

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 of 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 eliminate 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