

## **Miriam Lens**

---

**From:** Sherman Lewis on behalf of Sherman  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 18, 2012 12:08 AM  
**To:** Barbara Halliday; Francisco Zermeno - Forward; Michael Sweeney; Marvin Peixoto; Al Mendall; Greg Jones; Mark Salinas  
**Cc:** John DeClercq; Fran David; CityClerk; David Rizk; Morad Fakhrai; Kelly McAdoo  
**Subject:** SOUTH HAYWARD BART PARKING & ACCESS STUDY

December 18, 2012

Hayward City Council

By email

Re: Comments on SOUTH HAYWARD BART PARKING & ACCESS STUDY

Dear Council:

I oppose any subsidized parking structure at the South Hayward BART station. I also believe a structure that had to pay for itself based on parking charges set at a level determined by the market would not be able to pay for itself. A subsidized parking structure is uneconomic and anti-environmental, and an unsubsidized parking structure probably won't work. I request that Council look into these claims before committing to a structure.

Similarly, Council should consider requiring Eden Housing to unbundle parking in any project after Phase I. We know from projects in Arlington VA and from the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) and a project in San Francisco that projects can be unbundled with no difficulty for Tax Credit financing.

Council should consider re-planning the land use at the exit to the station to have BART riders walk past retail on their way to shuttles, homes, and cars, as is commonly done in other cities to optimize sales.

The JPA should consider market-based management of public parking through charges based on willingness to pay using technologies of SFPark that have proven to be increasingly efficient in San Francisco. Such parking needs to be shared among all uses to let the market work in a simple way. For day users, daily charges are appropriate; for long term users like residents, leases are important. Since BART is charging for parking, and there are no competing uses, shared parking should have little or no impact on ridership and would have less administrative overhead. Enforcement of BART-only parking could require a BART rider parking on Tennyson to re-park their car to go shopping at a store they are already parked close to. It's unnecessary and inefficient if the Tennyson parking is charged a market rate.

The proceeds could be used to finance a short distance rapid shuttle that is fast, frequent, and

free. Some of the financing would come from nexus-based contributions from development and from existing properties whose owners agree to a fixed charge on their property tax in exchange for passes. The JPA would manage the finances and contract with an operator based on an RFP, similar to what Union City and CSUEB Hayward have done. If the neighborhood is allowed to participate in deciding what neighborhood improvements get funded, they might also want information about a shuttle.

The Council should ask for some study of the elasticities of ridership on a shuttle compared to the time it takes to find street parking or structure parking, to walk in a long distance from outlying streets or to walk and take an elevator from the upper levels of a structure. My opinion is that a shuttle would not work for Phase 1, but would be feasible when the main parking area is developed, which would include using the land now planned for a structure for something useful instead. By the same token a larger area of shared market-based parking would provide more revenue for a shuttle and a way to balance parking and shuttle access, as explained in more detail in my other reports.

Further detail on these ideas is contained in a PowerPoint, spreadsheets, and maps that contain the research I have already done, and has not been done by Nelson Nygaard. Many months ago Nelson Nygaard claimed the shuttle would not work, but they never reviewed my data and used irrelevant studies that did not pertain to the facts of South Hayward.

I would like to have seen some assessment of the ability of existing off-street private parking to accommodate a reasonable amount of residential parking. Residents can get four free parking permits (RPPs). Do people need four RPPs? Are they allowed to sell them? Can they rent their spaces to others? How does the JPA plan to enforce against people acting rationally in their self-interest? Does the four per resident reflect informed opinion by residents who could in the majority prefer parking charges to pay for neighborhood improvements? Or does it reflect a fear of a few vocal residents without information about what most people want?

A lot of the Nelson Nygaard report makes sense, using unused street parking to replace lost BART parking. Subsidized parking, however, does not serve a public purpose.

Sincerely,

Sherman Lewis  
President, Hayward Area Planning Association

Note: I sent a copy of the PowerPoint to the City Clerk.