

Susan Gauthier

From: Annabell Holland
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2016 11:19 AM
To: Susan Gauthier
Subject: FW: My comments on permit parking for tonight's City Council meeting

FYI -

From: Vijay [<mailto:hamsanandi@comcast.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2016 11:12 AM
To: Bill Harrison; Lily Mei; Suzanne Chan; Vinnie Bacon; Rick Jones - Councilmember
Cc: Annabell Holland; Kim Beranek; Jannet Benz; Veronica Pang; Vijay
Subject: My comments on permit parking for tonight's City Council meeting

Respected Mayor Harrison and City Council Members: (cc: Jannet, Veronica, Annabell Holland, Kim Beranek)

I will be unable to attend tonight's City Council meeting due to a medical procedure I'm undergoing today.

So, I've asked Jannet or Veronica or one of the neighbors they designate to read my speech (given below) on my behalf on the permit parking matter.

I greatly appreciate your allowing my voice to be heard despite my absence due to unavoidable reasons.

Sincerely,
Vijay Pitchumani
635 Geyser Ct.
Fremont, CA 94539

Good evening!

The permit parking proposal is a very pragmatic, interim solution to the problem of overcrowding at Mission Peak. I want to express my deep appreciation to the City Council and the EBPRD; thanks to their help, we are at a near-closure now.

But a near-closure is not closure, just as "nearly surviving" is not "surviving," so the City must vote today to approve it, so the wheels of implementation can get moving.

The City Council set a very high barrier for the signature campaign: it included a larger area in the scope of permit parking than was ideal, and it required more than a simple majority. Yet, the campaign has well exceeded the target! That is a remarkable articulation of the pain endured by the immediate neighbors and of the exceptional fellowship shown by the extended neighbors! This outpouring of support must not be allowed to go to waste. The City Council must act to approve it today.

I want to touch on the subject of Weibel Drive: it was included in the scope of the permit parking proposal for a very good reason and it is absolutely important that it stay that way:

1. Between the Stanford staging area , Antelope and Vineyard, more than 200 parking spaces are already available for visitors. There is also access available from Ohlone College. If we are serious about preserving Mission Peak for future generations, we must walk the talk; we must not indiscriminately add more and more parking spaces.

2. The City of Fremont’s municipal code 10.05.870 regarding permit parking clearly requires attention to “the interest of the health, safety, or general welfare of the residents in, and adjacent to, the permit parking area.” There are many houses that adjoin Weibel Drive that have endured noise and nuisance at 6 AM. I can guarantee you that their health, safety, and welfare will not be well served by excluding Weibel Drive.

Finally, the permit program is just an interim solution. The City and the EBPRD must pursue a long-term solution that includes responsible use of Mission Peak. True “conservancy” involves more than having that word in your name; it requires some sacrifices to preserve a priceless treasure for our children and grandchildren.

Thank you!

Susan Gauthier

From: Andreas Kadavanich <kadavanich@gmail.com> on behalf of Andreas Kadavanich <andreas@kadavanich.net>
Sent: Sunday, May 15, 2016 5:40 PM
To: CClerk
Cc: Bill Harrison; Lily Mei; Suzanne Chan; Vinnie Bacon; Rick Jones - Councilmember
Subject: Comment on May 17, 2016 City Council meeting, Agenda item 5.B
Attachments: signature.asc

Dear City Clerk,

Please accept the comment below as a written communication regarding the public hearing Agenda item 5.B. MISSION PEAK NEIGHBORHOOD PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM

=====
Comment on Mission Peak Neighborhood Permit Parking Program proposal, City Council meeting 2016-05-17, Agenda item 5. B.

I am strongly opposed to the proposed permit parking program as outlined in Staff Report #2736.

I am a Fremont homeowner/resident/taxpayer. We park our cars on our property (garage/driveway) and do not encumber our neighbors and fellow citizens with vehicles parked on the street. Most of my neighbors do likewise. The streets should be saved for public use and in general the purpose of streets is to move people and goods, not to store unused cars. But if the city allows parked cars on public streets, it should be permissible for all the public to do so. At the very least, it should be open to all Fremont residents.

My property and sales taxes pay for the maintenance and upkeep of all roadways in the city, including in the Mission Peak Neighborhood. As such, I should be entitled to equal access to these public resources as the neighborhood residents. I am willing to pay the same fees to obtain a permit, but the current proposal does not give me that option. This is discrimination, plain and simple.

Worse yet, the proposal amounts to a substantial subsidy of the neighborhood residents. If street parking was metered (as it should be in a parking-scarce area), each spot would easily be worth \$0.25/hour. (Actually this is a laughably low valuation in the Bay Area. Even the vehicle day use fee at our local parks comes out to more than that). The proposal aims to restrict parking on weekends and holidays, amounting to 112 days (24-hours) annually, worth \$675 per vehicle. (Again, laughably low. It's really thousands of dollars.) Yet these spots are being provided at \$6-10/year. (Even more laughable.) Again, to neighborhood residents only. I am not eligible. Neither are the majority of Fremont's residents.

The streets are a public resource. They should be available to the public. If the cost of public access are not covered by current funding sources, there should be a use fee that does not discriminate against other Fremont residents.

And since some of the 501 Capital Improvement Funds that pay for pavement maintenance originate from county/state/federal funding sources, arguably it should not discriminate against non-residents either.

Residents should park on their property. That's why our zoning codes require garages. There should be no

resident permits!

Guests and visitors should pay for the privilege of short-term parking on an as needed basis. There is no justification for annual guest permits that go unused for most of the year.

Metered parking would be the natural solution. Properly structured, such a program would be self-funding (including enforcement), non-discriminatory, and pricing could be adjusted to the real value of the service (even dynamically). Doing so would also bring the City closer to meeting its sustainability/carbon-footprint-reduction goals by encouraging more shared-use/full-occupancy vehicles. I suspect parking spaces in this area are actually valuable enough that such a program could even help fund better transit to to the trailhead. Now that would be “smart urban” and actually reduce excessive vehicle traffic in the proposed permit area.

I urge the council to find in its discretion that the proposal would be detrimental to the welfare of the residents in the areas adjacent to the proposed permit parking area, including the city as a whole, in accordance with FMC 10.05.860 (c)(3). This so being as the proposal deprives Fremont residents of full use of a public roadway and prohibits the city from managing the available parking to the benefit of the whole city, including as a revenue source.

I also kindly request that the council consider updating the Municipal Code to make it consistent with the City’s general plan goals and zoning requirements for more pedestrian-oriented development and less on-street parking.

Sincerely yours,

Andreas V. Kadavanich
39311 Sutter Drive
Fremont, CA 94538

Fremont resident/homeowner/taxpayer/voter

=====

On Apr 11, 2016, at 13:17, cclerk@fremont.gov wrote:

Good afternoon,

You can submit written communication in two ways; you can email the Mayor and Councilmembers directly (see addresses below), or you can send your statement to the Clerk’s office and it will be printed and distributed to the Mayor and Council with their mail prior to the meeting. Please note, written communications are not read aloud at the council meetings. If you have any further questions, please feel free to reply to this email.

Regards,

Office of the City Clerk
510.284.4060 | cclerk@fremont.gov
3300 Capitol Ave, Bldg. A
Fremont CA 94538
www.fremont.gov

Mayor Bill Harrison: BHarrison@fremont.gov
Vice Mayor Lily Mei: LMei@fremont.gov
Councilmember Sue Chan: SChan@fremont.gov

Councilmember Vinnie Bacon: VBacon@fremont.gov

Councilmember Rick Jones: Rljones@fremont.gov

-----Original Message-----

Geneva Bosques

From: Bahram Malekzadeh <malekzadehbahram@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2016 10:20 AM
To: Geneva Bosques
Subject: Re: Mission peak neighborhood permit parking program

.Hi Geneva,

Thank you for your response. I have problem sending my message (email) to the Council members. I appreciate if you could make sure each member receives a copy of my email sent to you.

Thanking you in advance.

B.Malekzadeh

On Thursday, May 12, 2016 11:37 AM, "GBosques@fremont.gov" <GBosques@fremont.gov> wrote:

Thank you for your email regarding the Mission Peak Parking Permit Program. I will make sure that your comments are forwarded to the Fremont City Council prior to the public meeting on Tuesday evening.

Sincerely,
Geneva Bosques
Public Affairs Manager/PIO
Fremont Police Department
510-790-6957
Connect with Us!

From: Bahram Malekzadeh [<mailto:malekzadehbahram@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 1:50 PM
To: Geneva Bosques
Subject: Mission peak neighborhood permit parking program

ATTN: Ms. Geneva Clerk,

Re: Mission peak neighborhood permit parking program

As most probably I will not be able to attend the Council meeting on May17, I wanted to voice my objection on the issue that some advocacy groups are **against** including the Weible Street (connects Antelope Dr. to Stanford St.) in the above program. I find this absolutely ridiculous and unfair. Part of my property faces Weible St., and we have been for years subject to lots of noises early mornings on weekends, and collecting trashes from the visitors to the Mission Peak.

To leave this street (Weible) for parking between permit parking areas is absolutely illogical & unfair to the owners of the properties that part of their house is facing Weible Street.

Therefore, I do urge you to make sure that Weible St. is included in the above program.

Thanking you in advance.

B.Malekzadeh

581 Upper vintners Cir.

Geneva Bosques

From: Geneva Bosques
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2016 11:36 AM
To: 'Mukund Lathia'
Subject: RE: MISSION PEAK NEIGHBORHOOD PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM

Mukund Lathia,

Thank you for your email regarding the Mission Peak neighborhood permit parking program. I will make sure that your comments area forwarded to the Fremont City Council prior to the meeting Tuesday evening.

In response to your second question, the police department does go up to the Mission Peak area on a fairly regular basis to enforce parking infractions. During the first several weeks of the permit program, we intend to increase our staffing presence in the area. We anticipate that after the first few weeks, visitors will understand the new permit area restrictions and the violations will lessen over time. In addition, East Bay Regional Parks has committed to joint agency enforcement and their board recently approved funding for an additional CSO position, specifically to assist with parking enforcement at Mission Peak.

We again thank you for your feedback.

Sincerely,

Geneva Bosques
Public Affairs Manager/PIO
Fremont Police Department
510-790-6957

-----Original Message-----

From: Mukund Lathia [<mailto:mnlathia@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 11:34 AM
To: Geneva Bosques
Cc: mnlathia@yahoo.com
Subject: MISSION PEAK NEIGHBORHOOD PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM

Hi Ms.Geneva Bosques:

I live in the affected neighbourhood on Cougar Circle.

I have read the preliminary proposal to introduce parking permit in the neighborhood affected by heavy parking by visitors to the mission peak over the weekends and holidays.

Given that the mission peak is visited only during the park hours which are usually from 6AM to 7PM and the parking problem is only on weekends and holidays, I have following suggestions:

1. Require the parking permit in the neighborhood only during the Park Visiting Hours on weekends and holidays.

This will minimize the cumbersome process/effort to provide temporary parking permit to the visiting guests of the residents during social hours in the evening.

2. Since Fremont Police dept. has limited manpower, how will they enforce parking permit requirements ?

Will they be patrolling the area ? We were told in one of the meetings that their focus is on more serious crime and burglaries are not on high priority. Parking violations will be their lowest priority.

If the parking permit requirements can not be enforced then what good is this exercise ?

3. The best solution will be have a small parking structure at the entrance of the park and to use Ohlone College parking to visit Mission Peak from the trail behind Ohlone College.

Thanks Geneva.

Mukund Lathia
510-490-2127

Geneva Bosques

From: Geneva Bosques
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2016 11:54 AM
To: 'Parimal Sheth'
Subject: RE: Fremont Parking Permit Requirement in area near Mission Peak

Parimal Sheth,

Thank you for your email regarding the Mission Peak Parking Permit Program. I will make sure your comments are forwarded to the Fremont City Council prior to the public hearing Tuesday evening. I'm not sure if you had a chance to read the staff report for the ordinance that was adopted earlier this year, but I am providing you a link http://fremontcityca.ig2.com/Citizens/Detail_Meeting.aspx?ID=1392 (Item 2. C). I think that the staff report for the ordinance is responsive to a few of the questions and concerns you have.

Regarding your concern of police enforcement, we do actually send staff up to the Mission Peak area on a fairly regular basis to enforce parking infractions. During the first several weeks of the permit program, we intend to increase our staffing presence in the area. We anticipate that after the first few weeks, visitors will understand the new permit area restrictions and the violations will lessen over time. In addition, East Bay Regional Parks has committed to joint agency enforcement and their board recently approved funding for an additional CSO position, specifically to assist with parking enforcement at Mission Peak.

In response to your final question, staff is looking for a parking permit solution that addresses your concern of having to remember to display it. One option we're looking at is a window cling or something similar. This decal would be placed in the vehicle window and you would not have to remember to display it when parked in the roadway during the enforcement hours (weekends and federal holidays).

Thank you again for your feedback and I will make sure Council receives it. You are also more than welcome to contact me again, if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

Geneva Bosques
Public Affairs Manager/PIO
Fremont Police Department
510-790-6957

Connect with Us!



From: Parimal Sheth [mailto:parsheth@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 4:09 PM
To: Geneva Bosques
Cc: Parimal Sheth
Subject: Fremont Parking Permit Requirement in area near Mission Peak

Due to unavoidable circumstances I will not be able to attend the City Council open meeting to discuss requiring Parking Permit for affected residents in the area. I live at 707 Chavel Court. From what I understand after reading the proposal that my house will be impacted and I will have to use Parking permits for my car and cars used by my guest.

I am strongly opposed to this parking permit proposal for following reason. I would like city council to consider my objection seriously.

1. Parking problem has been created by visitors to Mission peak from surrounding cities. However, the headache of parking permit and making sure it is displayed on the cars and fines associated with not displaying parking permit has been assigned to the residents of the area. This does not seem fair.
2. In the last 7 years I have not seen any car from Mission Peak visitor parked on my street (Chavel Court) or upper vintners. Given that the number of visitors have stabilized over last 7 years why does one think that the volume of visitors will go up?
3. I have been retired since 2008. I do not remember seeing Fremont Police ever in my area. Near mission peak there are several cars parked illegally. I have seen police write tickets may be handful of times in last 8 years. When there is burglary we do not get reasonable response from Fremont Police. Their standard answer is that they are busy with more serious crime and do not have the bandwidth to attend to burglary request in a timely manner. I am not sure why we pay taxes that pay for Fremont Police salaries when we cannot even get any service like driving by once a week thru the neighborhood. Why does city council think that by requiring permit that some how Fremont Police will enforce it? If it is not going to be enforced why have permits?
4. Parking problems faced by many in the neighborhood is on Saturday, Sunday and some holidays. Why do we want apply permit requirements 7 days a week?
5. Park hours are established and vary by season. Once the park is closed there should not be any parking problems since visitors to Mission Peak are gone. If permit is a must, why not permit hours be during Park hours on Saturday, Sunday and Holidays ONLY and not rest of the time.
6. Why not build a parking structure that was proposed to alleviate parking problem and eliminate permit requirements all together?
7. If Fremont Police is not going to enforce it because of bandwidth issue, why have permits?
8. Lastly if resident or his personal visitor made a mistake and parked the car outside without a permit being displayed (and sun came up in the west instead of east) and Fremont police gave us a ticket we should be able to go to the police station and get ticket waved instead of having to pay for it. It should be similar to FASTRACK. If you have FASTRACK but you forgot to carry it with you and crossed the bridge you get ticket in the mail. If you call the agency up they look up your license plate and if it is registered with them, they wave the fine.

Parimal Sheth

From: Ali Bakhshandeh,
206 Lynx CT
Fremont CA 94539-6051

Subject: Mission Peak Neighborhood Permit

Recipient: City of Fremont

Date: May 17, 2016

Hi Ms. Bosques, Public Affair Manager

I am glad I spoke to you yesterday. The talk over the phone clarified some of my main concerns. I appreciate the time you spent to explain related matters to me.

I would like to ask you to convey the following to the Public Hearing this afternoon. I have offered some reasoning at the beginning and my specific request at the end.

1) As far as I know, hikers get to Mission peak and vicinity through Stanford Ave (the main one) and Ohlone College. Both places are far away from Lynx CT and the possibility the hikers park their car in Lynx Ct is near zero and hence the necessity to furnish Lynx Ct with parking permit might be useless. Since to begin with, it might not happen that the hikers park their car in Lynx CT and walk around 1.5 or more miles to get to the point of departure to mission peak. They might even get lost to go back to the point of departure, which is located at the end of Stanford Avenue.

2) Rules for parking permit will not work. This is a professional area, people are busy, and interaction with other people is limited. Some might not even have a guest/party for 3 or more months. However if for whatever reason they have a party the street will be flooded by cars for a few hours. If so, parking permit is a burden, since the neighbors do not care if somebody parked in front of their house for a few hours every 2, 3 months. At the same time the parking permit signs, if in place, will not be helpful. Since the guest do not want to violate the rule and it will cause the guest either, out of desperation, violate the "parking Permit" rule and park in restricted places or has to go back home since he or she cannot find a place to park (in the weekend) while have been invited by

a friend. The problem becomes critically bad, if the guest (because of the "Parking Permit" cannot find a parking spot in the vicinity streets with "Parking Permit" signs installed in front of the houses).

While de-regulation serves the need of such burst demand. it is working fine, because of its random and rare occurrence.

3) With the same token, Imagine parking Permit was installed in all area around the Stanford point of departure to Mission Peak. A group of Hikers arrive e.g. from San Francisco and the designated parking spots, building is full and they cannot find any place in the vicinity to park. This means they should go back home just because they could not find a place to park. If it happens, how the City of Fremont feels about it? How the hikers will feel about it? How people of Fremont feel about it? How Fremont businesses feel about it? Considering the agony and frustration it brings to the hikers who came to Fremont from a relatively long distance to go to Mission peak, can "Parking Permit" be considered a solution?

4) The owners, who purchased the houses in the vicinity of point of departure in Stanford Ave, should have expected such relatively huge hikers in certain week-end of the hiking season(s) and if were concerned, they should have not purchased their houses in the vicinity. Now they have option to sell their houses with cheaper prices and the new owners also knows he or she is paying a cheaper price for the house since in certain time of the year people hike to Mission Peak and the hikers might desperately park in the street in front of their houses. But it looks like the current owners are trying to create agony and constraint for hikers and discourage them to come to Mission Peak due to parking issue for the sake of their own comfort. It can also be the possibility that they purchased the houses cheaper and now adding value to them by imposing "Parking Permit" to the vicinity at the expense of discouraging recreation activities and probably hurting Fremont businesses).

5) It is my Understanding; City of Fremont has designated parking places for the hikers. Considering that, how many weekends in the hiking season(s) the designated parking area are full and the hikers need to park in the vicinity streets? If it is not many weekends, then it should not be a problem. Since yearlong only e.g. 4 or 5 weekends cars are parked in front of their houses. Can that be a problem? Considering such restriction can cause the hiker return home instead of going to Mission Peak.

6) If owners of houses near point of departure at the end of Stanford Ave are extremely concerned, If a possibility, they might create a gated area for themselves which only allows people with certain code or card to get in.

7) At the end, is this the way city responds to recreation and hiking: to give in to the demand of some probably selfish owners? Can't the city find a genuine solution such that the hikers, as much as possible, will be encouraged to come to Fremont for hiking without facing any hurdles of any kind? At the same time, accommodate the need of houses in very close distance (one or two blocks) from the point of departure to Mission Peak, from the end of Stanford Ave. Hence, maybe the current solution needs to be revisited and gets overhauled.

My Specific Request for Lynx CT:

I feel furnishing Lynx CT with parking permit can be decided by who live in Lynx Court. If majority of residents agree with it, Lynx CT will be furnished with Parking permit; Otherwise the parking Permit will not be provided to Lynx CT.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Ali Bakhshandeh
206 Lynx CT
Fremont CA 94539-6051
510-270-8582