at the beginning.
- *Should parking meters have a time limit or allow unlimited time? **Time limit*** similar to the current parking limits.
- *Should funding go back to the paid parking area only, or to general fund?* Funds should be used to provide transit/transportation benefits – facilities supporting biking, walking, or transit anywhere in the city, or road maintenance or off-street parking improvements in the area of paid parking.
- *Should the process to allow for an adjustment for shared off-street parking be revised?* I don't know this process.
- *Should specific locations be reserved for low emission vehicles or city car share members?* City car share members (not low emission vehicles). The goal is to have fewer cars on the street and less miles driven; rewarding low emission vehicles doesn't help that.
- *If the effect of parking meters on neighborhood cross streets is negative, would implementing a permit parking zone be a mitigation? **Yes.***
- *Obtain revenue figures from the City of Berkeley regarding paid-parking on Solano Avenue.* I would be interested in some of the consequences that might have occurred when the Berkeley program was implemented – was there a local reduction in customers or other negative consequences on the businesses? Where became of the "excess" parking demand?

ATTACHMENT 2

Residential Permit Parking Zones

- *In commercial areas, should residential permit parking zones have a mixture of residential and paid parking?* **No**, I guess; I'm not sure what this means. I assumed that residential permit parking areas would be in strictly residential areas. The only area I can think of that would have residential in a commercial area is along San Pablo, which I recommended above not have paid parking.
- *Is the requirement that the occupancy rate be at least 75% during the peak parking period adequate or too high?* **Adequate** (definitely not too high) – in fact would suggest higher. Note, however, that the peak period may be different in different areas.
- *To ensure that there is adequate street parking in residential zones, should the city contemplate code enforcement of existing private parking (e.g. illegally converted garages)?* **No**. Illegally converted garages are likely rare; real issue is that everyone uses their garage for storage. I don't think there's an "enforcement" action to take there. That can be balanced by requiring a higher occupancy rate before implementing a permit parking zone.
- *If a permit parking zone includes a school, how would parking be impacted, as many of the schools do not have adequate student or employee parking?* The school issues need to be addressed separately through, for example, park and ride program, vanpool, carpool, and bike incentive programs. A comprehensive school transit program should be done with significant involvement from the faculty/student body.
- *Automobile repair uses often use residential streets to park cars. What impacts would a residential parking permit have on these uses?* I suggest each repair shop receive a limited number of parking permits (for daytime parking); they are gradually losing their commercial parking areas, and are an important component of Albany's local businesses.
- *If only one permit parking zone is allowed to be created per year, determine a prioritization system.* I would go **by occupancy** (higher occupancy gets priority).

Residential Parking Space Requirement (Measure D)

- *Would an adjustment to the requirements of Measure D be beneficial (e.g. alter parking requirements so that studio and 1-bedroom units are only required to provide 1 off-street parking space and 2+ bedroom units are required to provide 2 off-street parking spaces)?* **Maybe**. Measure D is not consistent with the community's overall values of sustainability and reducing car use. Changes in the parking requirements may be part of appropriate adjustments, but more analysis is needed. Other options could include financial contributions to a fund that would construct shared off-street parking, or development of a comprehensive car-share program.
- *Should parking requirements stay to ensure adequate off-street spaces for residents?* **Maybe**. Same response as above.
- *If an adjustment is recommended, should it apply only to specific projects such as Senior Housing?* **Maybe**. Same response as above.
-