



PARKING ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

Wednesday, November 16, 2022 - 6:00 PM

City Hall, Council Chambers, 169 SW Coast Hwy, Newport, OR 97365

All public meetings of the City of Newport will be held in the City Council Chambers of the Newport City Hall, 169 SW Coast Highway, Newport. The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter, or for other accommodations, should be made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to Peggy Hawker, City Recorder at 541.574.0613, or p.hawker@newportoregon.gov.

All meetings are live-streamed at <https://newportoregon.gov>, and broadcast on Charter Channel 190. Anyone wishing to provide written public comment should send the comment to publiccomment@newportoregon.gov. Public comment must be received four hours prior to a scheduled meeting. For example, if a meeting is to be held at 3:00 P.M., the deadline to submit written comment is 11:00 A.M. If a meeting is scheduled to occur before noon, the written comment must be submitted by 5:00 P.M. the previous day. To provide virtual public comment during a city meeting, a request must be made to the meeting staff at least 24 hours prior to the start of the meeting. This provision applies only to public comment and presenters outside the area and/or unable to physically attend an in person meeting.

The agenda may be amended during the meeting to add or delete items, change the order of agenda items, or discuss any other business deemed necessary at the time of the meeting.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

1.1 Memorandum.

[Staff Memorandum](#)

2. ROLL CALL

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 3.1 November 2, 2022 Parking Advisory Committee Meeting.
[Draft Parking Advisory Comm Mtg Minutes 11-2-2022](#)

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 4.1 Continued Discussion on the Parking Permit Component of the Bayfront Parking Management Solutions.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

This is an opportunity for members of the audience to bring to the Work Group's attention any item not listed on the agenda. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes per person with a maximum of 15 minutes for all items. Speakers may not yield their time to others.


6. ADJOURNMENT

HANDOUTS

Meeting Materials:

[Bayfront Parking Management Solutions RFP- Final Draft](#)

Memorandum

To: Parking Advisory Committee
From: Derrick I. Tokos, AICP, Community Development Director 
Date: November 10, 2022
Re: Topics for 11/16/22 Parking Advisory Committee Meeting

At this meeting, we will have an opportunity to continue our discussion about how the parking permit component of the Bayfront Parking Management Solutions project should be framed. I'll try to pull together some information to help guide the conversation. If time permits, we can also begin to discuss changes the City should make to its off-street parking requirements for new development and redevelopment along the Bayfront once the parking management program is rolled out.

I don't have any new materials to include with the agenda. Background information on the topics we will be discussing were included with the November 2, 2022 meeting packet. The one item included as an attachment is the final draft of the Bayfront Parking Management Solutions RFP. Thank you for your feedback on how the document could be improved. Your requested edits are included in this final version, along with those received from the City Attorney. At its November 7, 2022 work session, the City Council was briefed on our work to develop the RFP and were comfortable with it moving forward. It will be officially released and distributed to prospective proposers on Monday.

I hope you have a wonderful weekend, and look forward to seeing all of you at the Parking Advisory Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday 11/16 at 6:00pm here at Newport City Hall.

Attachments

Bayfront Parking Management Solutions RFP – Final Draft

***Draft* MINUTES**
Parking Advisory Committee
Meeting #2
Newport City Hall Council Chambers
November 2, 2022

Committee Members Present: Aaron Bretz, Ian Clayman, Janell Goplen, Bill Branigan, Nevin Beckes, and Robert Emond.

Committee Members Present by Video: Gary Ripka, and Doretta Smith.

Committee Members Absent: Aracelly Guevara.

City Staff Present: Community Development Director, Derrick Tokos; and Executive Assistant, Sherri Marineau.

1. **Call to Order & Roll Call.** Meeting started at 6:00 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.**

MOTION was made by Bill Branigan, seconded by Robert Emond, to approve the August 17, 2022 Parking Advisory Committee meeting minutes with minor corrections. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

3. **Draft RFP for Bayfront Parking Management Solutions.** Tokos reviewed the schedule for the RFP noting that it would take six weeks for submittals and confirmation. Emond asked how the consultants got notice to submit. Tokos explained there would be a public notice and the City would also send it out to those who normally submitted.

Tokos reviewed the instruction section. He reminded that they would have to have kiosks that were solar powered for credit card payments. Bretz thought they should add that the apps should be ADA compliant. Emond thought this would make some vendors leery because some had problems with this. He asked if it should be a suggestion that they have this and not required. Emond was concerned this might limit some of the responses. Bretz thought special districts encouraged them to be ADA compliant. He thought this was something they would want. Tokos could add language to say it wasn't mandatory. Beckes asked if they had an example of vendors who allowed reservations of spaces for events, including the ability to prepay for parking. Tokos noted the Abbey Street parking lot was an example of this. The RFP was about the functionality instead of how it would be deployed. Vendors generally had this functionality.

Smith asked if the traffic study would go out with the proposal. Tokos confirmed it would be available as an addendum. Bretz asked if there was anything in the study they didn't want to link together with the RFP. Tokos noted the parking study was completed in 2018 and its key recommendations were adopted in 2020 by the City Council. Things like the meters had changed since then. Tokos thought they wouldn't want the number of meters in the study now because the technology had improved.

Tokos reviewed the project objectives. Goplen asked if digital parking permits would print something out for someone to put in their car. Tokos explained they would have an online application where they would get the person's license plate number. They wouldn't print a permit. Tokos reviewed how the permits would be set up for the public and fishermen. There would be different permits for different areas. Goplen asked if they could do permits for Bayfront businesses as well. Tokos explained they

could do it that way or have a fixed number of permits made available in certain zones or areas based on the available parking in the area. The City would be able to sort this out in the coming months and the vendors were able to do this. Tokos noted they could have merchant validation with this as well.

Tokos asked if they should reduce cash payments. Goplen thought they should eliminate this. Smith thought this would attract crime. Goplen reminded most cities didn't accept cash and used credit card payments only. Emond thought cash was a fair compromise for people who were technology adverse. Smith noted that most people had debit cards and they could be used like credit cards. Branigan thought they should confirm if the vendor could accept debit cards for payments. Goplen thought they could use a cash machine that gave them a debit card for those that didn't have credit cards. Tokos noted these machines would have to be independent from the kiosks.

Gary Ripka joined the meeting at 6:23 p.m.

Tokos talked about the functionality that allowed business owners, employees, residents, and tourists to track pricing in parking locations. He confirmed that the vendors would have the technology to do this. Goplen asked if they would be getting sensors. Tokos didn't know if they wanted to invest the money for sensors. He thought they may want to do sensors on the driveway approaches on lots. They could also base this on data from enforcement when they went through the lots on a regular basis and picked off how many cars were in a particular location. They could use that information, along with the number of spaces to show the number of vehicles in the lots.

Branigan pointed out that some people took up multiple parking spots when parking. Goplen questioned if people would be able to purchase multiple spots. Emond asked if there would be RV parking spots as well. Tokos confirmed they could set them up for RV parking. Part of the actual enforcement was based on how they stalls were set up and knowing which vehicle wasn't in the system. Bretz noted that if they were reliant on enforcement, and the enforcement wasn't as good as it should be, people would be mad if they advertised that there were spots open and they weren't any. Tokos thought it best to ask for it and see how the vendor would implement it, rather than not require it at all.

Smith asked who would review the proposals. Tokos confirmed that the Committee would. This could either be a sub group or the whole Committee. They would then come up with a recommendation give to the City Council for a contract.

Tokos continued his review of the vendor requirements noting they added language to accommodate permit holders with multiple vehicles. Goplen thought the prepayment was a great idea for people who were planning their trip to Newport for a number of days. Tokos didn't think this was how it would be set up. There needed to be a conversation on the management of the permit program. He added that there would be temporary permits for fish chartering.

Tokos reviewed the background of Newport. Emond asked if they wanted to expand this program to other areas in the City. Tokos reported they weren't in a position to do that currently but thought the vendors would be competitive on this.

Tokos reviewed Figure 4 from the adopted ordinance. Goplen asked if the City received any new funds for streets and parking. Tokos explained the state money for parking would generally go towards the street overlay program. There wasn't anything currently for parking lots. They would convey that they had budgeted funds for this project though. Emond noted a typo on the document that said 2022/2033 instead of 2022/2023. Tokos would correct this.

Tokos asked for comments on the proposal requirements. Beckes thought the scoring for proposal costs should have more weight when they were more cost effective. Tokos noted that if the vendors were close in terms of their qualifications, then the 15 points for costs would be good enough to help them go with the more cost effective vendor. Bretz noted vendors often would leave things out that the City wanted if this became more of a bidding proposal. They wanted to make sure to blend functionality with cost effectiveness. Tokos reminded that this didn't preclude them from negotiating the price down once they selected someone.

Goplen asked if vendors should submit a PR or marketing proposal to show what they were offering was easy to share with the community. Tokos noted they all had marketing. Goplen thought it would be easy to get buy in from people if they were able to see how it worked. Tokos noted they didn't do this with proposals. They should make sure that vendors had outreach materials to help the City with stakeholder groups to give details on how it would be implemented, not a broader engagement of what the management strategy should be pursued on the Bayfront because a decision had been made. Goplen thought if vendors had a video this would give the City something to share on how the program worked. Tokos asked if this was for once the program was deployed or for their submittal. Goplen thought it should be both. One should be for the submittals, and the other was to provide marketing materials as part of the roll out. Ripka questioned if the app would have some kind of instructions or video. Tokos would work some of these terms into the document to add marketing materials, demo videos, and shared tutorials as requirements. He thought this was covered in the objectives but they could be more explicit on what they wanted vendors to submit. Branigan noted there needed to be education with the fleet, businesses and the public for the program. Tokos would add that they provide a demo on the ease of use. If they didn't provide this they would get marks taken away on the points.

Goplen thought the profile of the firm should include if they were currently being bought or if they were in negotiations with another company. Branigan asked if they should request a copy of an audited balance sheet to know their debt load. Bretz thought this would be a lot of details to ask for. Ripka didn't think they would get companies to share their financial records. Tokos thought they needed to frame it so the vendor would give enough insight for the City to spot a red flag. Smith reminded this would come down to scoring. Ripka asked how much detail the Port required. Bretz reported they didn't ask for financial records and they were comfortable with what was listed in the RFP. He pointed out that the Committee would want to write a RFP to make sure they got companies to apply. Emond wasn't sure about asking for the financials.

Smith didn't see anything about ongoing support and who was responsible for installing and paying for upgrades. She thought they needed to understand their warranty and upgrades. Tokos would add this. He noted that once service plans were up, the cost of the upgrades weren't free. He thought it was a good thing to ask for and would add it to the cost of service.

Tokos asked if they should add language on communities of comparable size. Bretz didn't think comparable size mattered as much as showing projects that had the same number of parking spots. Smith didn't think the geographical issues mattered as much as the coastal environment. Tokos noted different vendors deployed similar systems in similar environments at the coast. Ripka noted Seattle was comparable and was in a marine area like Newport. He thought there should be equipment readily available that has been time tested to survive in our climate.

Beckes thought they should merge J and K on the proposal requirements because they were similar.

Tokos reviewed the scoring for proposals. Branigan asked if the scoring was similar to what they used in the past. Tokos confirmed it was. Beckes asked if they received proposals in January would they

decide who they liked in January. Tokos confirmed they would be selected in February and they would then have from March to May to implement. The Committee would meet to review the proposals and devise where they were going with it. Then they would work it into a contract that went to the City Council for approval. Tokos noted the Committee could also choose to give two options to the Council and number them as choices 1 and 2 on who they wanted to recommend. Goplen requested Tokos send the group the edited RFP draft with the changes discussed this meeting.

Ripka reported he wasn't opposed to tightening up the schedule in November and December. Tokos explained this would be the vendor's schedule not the Committee's. Most vendors wanted six weeks to be able to submit good proposals. Beckes asked if the vendors were invited to present their concepts to the City, would it be done for the Council or the Committee. Tokos explained the intent was to have this done with the Committee. The Council had expressed interest in having a couple of the members sit in on these as well.

Goplen asked if credit card fees would be paid by the City. Tokos wanted to make sure it was included in all cost of services. He also wanted them to provide information on if there were any transaction fees.

MOTION was made by Nevin Beckes, seconded by Aaron Bretz to move the document forward with edits. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

Ripka noted that he liked the idea of people coming in to make proposals. Goplen suggested vendors do video walkthroughs for their proposals. Tokos thought this would be a good way for the Committee to ask clarifying questions.

4. **Sample Parking Permit Fee Structures.** Tokos reviewed the parking fee structures for different municipalities. Ripka noted that earlier in the process it was contentious trying to talk people into permits when they were hunting permits, not parking permits. With the turnover from meters there would be more spots available. If they didn't make enough of the permits available it defeated the whole conversation. Ripka thought they needed to come up with how many spaces they had available and determine how many they wanted to make permitted spots. Bretz thought there was bound to be a disparity on what the fees for the permits would be compared to what the Port was charging. There was also the question on how the Port permits related to the City permits. This process looked at changing the meaning of permits. Bretz explained that fishermen often had a problem with paying \$20 a month for parking. He questioned if the City wanted to continue doing what they were doing or move the long term parking down to the Port property. Bretz thought they should consider changing the time limits there. Tokos thought they would want to have parking permits by zone. Ripka thought they should have a week long parking permit. There should be both a City and Port permit with an option for both. Ripka thought they could limit it to a week. If someone knew they were going to be parked long term they could park in the area where that was allowed.

Tokos thought the electronic permitting had a fleet option for commercial fishing boats where they bought a bulk number of permits and had a clear understanding of the number of employees. It was up to the fleet to provide the license plates for vehicles that were in the fleet to the system so they would have some confidence that those that were signing up for permits were in the commercial fishing industry. Ripka liked this but noted there was a problem with the turnover of crews. He questioned who would provide the license plate information. Goplen suggested that when someone was hired they could text a photo of their license plate to the system. Ripka questioned who would notify the system when the person wasn't an employee. Bretz thought they needed to tighten up the process on who got the permits. They needed something that would be a thorn in the captain's side to make them want to notify the system the person was no longer an employee.

Beckes pointed out that the yellow zone was for tourists and they wanted to encourage fishermen to park down the road. He suggested pricing the area where they wanted them to park to be less expensive. Goplen thought they could have a tiered permit plan. Bretz thought if they left the Port permits as they were they would get close to this. If they were less than the other permits fishermen might choose to use the Port parking. Ripka liked this and thought they were already there. Bretz thought fishermen would complain if they had two permits. Ripka reminded that the parking was seasonal. He noted that if it was off season they wouldn't need a permit. Bretz thought they needed to change the time limit in the yellow area. Tokos asked what the time duration on the Port Dock 5 should be. Bretz thought it should be 24 hours. They could stay as long as they wanted at the Port's parking lot. Ripka didn't think this would work. He thought it should be a week, not 24 hours. Bretz noted the pier was there for crews to park to load boats, and then have one person move their trucks to the parking lot. Beckes asked if they could make a bigger loading zone there so they weren't using up parking spots. Bretz reported there already was a large parking area there. Ripka noted they tried to move the crews from Dock 5 to Dock 7 but it was too far away. Bretz thought they had to give people a choice. Tokos suggested allowing it to be three days/72 hour parking. Ripka wanted it set at five days. Bretz suggested having a five day permit for \$600. He reminded that they needed to be clear that they wouldn't have a guaranteed parking spot.

Tokos reviewed his spreadsheet on the parking stall management for Paid and Paid/Permit. He thought they should price permit at a discount on what they would pay for paid parking. Tokos liked the Hood River example for a monthly permitting. He suggested the Abbey Street parking lot be \$25 a month permit. Ripka thought they should stretch out the four hour limit there to allow people to do a full day's work. Tokos thought they should change the whole thing to a permit. He questioned how enforcement would know how long someone had been parking. Bretz thought they would have a digital chalking to determine this.

Tokos asked if June to September made sense for the on season. A discussion ensued regarding how unique Newport's Bayfront parking was. Tokos hoped the Committee could better define what a reasonable permit program was so they could have more information for the vendors. Goplen noted the time her restaurant put up their tent for outdoor dining was from May to October. Ripka thought May made a lot more sense to the fishing industry, especially if they were asking people to pay \$500 for special permits. The committee was in general agreement to change it from May to October.

Tokos asked if the Committee liked the meters to run from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m., or if it should be changed to 7 p.m. The Committee was in general agreement with 7 p.m. Bretz asked if the processing plants were on a three shift schedule. Tokos would check on this. Goplen asked what a monthly pass would cost. Tokos thought that \$25 a month made sense. Goplen thought \$25 wasn't that much of a discount. Tokos asked for thoughts on what it should be. A discussion ensued regarding fleet permits and how they should be managed. Bretz didn't like the idea of fleet deals. Ripka questioned if the Port had the man power to manage the fleet passes. Bretz noted it wasn't easy to get a fisherman's pass currently and they needed to fix it. Tokos noted it would be on the Port to manage the list to make sure the people were legitimately part of it.

Tokos would bring back a further flushed out permit program and report what the City Council thought of the RFP. Goplen questioned if they would have another meeting on permits. Tokos confirmed they would discuss this at the next meeting. Beckes asked that the Excel spreadsheet include what they would expect to collect on the permit only. Ripka asked for comparisons on the hunting permits to be able to tell people what things cost in other places. He thought they needed to try to sell this to people because the sell was harder than it was a few years before. Tokos would try to make the spreadsheet more plug and play for the Committee.

Tokos reported the next meeting would be held on November 16th.

5. **Priorities for Updating Special Parking Area Requirements (9/26/22 PC Work Session Materials)**. Tokos reported this discussion would be picked up at the next Committee meeting.
6. **Public Comment**. None were heard.
7. **Adjournment**. Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherri Marineau
Executive Assistant

CITY OF NEWPORT

169 SW COAST HWY

NEWPORT, OREGON 97365

COAST GUARD CITY, USA



phone: 541.574.0629

fax: 541.574.0644

<http://newportoregon.gov>

mombetsu, japan, sister city

CITY OF NEWPORT, OREGON

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

for

BAYFRONT PARKING MANAGEMENT SOLUTION

PROPOSALS DUE: January 6, 2023 by 5:00 pm PST

SUBMIT PROPOSAL TO:

**Derrick I. Tokos, AICP
Community Development Director
City of Newport
169 SW Coast Highway
Newport, Oregon 97365**



CITY OF NEWPORT, OREGON

Request for Proposals Bayfront Parking Management Solution

1. INTRODUCTION

The City of Newport (“City”) desires to engage a qualified firm to implement an app based parking management solution in the City’s Bayfront commercial district that includes metered (“paid”) zones, hybrid paid/permit zones, hybrid paid/timed zones, and timed zones for on and off-street public parking areas. The approach should be generally consistent with the concept illustrated in Figure 4 of City Ordinance No. 2163 (enclosed) with implementation by June 1, 2023.

2. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

City is looking for an integrated, turnkey solution that can be managed and operated by the City with vendor maintenance and support. Services are to include a product that provides for phone/app based payments, revenue and data management, real-time parking availability information, issuance of digital parking permits, robust reporting, intuitive customer service tools, and software and equipment to support parking enforcement and collections.

Proposals must provide for the design, integration, installation, testing, training and support needed to implement the solution, including the provision and placement of parking and wayfinding signage. City recognizes that there will be a need for pay stations to ensure equity amongst users, but desires to minimize the number that are needed and to avoid handling of cash/coins. Proposers should identify the type and number of pay stations they would deploy and how the stations would be integrated with their software solution.

City’s principal objective is to reduce congestion and improve the availability of parking along the Bayfront by influencing user parking preferences, increasing parking turnover rates, and improving the overall user experience. With that in mind, the parking management solution must satisfy the following:

- a. Supports dynamic/demand based pricing adjusting rates by peak season, weekday versus weekend, and by time of day. The solution must also provide a convenient interface for merchants to generate validation codes for customers.
- b. Accommodates a range of convenient, stable and secure electronic and online payment methods, reducing the amount of cash/coin that is potentially handled. Functionality must also provide daily settlement and automated financial reconciliation options.
- c. Provides a customer friendly, easy-to-use system that eliminates trips to City offices or phone calls to City staff to address routine transactions. This includes use of signage to provide clear direction to parking locations and payment options.
- d. Allows business owners, employees, residents, tourists and other users to easily track parking availability and pricing at on-street and off-street parking locations.
- e. Offers an easy to use data management interface that minimizes manual data entry.
- f. Provides on demand and structured reporting of revenues, transactions, and parking data, including utilization, turnover rates, and enforcement trends.
- g. Allows for reservation of spaces for events, including the ability to prepay for parking.

- h. Facilitates real-time parking permit management that offers end user accounts, easy access to customer and vehicle permit information, back office permit issuance, and an automated renewal process. The solution must accommodate tiered permit pricing and provide for issuance of guest passes.
- i. Utilizes license plate recognition technology for monitoring and enforcement of parking operations including digital chalking and integration with DMV and related platforms. Software should be able to accommodate permit holders with multiple vehicles.
- j. Offers customer service support in multiple languages with easy to use help screens, online technical support and tutorials, product educational materials, and telephone hotline service.

City's preference is that proposers furnish labor, materials, and equipment necessary to implement the parking management solution in line with the objectives outlined above, including installation of signage, striping, pay stations, and other requisite materials. Any role the City is to perform in this regard must be clearly identified in the proposal.

3. BACKGROUND

Newport's Bayfront commercial district is a working waterfront with a mix of tourist oriented retail, restaurants, fish processing facilities (e.g. Pacific Seafood), and infrastructure to support the City's commercial fishing fleet. The Port of Newport is a major property owner and a boardwalk and fishing piers provide public access to the Yaquina Bay. The area is terrain constrained, with steep slopes rising up from commercial sites situated along Bay Boulevard. Tourist-oriented businesses are the predominant form of development on the upland side of the street. On the opposite side, buildings and piers extend out into the Bay where there is a mix of waterfront industrial development, namely fish processing facilities, and tourist oriented uses. Moorages for the commercial fishing fleet and Port of Newport facilities are located at the east end of district.

Most of the parking along the Bayfront is publicly owned, with 575 on-street spaces along Bay Boulevard and its connecting streets and 178 spaces in parking lots. Many of the spaces are posted with a 4-hour timed parking limit, and there are a few that are limited to 30-minutes. There is no paid, public parking at this time.

In 2018 the City of Newport, with assistance from Lancaster StreetLab, completed a parking study that inventoried and assessed the condition of public parking assets along the Bayfront and a couple of other areas. The study includes detailed field survey data illustrating the utilization and turnover rates of parking spaces during peak and off-peak periods; a list of capital improvements needed to maintain and improve available parking, including possible upgrades to transit service; and financing strategies to fund needed improvements. Along the Bayfront, the study showed that parking occupancies are routinely at or near 85% or "functionally full" for much of the year, resulting in congestion attributed to vehicles cruising for parking, illegal parking, and other undesirable behavior. This led to a recommendation that steps be taken to manage parking demand, and a plan was developed identifying public parking that should be placed into metered ("paid") zones, hybrid paid/permit zones, hybrid paid/timed zones, and timed zones. The concept is illustrated with Figure 4 on the following page, and was adopted by the Newport City Council in March of 2020 with City Ordinance No. 2163. A copy of the ordinance is an attachment to this request for proposals. The complete parking study can be found at:

https://www.newportoregon.gov/dept/cdd/documents/Newport_Parking_Management_Plan_Final_Report_000.pdf

Figure 4:



4. FUNDING

Funding to implement these parking management solutions is included in the City's FY 22/23 capital budget. There are no state or federal funds associated with the project.

5. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Proposals should be organized in the following format:

- A. Cover Letter. Provide a cover letter, signed by a duly constituted official legally authorized to bind the proposer to both its proposal and cost estimate. The cover letter must include the name, address, and telephone number of the proposer submitting the proposal and the name, title, address, telephone number, and email address of the person, or persons, to contact whom are authorized to represent the proposer and to whom correspondence should be sent.
- B. Proposal Summary. This section shall discuss the highlights, key features, and distinguishing points of the Proposal, including a description of how the City's objectives will be accomplished as outlined in the RFP. The City is open to alternatives that a proposer believes will more effectively achieve its desired outcomes. In such cases, proposer should clearly describe and explain the reason for the proposed modifications.
- C. Profile of the Proposing Firm(s) This section shall include a brief description of the Proposer's firm size as well as the proposed project organization structure. Include a discussion of the Prime Proposer firm's financial stability, capacity and resources. Include all other firms participating in the Proposal, with similar information about those firms. Additionally, this section shall include a listing of any product related litigation, and the result of such action, pertaining to any public project undertaken by the Proposer or major subcontractors within the last five (5) years.
- D. Work Plan or Proposal. This section shall present a well-conceived service plan. Include a full description of major tasks and subtasks required to implement the parking management solution. This section of the proposal shall establish that the Proposer understands the City's objectives and work requirements and Proposer's ability to satisfy those objectives and turnkey requirements. Succinctly describe the proposed approach for addressing the required services and the firm's ability to meet the City's schedule, outlining the approach, including training and support details that would be undertaken in providing the requested services.
- E. Proposed Innovations. The Proposer may also suggest technical or procedural innovations that have been used successfully on other engagements and which may provide the City with better service delivery. In this section discuss any ideas, innovative approaches, or specific new concepts included in the Proposal that would provide benefit to the City and support its objectives. Proposals may include other services that are considered necessary to complete this project in a turnkey fashion.
- F. Proposal Exceptions. This section shall discuss any exceptions that Proposer has to the City's RFP project objectives. If there are no exceptions noted, it is assumed the Proposer can meet all of the objectives. Items not excepted will not be open to later negotiation.
- G. Project Timeline. Proposed timeline for accomplishing the project, including critical paths and milestones, and specific staff by task based on the Work Plan.

- H. Project Coordination and Monitoring. Describe the process for ensuring effective communication with the City, and for monitoring progress to ensure compliance with approved timeline, budget, staffing and deliverables.
- I. Proposed Cost of Services. Provide a budget summary broken down by task, time, personnel, hourly rate, number of hours and cost for each team member including those employed by major subcontractors. Fee information should be formatted to correspond to tasks identified in this RFP; however, this format may be modified to suit the Proposer's approach to this project. The summary shall include a budget for reimbursable expenses. The final cost of services may be based on a negotiated detailed scope of work. The budget summary shall also include all required materials and other direct costs, administrative support, overhead and profit that will apply. Transaction fees, technical support plans, maintenance plans, or other ongoing costs to the City are to be included in the proposal, but listed separate from those associated with initial implementation.
- J. Product Specifications. Brochures or similar materials shall be provided describing characteristics, features, maintenance requirements, and warranty information for pay stations and other hardware that is to be installed.
- K. Project Qualifications and Similar Experience. This section shall include a brief description of the Proposer's and major subcontractors' qualifications and previous experience on similar or related projects. Include descriptions of pertinent experience with other municipalities that includes a summary of the turnkey work performed, the total project cost, the percentage of work the firm was responsible for, and the period over which the work was completed. Provide names, addresses and telephone numbers of clients associated with each of these projects. Through submission of a proposal, all proposers specifically agree to and release the City of Newport to solicit, secure and confirm information provided.

6. SELECTION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

Thoroughness, quality and conciseness of submittal.	20 pts.
Project understanding and approach for accomplishing the City's objectives.	20 pts.
Qualifications of the project manager and project team, and proven ability to successfully complete projects of similar scope.	20 pts.
Proposed cost of services.	15 pts.
Ability to implement the parking management solution by June 1, 2023.	10 pts.
References from past and present clients.	15 pts.
Total	100 pts.

7. PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL INFORMATION

The City will make every effort to ensure that all proposers are treated fairly and equally throughout the entire advertisement, review and selection process. The information provided herein is intended to give all parties reasonable access to the same basic information.

Parties interested in submitting a proposal should contact Derrick Tokos, Newport Community Development Director at (541) 574-0626 or d.tokos@newportoregon.gov. to indicate their interest and specify the manner to receive any amendments to the RFP.

Any amendments to this RFP will be in writing and will be issued to all persons or businesses that have indicated an interest to receive RFP amendments. No proposal will be considered if it is not responsive to any issued amendments.

Proposals may be submitted electronically via the email address listed above, or in hard copy form to the attention of the Community Development Director at Newport City Hall (169 SW Coast Hwy, Newport, Oregon 97365).

8. SCHEDULE

November 14, 2022: Request for proposals released.

December 9, 2022: Deadline for questions.

December 16, 2022: Deadline for City to issue addenda (this will include a summarized list of questions and answers).

January 6, 2023: Proposals due by 5pm PST.

Proposers may be invited to present their concepts to the City. This may be in person or on a digital platform like ZOOM. City anticipates making a final selection by the end of January.

9. PUBLIC RECORDS DISCLOSURE

Information provided to the City will become property of the City and will be subject to public inspection after completion of the evaluation in accordance with Oregon Public Records Law, ORS 192.311 et seq. If an entity responding to this RFP believes that a specific portion of its response constitutes a “trade secret” under Oregon Public Records Law (ORS 192.345(2)) and is therefore exempt from public disclosure, the entity must clearly identify that specific information as a “trade secret.” Identification of information as a “trade secret” does not necessarily mean that the information will be exempt from disclosure. The City will make that determination based upon the nature of the information and the requirements of Oregon Public Records Law.

10. GENERAL CITY RESERVATIONS

City reserves the right to extend the submission deadline should this be in its best interest. Proposers have the right to revise their proposals in the event that the deadline is extended. Additionally, City reserves the right to withdraw this RFP at any time, and will notify proposers that the solicitation has been canceled. The City makes no representation that any contract will be awarded to any proposer responding to the RFP. The City reserves the right to reject any or all proposals. If in City’s judgment, an inadequate number of proposals are received or the proposals received are deemed non- responsive, not qualified, or not cost effective, the City may, at its sole discretion, reissue the RFP, or cancel this solicitation.

11. DESIGNATED CONTACT

For questions regarding this RFP please contact Derrick I. Tokos, AICP, Community Development Director, City of Newport, at d.tokos@newportoregon.gov or 541-574-0626.