

MINUTES
Parking Study Advisory Committee
Meeting #12
Newport City Hall Council Chambers
March 11, 2019

Committee Members Present: Cris Torp, Janet Webster, Bill Branigan, Jeff Lackey, Wendy Engler, Sharon Snow, Linda Neigebauer.

Committee Members Absent: Gary Ripka (excused), Aaron Bretz, Frank Geltner, Laura Anderson, Jody George (excused), Julie Kay, Kathy Cleary, Cynda Bruce, Tom McNamara, and William Bain.

City Staff Present: Community Development Director (CDD), Derrick Tokos, and Police Chief, Jason Malloy; Executive Assistant, Sherri Marineau.

Public Present: Madeline Shannon.

1. Call to Order & Roll Call. Meeting called to order at 3:13 p.m.

1a. Review and Amend Agenda, as Needed. Tokos asked for amendments to agenda. Webster asked to add Chris Torp's handout to the agenda. She also wanted to talk about issues with construction projects on the Bayfront that the Parking Study Advisory Committee (PSAC) wasn't able to talk about at the last meeting.

1b. Approval of Minutes. Webster gave Marineau corrections to the January 31, 2019 minutes. Motion was given by Webster, seconded by Torp, to approve the January 31, 2019 minutes with corrections. All approved.

2. Adopted Ordinance Relating to Parking Enforcement for Timed Limited Areas and City Parking Lots. Police Chief, Jason Malloy reviewed where the City was at with the adoption of the parking enforcement ordinance.

Discussion Items:

- Webster: Concerned the definition of a block wasn't obvious. Malloy explained that intersections were defined and the Police Department utilized intersections in order to define blocks.
- Snow: Wondered how cars that were parking over timed limits were identified. Malloy explained that their tires were marked.
- Branigan: Asked how the public would be educated on the new ordinance. Malloy explained there would be a public campaign for locals. Webster and Snow liked the idea of talking to the fish plant workers on the new rules.
- Torp: Asked if the parking violation language would be posted on the parking kiosks. Malloy explained that whomever made the decisions would discuss what should be posted but reminded the PSAC that not all rules could be posted. Tokos explained that if there was policy going forward, there would be a parking committee who would be giving feedback on details for a roll out plan.
- Webster: Asked what the parking enforcement officer's hours would be. Malloy reported the officer would work 40 hours a week, Thursdays through Mondays. Tony Garbarino was hired as the parking enforcement officer. He would identify gaps and would be talking to Public Works to see what could be done. Garbarino would also be meeting with business owners to see what their concerns were.
- Snow: Would the city advertise enforcement hours for meters. Malloy explained there would be a roll out plan for this with advanced outreach.

- Torp: Could parallel parking be encouraged at the west end of the Bayfront. Malloy explained that parallel parking meant a loss of parking spaces. An alternative would be parking on only one side of the street but there would be other parking concerns to consider such as loading vehicles.
- Webster: Would the parking enforcement officer be available to meet with the parking committee. Malloy confirmed that they would because the officer would try to join any committee that involved enforcement.

3. Draft Amendments to Public Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Tokos reviewed the Public Parking Facilities element of the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that he took elements from the Lancaster Study and PowerPoint slides the PSAC had worked out and used both to define amendments to include in the document.

Discussion Items:

- Webster: Add dates of when the districts were established.
- Webster: Call out Pacific Seafood (fish processing) and restaurants as major industries in the description.
- A discussion ensued regarding a question on if additional outreach would happen before or after the document went to the Planning Commission. Suggestions included holding a special Chamber of Commerce meeting, doing surveys through the News Times or handouts, and including the outreach in the City's new e-newsletter. Tokos explained there still needed to be more outreach done.
- Engler: Questioned if the last two paragraphs on "Outreach" needed to be included. Tokos explained how it was important to include what outreach had been done.
- Engler: Align the language that referenced to the districts with the Comprehensive Plan language. In the first paragraph cross out "retail-oriented, tourist commercial businesses" and add "a shopping, government and hospital district" which was how it was described in the Peninsula Urban Design Plan.
- Engler: Nye Beach should be called a "mixed-use neighborhood".
- Engler: Suggested using "commercial" to describe Nye Beach would take away from the neighborhood. It should say "neighborhood" anywhere it was referenced as "commercial" for Nye Beach.
- Webster: Add a better lead in for the transition on the "Existing Public Parking Assets".
- Engler: Add a date for when the inventory was done.
- Webster: Add an explanation on why the figures for "stripes on street spaces" on Pages 2 and Page 14 weren't the same.
- Webster: Add dates for when the Pavement Conditions Assessment was done.
- Tokos: Public Works' updated pavement management program was used to update the cost figures for the Maintenance Schedule.
- Webster: Where were the figures for the maintenance on the Angle Street lot. Tokos said the Angle Street lot and the Nye Beach turnaround costs were shown on the table but were backed out of the maintenance piece on Table 4. He would make a note to that effect on the draft and make an adjustment on Table 3.
- Torp: Add a blue banner under Table 3 to highlight it like the rest of the tables.
- Torp: Add information on which meeting is being referenced when a "meeting" is noted in the document.
- Webster: Add that there were "some" issues and solutions for incorporating the Parking Management Plan.
- Engler: Questioned if "robust" public input was necessary. Tokos explained it was taken from the study but he would take it out.
- Torp: The Lancaster report should be "a" study not "the" study and was an attachment to this process.

- Engler: Questioned why there was a lot of narrative going into the comprehensive plan. Tokos said there needed to be enough included to show how it was framed and have context for the recommendation to follow.
- Webster: Call out the areas in the document where the recommendations were from the Lancaster Study, not the PSAC. Reflect that the PSAC condensed the plan down.

Recommendations Discussion:

- Webster: Fix the missing summarization for the last bullet under Parking Improvements on Page 12.
- Webster: The capital projects on Page 13, Table 5 was from the Lancaster report, not the PSAC.
- Tokos: Noted the Don Davis Park piece would to be taken out.
- Engler: Asked for clarification that the Parking Management Plan on Page 12 was Lancaster's not the PSAC. Tokos confirmed that it was Lancaster and would add language that Lancaster's product was formed by the PSAC but was also later refined by the group into a recommendation.

Goal 1 Discussion:

- Engler: Add "mixed-use neighborhood" at the end of the first sentence for Goal 1 in reference to Nye Beach. Torp suggested using the term "three distinct neighborhoods". Engler liked calling them "districts". Tokos would add the mixed-use concept.
- Engler: Concerned that Policy 1.1.1 was saying that the PSAC was agreeing to pursuing metered zones. Tokos explained the PSAC wasn't agreeing to this for this meeting. Engler noted that she hadn't heard from anyone that they were agreeing to metering on Nye Beach at this time. Tokos said this could be juxtaposed with Goal 4, Policy 4.1.2 that clarified they would do further outreach in Nye Beach to determine if they would do limited metering or a non-meter business license/permit approach.
- Neigebauer: Once enforcement became a part of what would be happening for parking, they would know what to do in Nye Beach with metering. Tokos would do a language adjustment to Policy 1.1 to reflect this.
- Torp: Requested that any changes to the Goals be highlighted when they are shown to the PSAC. Tokos would show changes as a markups.
- Webster: Flip Policies 1.1 and 1.2 so that wayfinding, lighting, and alternative modes were before metering and permitting.
- Webster: Questioned if the police could do a late shift to observe lighting. Malloy thought this could be done. It would be added to their list when there was better weather.
- Torp: Switch Goal 1 Policies so that they were in this order: 1.3, 1.2, then 1.1.
- Webster: Nothing had been implemented for Policy 1.4. Tokos reported the old laundry site was considered as an opportunity. Engler didn't think anyone was interested in this site and was concerned it wasn't right for a parking structure. Tokos explained how the location came up in the context of the parking plan work and noted the Abbey Street lot was also discussed.
- Webster: Questioned if people would understand what "structured parking" was when reading the goals. Tokos thought it was more about if there was value in having a policy and if it was something they should be doing. It pointed out there was limited funding for these types of things and how it should be leveraged.
- Engler: Change "pursue" possibilities, to "entertain" on Policy 1.4.
- Torp: Move Policy 1.4 to be part of 1.3. Tokos noted it wouldn't fit under the heading but it could be changed to "entertain, investigate or explore" opportunities.
- Engler: Policy 1.4 should talk about bike routes, sidewalks, and multi-use paths to promote local transportation.
- Webster: Continue to expand sidewalk language especially between the hospital and the Bayfront.

Goal 2 Discussion:

- Engler: Suggested that vacation rentals that had conditional use approvals pay into the parking districts since they weren't already.
- Webster: Questioned if fishermen who were selling fish off of their boats were paying into the parking district. Tokos would check into this.

- Lackey: Questioned if the Port was paying into the parking district. Tokos would check on this.
- Snow: Policy 2.1.1 should be “demand” as opposed to “year-round” to help with confusion. Tokos suggested take out “as opposed to year-round”.
- Torp: Suggested that anything being done with meters for enforcement needed to be done for permits.
- Webster: Implementation measures needed to be added for permits. Tokos to work this into permitting.
- Engler: Policy 2.1.4 mentioned a license surcharge and was where she suggested adding that vacation rentals should contribute to the parking district.
- Webster: Questioned the City Center adjustments for Policy 2.3. Tokos explained this district was different than the other two districts. The maintenance approached would be based on how transportation investment was reprioritized.
- Webster: Concerned with City policy for the Rec Center and Angle Street parking lots not being metered and how they were being utilized by the Rec Center and City staff when they were making other businesses pay for parking. Tokos explained that the City Center area parking wasn’t the same as the Bayfront. Webster thought there needed to be another policy focusing on the City campus. She was also concerned about the Farmers Market using the parking lot without providing parking. The parking lot couldn’t be utilized for park and ride.

Goal 3 Discussion:

- Engler: Concerned about how they could reduce or eliminate off-street parking for new development. Tokos explained how the concept in areas where there was demand management there would be better turnover for those stalls and therefore require off-street parking be provided where they effectively couldn’t. Webster declared she had a conflict of interest with this because she owned Bayfront property.
- Engler: Questioned if new developments that weren’t required to have off-street parking should have to pay into the parking district or pay into something to offset the costs somewhere else. Tokos explained that with most development they would explore opportunities to provide some off-street parking. The business license surcharge concept was also out there and would help contribute. Engler wondered how this would apply if a new vacation rental development went in and they didn’t have to provide any parking. Tokos said it would be structured so that everyone who was not providing off-street parking would have to do some sort of contribution. This would probably be through a business license surcharge.
- Webster: If the city was promoting development in Policy 3.2.3 the proprietor should have to have a parking plan. Tokos thought Policy 3.2.3 was more about the Bayfront and should free up enough spaces to provide parking. Webster thought it should say “Bayfront”.

Goal 4 Discussion:

- Torp: When forming the new advisory committee, two (2) at large members should be included.

4. Ordinance Related to Establishing a Standing Parking Advisory Committee. Tokos asked the PSAC for revisions and comments.

Discussion Items:

- Torp: Concerned that not having meters in the City Center meant that Nye Beach and Bayfront had taken over the discussion. He felt the new Advisory Committee (AC) would be better with four (4) people from Nye Beach and the Bayfront. Neigebauer thought it would be difficult to get four people from these two districts. Tokos noted that since the Transportation System Plan was coming up there would be more interest from the City Center.
- Webster: How would the new AC interact with the Bike and Pedestrian Committee and Transit. She suggested merging both committees to make one Transit Committee. Tokos thought that transit could be included but the Bike and Pedestrian Committee was more challenging to merge because of parking issues.

- Neigebauer: Add the Wayfinding Committee as part of the AC or having one person sit on the committee to keep the line of communication open.
- Webster: Thought a six (6) person committee was better.
- Tokos: Suggested seven (7) total members so that there were enough to get a quorum that had meaning.
- Webster: Suggested changing the name of the committee to “Transportation and Parking”.
- The PSAC was in general agreement to having the committee as seven (7) member structure.
- Webster: Concerned that the committee members would have to be “affiliated” with businesses in parking districts. Tokos reminded that it was up to the PSAC to say if they wanted people from parking districts. He suggested there be seven (7) members with three (3) being business owners in each district.
- Tokos: Suggested adding someone from the Port or fishing industry. Lacey agreed.
- Branigan: Questioned if someone from the fishing plants should be included. Snow thought that if someone from commercial fishing or the Port was included, that would cover them.
- Engler: Liked the idea of including a resident in Nye Beach.
- Tokos: Stated that what he was hearing was the PSAC wanted two members each from the parking districts, plus one, and to generalize the language. They also wanted to make sure there was some reference to the commercial fishing interest.

Tokos said he would make revisions to the document and update the ordinance. He noted that most of the questions that Torp had asked were covered in the meeting discussion.

Tokos asked Webster if she still had questions for her additional agenda items. Webster asked what was happening with the Apollo’s property. Tokos explained that the project was mostly demolition but he could check to see what their schedule was. He noted that Ripley’s was going to be doing work. Webster felt it was important to provide an alert or a conduit to notify people on the Bayfront of what was happening. She also requested updates on the Nye Beach turnaround and communications with the neighborhood.

Tokos said he would get a meeting request out for the next meeting which would include final documents with highlighted markups of the changes, a bullet list of outreach thoughts, and a discussion on whether or not the PSAC was comfortable making a recommendation at that point. Webster thought the PSAC still needed to talk about the permits and felt there was a lack of agreement on how permits would work, what the costs would be, how many permits there would be, and how it would work with the fishermen. Tokos said he would frame permits in terms of what the discussions had been.

Lackey questioned what the PSAC would be making a decision on for a recommendation. Tokos said the thought was that this would be step one by having the goal policies and implementation measures framed enough that it could go through a policy making discussion and get adopted as is, or have a modified version through the process.

5. **Resignation of Tom McNamara.** No discussion was heard.
6. **Public Comment/Questions.** None were heard.
7. **Adjournment.** Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Sherri Marineau
Executive Assistant