

MINUTES
Parking Advisory Committee
Meeting #3
Newport City Hall Council Chambers
November 16, 2022

Committee Members Present: Aaron Bretz, Gary Ripka, Janell Goplen, Bill Branigan, Nevin Beckes, Aracelly Guevara, and Robert Emond.

Committee Members Absent: Ian Clayman (*excused*), and Doretta Smith.

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

Public Present: Susan Armstrong, and Ashley Bechler.

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 November 2, 2022 Parking Advisory Committee meeting minutes with minor corrections. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

3. **Parking Enforcement Discussion.** Bretz requested an addition to the agenda to discuss parking enforcement and regulation changes. The Committee was in general agreement to add the agenda item.

Bretz pointed out that when they were changing things like having people pay for parking and putting time limits on parking, they wouldn't be able to have success without rigorous enforcement. They needed to make sure the police had the resources to be able to enforce. Bretz asked if they had a state contract, or could piggy back on the state contract, to make it so people were subject to fines if they didn't appear for an appeal and pay their fines. Also, if they didn't pay their fines they would have to go to collections. Tokos suggested that Police Chief Malloy attend a meeting to given his thoughts on how this worked and was coordinated. The Police Department had budgeted to fill for parking enforcement for the fiscal year, and they were looking to fill this before the parking changed on the Bayfront went online. This way they would have more enforcement resources so somebody could do the tasks. Tokos explained the individual would be dedicated to the Bayfront, Nye Beach and City Center. He noted they needed to look at what the vendor's resources were to make enforcement easier. Vendors would be able to show during their interviews what technology they had and how they would be able to assist with collections. Tokos noted that Chief Malloy reported that collections ran around 25 percent of the actual citations.

Branigan asked since people were using a credit card to park, could the vendors charge the violation to their credit card. Tokos explained they needed to talk to the vendors about this to see if it was legal. He wasn't sure they could. A discussion ensued regarding how phone apps worked with citations. Goplen asked if they had enough funds to pay for the enforcement officer. Tokos clarified the expectation was that the enforcement position would be paid through permit revenues partially. Whatever the city collected for citations themselves would not cover the cost of the position. The meter revenues would also fund a portion of what would be dedicated to enforcement. Tokos reminded the license plate recognition technology was a pretty efficient way to enforce. He pointed out the police wanted to be involved with the selection of the vendor.

Goplen asked if Bretz had any specific ideas in mind for enforcement. Bretz thought they needed to do something that didn't tax the police force too much but also motivated people to care about their credit and paying their bills. When it came down to it, there were limited options when somebody didn't want to pay for citations. Emond asked if they could tow away cars if they were parked without paying. Tokos explained the city put some rules in place a few years earlier to allow booting and towing. He reminded they would have tools for enforcement that they didn't have in the past to make sure as it moved forward and that the enforcement piece had been adequately addressed. Bretz thought it would be good to hear from the police on this since they were the ones doing the booting and towing. He thought the Committee should include in the recommendation to the City Council that they paid close attention to enforcement. He thought there would be people who would challenge enforcement and the city needed to show them that it was in their best interest to comply with the law.

Beckes thought enforcement would be a challenge in the beginning and thought they should look at seeking a third party to do it instead of the police. This way it wouldn't change the public's perception of the police. Goplen asked if the proposal included enforcement. Tokos confirmed it did. Branigan recommended they implement this gradually. If they were too aggressive it could make Newport look like an unfriendly city. Bretz disagreed. He thought that they would empower people to break the rules if they did it this way. The way to get people to comply was to say exactly what the rules were and enforce it. Goplen thought they needed to enforce. She requested the Police Chief be included on the next agenda. She also wanted to make sure the interviews included this. Tokos reported they would work with the vendor that was chosen on the rollout so people weren't genuinely surprised. Goplen thought they could work with Discover Newport, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Seafood and Wine Festival to make it known that meters were in. They needed to find incentives and way to market the meters in a positive way. Tokos reminded if people saw the parking signs they would know the drill. This was becoming a more common because people understood parking had to be managed in high demand areas. Ripka noted Seaside had metering and Newport wouldn't be the only coastal town with it. Bretz thought that enforcement wise the Committee's role was to make recommendations to the City Council, not tell the police what to do. He suggested the Committee's recommendation say they placed a high priority on funding enforcement. Tokos thought it would be good to get Chief Malloy's thoughts right before they got the responses to the RFP.

4. Continued Discussion on the Parking Permit Component of the Bayfront Parking Management Solutions. Tokos reviewed what the current signage looked like on the Bayfront, and an example of permit program signs. He reported that they did a study which showed people typically parked for around two and half hours at a time. Emond thought four hours on a permit was generous. Branigan asked what they charged in Warrenton. Ripka reported their docks charged \$10 a day. Bretz asked how the charter boat people would be permitted. Tokos explained they would get a temporary permit. Emond asked if there would be a separate sign about towing. Tokos confirmed there would be. Guevara thought there should be Spanish language signs. Emond thought Spanish signs or foreign language signs would be good to ask for. Bretz asked if there was an ODOT standard for signage for parking. Tokos reported there was some flexibility but the examples he showed the Committee were the typical signs you would see. He noted there would also be different options for signs from each vendor, and the timed regulatory signs had to be green. Tokos reminded that the Committee would be able to designate what the zone names would be for the permit zones on the signs.

Tokos reviewed the Bayfront parking permit map. He noted at the last meeting the Committee thought a paid parking permit should run from 11 a.m. to 7 p.m., from May to October. Then outside of those dates, from November 1st through April 30th, it would be from 11a.m. to 7 p.m. offseason only. Emond asked if there were considerations for holidays. Tokos thought they could decide how to charge on holidays. Emond liked the idea of making holidays free. Ashley Bechler reported that spring break

was busy from the second week of March to April. Emond asked if the time period that they were enforcing would be written in the ordinance. If not, they could do the rollout with whatever holidays they wanted to start with and add spring break later. Tokos reported they could put language in the ordinance to allow an adjustment by resolution. He noted they would make sure the flexibility was written in it.

Tokos reviewed the west end of the parking map where there would be metering only, and the lots that would be set up as paid. He explained there would be no option for the permits on the street, but the lots would have a permit option. Tokos reminded this was about changing behavior by pricing the parking assets. Goplen asked if all the shops on the west end had their own parking. Tokos explained very few had off-street parking. Goplen asked if Areas 9 and 12 could be permit areas as well. Tokos explained this would further eat into what would be available for permit parking. The maps were drafted at a time that this area wasn't vacant and when the expectation that the market would be going in there. This was why they wanted angle parking there and meter only. This map had been framed from the RFP. Bretz asked if the parking spaces there were unregulated with no time limit. Tokos confirmed they were. There would be regulations for people parking too long and the Camping Ordinance came into play for this.

Bretz asked if any of the residents who were relying on off-street parking would be sensitive to fish workers parking in front of their houses. Tokos explained the residents had their own off-street parking. Their feedback had been less about people utilizing the parking and more about them not wanting it to be time limited.

Tokos asked if the Committee if they wanted all four of the areas together in a zone, or if the Abbey Street lot should be by itself. Emond asked if Pacific Seafoods would be buying permits just for the Abbey Street lot or for all the individual lots. If they were trying to get into the Abbey Street lot, then maybe they should price it differently to reflect the demand. Branigan thought they should look at what percentage of the available spots should be permits. Emond asked if the permit was for an unlimited or specific time. Tokos reported they talked about doing a \$25 per month permit. Tokos thought they could also consider these hunting permits. A discussion ensued regarding the number of businesses in the area, and where they wanted to get workers to park. Bretz thought they should put the four yellow lots under the same permit. Then, when the water side was fixed and development started, they could look to fix it. Tokos suggested they call this Zone A, and have it be a paid/permit that were hunting permits. He asked if the Committee thought \$25 a month was a good price. Emond thought that would be a good deal. Goplen pointed out it would be cheaper than paying a \$1 a day for metering. Ripka thought fish workers wouldn't be able to manage meters and would end up getting a ticket.

Goplen asked what the price of the stall for five days a week, for five hours each would be. Tokos didn't have the numbers but reported he ran this per stall, per month during the peak period. He also read this as it being 85 percent utilization, recognizing there was always going to be some degree of vacancy on stalls. Tokos asked what amount of time the group thought was reasonable for permitted parking. Goplen thought 24 hours would be right. Bretz thought they should look at setting the time to be enough for a plant worker to park there for the day and be able to get through their work shift. The Committee was in general agreement to have it be 24 hours. Bretz pointed out they needed to set the price right so that it was balanced so that some plant workers would say it was too much to pay and park up the hill, and others would choose to buy in. Emond thought that since the lot up the hill would be \$25 they should have the yellow areas be at least 50 percent more. They could start the pink lot #33 at \$25 and the yellow at \$50. Tokos reminded that when thinking about permit parking they needed to think about the duration they would actually be metering. He suggested they set it for the full eight hours to cover the duration the meters would be running.

Beckes asked if they set the yellow area at \$100, would they be selling 100 permits or would it maybe be 50. Tokos thought they could designate them as hunting permits and make it so anybody could purchase them. Bretz thought that was what they should do. Tokos reminded that if people became frustrated that they couldn't find spots they could stop purchasing monthly permits. Emond thought they should get the usage statistics to see how much parking was happening in different lots and areas. Tokos noted the objective here was to further refine things so that when they selected the vendor, there would be a clear concept. The vendor might then have some suggestions that could influence the direction the City would want to take. Emond thought the pink lots should be cheaper than the yellow lots. Goplen asked if there should be a tier permit program for businesses that had under five employees and the other programs for businesses who have more employees. Tokos thought they needed to ask themselves what policy objective would lead to doing tiers because they were trying to change behaviors with those that worked at the fish plants and small retail establishments. Goplen thought that this could be an incentive to have employers pay for parking for their staff. Bechler thought that having employees pay for parking would disincentivize people from working on the Bayfront.

Tokos asked if a fee of \$25 for the pink lots and \$40 for the yellow parking lots sounded right. Emond thought it was fair. Branigan asked if people with permits could park in the green areas. Tokos reported they would have to pay. Emond asked for clarification on what Lot 7 was. Tokos explained this wasn't an improved parking area. It was Gino's Restaurant parking and currently a negatable spot. Beckes asked what percentage of the Lot A permits they would sell. Emond thought paid permits should be 150 percent of the spaces. Tokos thought if they were permit only lots they should sell more than the number of spaces they had, because different people would be utilizing the parking on different days. Bechler suggested they make sure it clear that they wouldn't get a guaranteed spot. Branigan suggested they ask the vendors their feeling on how much hunting permits should be. Tokos thought they could pitch a couple of options to say either 150 percent as a cap, or do a hunting permit where they recognized upfront that they weren't guaranteed a space. He reminded that the shift workers and retail workers would typically be able to find spaces because they started earlier in the day. Beckes pointed out that people with permits who went down to the Bayfront to look for parking between noon and 4 p.m. would assume there would be limited parking at that time.

Tokos noted the River Street Lot #28 would be set up as a 12 limit for charters. Bechler asked if it was \$25. Tokos noted their expectation was the charters would be buying temporary day use permits and they would be more like the pink lots. Bechler reported her employees used this hill parking and thought the hill was hard to walk up. She thought the permits shouldn't be \$45 but more like \$25. Tokos asked the Committee if this should be designated Zone B. The Committee was in general agreement with this. Emond asked if the permits would allow holders to park on the street and avoid the four hour parking limit. Tokos confirmed they would and it would be the reason to get a permit. Goplen thought the Area #2 by Ripley's should be a green area. Tokos noted this would be a minor change and pointed out they needed to make sure there were signs there to make it clear the parking was for a fee.

Tokos reviewed the commercial fishing area near Port Dock 5, identified as the orange colored areas. Bretz reminded that the group's thoughts before were about doing this area as a four day time limit for permits with no more than 96 hours. Tokos thought this could be designated as Zone C. Bretz noted the Port had small lots where people would have to pay for separate parking passes for. He said their concept was to keep the cost of the Port's permits under the cost of the City's to get fishermen to park on their lots. Their permits would be for fishermen only. Tokos reminded that they had talked about doing a fleet purchase option through the Port who would be in charge of identifying who was eligible for the program. Bretz explained what they wanted to do was increase the standard to get access for

the permits and to verify who the people were that were working with the commercial fleet. Emond questioned if the permits would be for 96 hours. Bretz asked if the city passes were monthly. Tokos thought it might make sense to make this a year pass for the long stretches. Ripka thought it made more sense for them to be monthly or six months. Tokos suggested they charge \$45 a month, except for when they had a longer duration to stay because of the nature of the business. Goplen felt the fee should be more than \$45. Ripka thought the fishermen would squawk at a higher cost. Bretz pointed out that they would have to put up with people who didn't like the cost. He reminded that these permits would be sold at the City and would have to manage them. Tokos explained the Port would give the City a list of license numbers of those eligible and they City would then build it into the photo sharing system and provide something for them to use. Bretz wanted to make sure the permits showed that they came from the City of Newport. Goplen thought they should consider giving a break on the fees for business owners in the other areas. Ripka thought the fee should be \$50. Armstrong suggested they do a different permit for employees and other pricing for the fleet. Goplen thought the 12 parking spaces between #5 and #3 should be changed. Ripka noted there was a lot of tourist in this area currently. Tokos thought that \$40 would be better than \$50 for this area.

Goplen asked to move the remainder of the discussion to the next meeting. Tokos asked if Zone A should be \$25 a month, if the commercial fishermen permits should also apply to this area as well, and if Port permits could park there too. Goplen suggested the #6 orange area be changed to pink. Ripka thought they should make all of #10 commercial fisherman. A discussion ensued regarding splitting permits between retail employees and fishermen.

6. **Public Comment.** None were heard.

7. **Adjournment.** Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Sherri Marineau
Executive Assistant