



## **PARKING ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA**

**Wednesday, April 19, 2023 - 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 Erik Glover, City Recorder at 541.574.0613, or [e.glover@newportoregon.gov](mailto:e.glover@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](mailto: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 March 29, 2023 Parking Advisory Committee Meeting.  
[Draft Parking Advisory Comm Mtg Minutes 03-29-2023](#)

### 4. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 4.1 Review of Potential Regulatory Signage Changes and Placement with Street Superintendent Justin Scharbrough.
- 4.2 Discuss Regulatory Sign Concepts.
- 4.3 Potential Changes to Loading Zone Areas.
- 4.4 E-Permit Pricing and Availability.
- 4.5 Timing and Location for Outreach with Affected Stakeholders.

### 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:

- [Parking Regulatory Sign Concepts](#)
- [Map Showing Regulatory Sign Locations](#)
- [Response to Cris Torp Email](#)

## Memorandum

To: Parking Advisory Committee  
From: Derrick I. Tokos, AICP, Community Development Director   
Date: April 14, 2023  
Re: Topics for April 19<sup>th</sup> Parking Advisory Committee Meeting

---

The City of Newport's Street Superintendent, Justin Scharbrough, will join us to review changes to sign pole placement and the regulatory signage needed to implement the parking management solution. He has put together a map in Google Earth showing where sign poles will be placed, or in some cases replaced. A hardcopy of the map is enclosed. Our plan is to walk through the Google Earth map with you interactively, as he has imbedded images showing where each sign change is to occur.

Public Works staff has also put together regulatory sign templates to reflect the paid/permit concept discussed at your previous meetings. This is an opportunity for the group to provide feedback before the concepts are finalized.

Additional agenda items for the meeting include a review of potential changes to loading zone areas, electronic permit pricing and availability, and the timing/location for outreach with affected stakeholders. Materials related to these topics will be distributed on Wednesday.

### Attachments

Parking Regulatory Sign Concepts  
Map Showing Regulatory Sign Locations

**Draft MINUTES**  
**Parking Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting #9**  
**Newport City Hall Council Chambers**  
**March 29, 2023**

---

**Committee Members Present:** Aaron Bretz, Janell Goplen (*by video*), Bill Branigan (*by video*), Aracelly Guevara (*by video*), Doretta Smith, Jan Kaplan, Gary Ripka and Robert Emond.

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

1. **Call to Order & Roll Call.** Meeting started at 6:03 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.**

MOTION was made by Bill Branigan, seconded by Robert Emond, to approve the February 15, 2023 Parking Advisory Committee meeting minutes with minor corrections. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

3. **Final Review of T2 Systems Contract Package.** Tokos reviewed the revisions to the T2 Systems contract package. At the last committee meeting they went through the map, and confirmed that 10 kiosks was the right number, and determined where their locations would be on the map. Tokos reported the contract amount had been bumped up. The City Council authorized that it not exceed \$320,000 over a five year period, as opposed to \$260,000 over a five year period. The increase in in the number of pay stations and adding the coin options increased the costs. Tokos reported that the Police Chief was comfortable with the coin option. He explained that they upgraded the 10 kiosks that were credit card only to stations that could accept chip and contactless transactions. The number of text to pay signs would be 45 and they also extended the pay by phone functionality as well. Tokos reported they made a change on who would handle the wireless side of things. The city chose to work with Version themselves instead of through T2 Systems. They also adjusted things relative to training to allow for cost saving. Tokos reported the \$320,000 figure was well within the budget. During year one they were looking at spending \$175,000 which left them well over \$200,000 or more to upgrade parking lots and things of that nature. The City Attorney was currently reviewing the contract and they hoped to have T2 Systems under contract soon. Tokos reported that it looked like things would be implemented by July 1st.

Goplen asked that since they would be signing a three year contract would they be able to change things in the agreement if the technology changed in the next three years. She thought the technology could change quickly and the city might realize they needed to completely update things. Tokos explained that once they moved past the installation, they could pursue what options they had should they need to pull out of an agreement with T2. He pointed out that the expenses would drop considerably after year one. Smith asked if the contract covered software updates. Tokos confirmed it did and noted the ongoing service package included upgrades to the software, both for the back end and the kiosk updates.

4. **Pay Station Decal Options.** Tokos reviewed the standard blue decal options with the Committee. Goplen thought this was fine because it was what other cities were using. Smith thought they should have the Newport logo included. Tokos assumed that the sides of the kiosks would have Newport's customized logo on them. The Committee was in general agreement to go with the blue color.

Branigan asked if they had an option to put in a small LED screen on the kiosk to advertise businesses on the waterfront. Tokos explained that T2 offered options for advertising and they could bring this forward for discussion at future meetings. Bretz asked what the cutoff date was to order the kiosks. Tokos reported the kiosks were already going in and the Committee was just making decisions on the logos. There were elements that could be added in later. Ripka wondered if the city was set up to charge for advertising. Goplen pointed out the city had Discover Newport and the Destination Newport Committee who the city could partner with. Tokos thought this could be done. They weren't set up for it currently but they were working towards it. Ripka thought this was a question that should be brought up. Tokos would bring back what T2 was offering for advertising. He would also let T2 know they would go with the standard decal with the blue color. Goplen suggested they add how people would be able to get help if they were having problems on the LCD kiosk screens.

- 5. Planned Bayfront Parking Lot Improvements.** Tokos reviewed the Bayfront Parking Meter-Permit Plan map with the Committee. He noted that the map would get more elaborate in the coming months. Tokos reported that he had walked the Bayfront during Spring Break and plugged in where they would be making signage adjustments. At the next meeting they would add questions relative to potential changes to the areas that had striped parking, discuss loading zones, and review how the 20 minute parking worked with the overall program. Emond asked if there was an ordinance that defined parking. Tokos confirmed the municipal code set the parameters for parking in loading zones. There would be a recommendation from the City Engineer in respect to sizing. There would be changes to the parking code in future meetings. The current code didn't have the kiosk and metering component in it which needed to be built into it. Emond asked to have the existing code added as a discussion item in the next meeting.

Ripka asked what the parking was from England Marine to Eads Street. Tokos explained this would be a permit/timed area where people would have to meet the parking time limitations or they would need a permit. The only change was a minor change on the west end where they added three spaces that were in the meter area previously. During the rate discussion, the Committee had designated a pink area as a Tier 2 zone, and determined it would be \$25 a month with a 12 hour maximum. If someone didn't have a permit they could park four hours. Ripka pointed out this was a big overflow area for crabbers. Tokos explained there would be a permit for a 72 hour period. The cost would be \$45 in the orange areas or \$25 a month for the Tier 2 area. The expectation was that the commercial fishermen would deal with a reduced \$25 a month permit in the pink areas and still have their 72 hour allowance. Tokos explained that this would be an electronic license plate recognition permit. The fishermen would get an email invitation to get a permit. Goplen asked if the process for the invites had been discussed yet. She wanted to know what constituted a commercial fishermen and how many passes there would be. Bretz explained the city would need a list of the current Port parking passes to know this. If the Port had to do some sort of vetting, he thought the effective way to do it would be to have each person that worked on a commercial boat have their captain vouch for them to say they were an employee. Tokos thought that was reasonable. This could be adjusted down the road if there were issues. Goplen asked how new boats would be added. Bretz explained they came into the Port's office to report it and the Port was already doing this. Goplen asked if there would be a situation where the Port wasn't open. Bretz noted there was a couple of days lag time to get any administrative item done. Smith thought they needed to give thought on how they would get the information to the Police.

Ripka thought it would be a problem when a person came in at the last minute and parked a car without a permit who didn't have cell service to get a permit. He asked this would deal with this. Tokos asked how much lead time they had for fishermen. Ripka reported that the crews they were dealing with these days had guys that didn't show up and the captain had to scramble to get people

on the crew at the last minute. This happened a lot and the more elite fleet they were the more this happened. Tokos thought they could set it up so the ship captains had a trip permit they could prepay for these individuals. This would mean that they would have to get license plates to handle it this way. Ripka liked that and noted he had a lot of people who had Joe Doe licenses. Goplen reminded that T2 Systems talked about a special code to use as payment. Ripka thought the captains could consider subtracting the cost of the permits from the crew's wages. Bretz thought they should consider having a way to have the vessel owner operator limit the number of permits. They could assigned a certain number of passes, or they could put it on the individual to make sure they got their permits. Bretz though then it would be on the individual to deal with their own parking tickets. Ripka thought they should do this the same way they did the John Doe fishing licenses. Bretz questioned how they could link that to individual vehicles.

Emond questioned how long the passes would last. Goplen suggested they have T2 give them some options. Tokos noted the key was how to get the license plate in the system before citations were issued. Emond thought it would be nice to give a boat a certain number of licenses. Then, when they had their crew the boat would log the license plate numbers in the system before they left. Bretz thought they could use the kiosks to do this. Then it would be on the person who owned the vehicle to get it done, and less worry for the captain. Smith questioned what happened if they were out to sea and there wasn't any cell service. Ripka noted that if they were within 20 nautical miles from land they would have cell service. Bretz thought that anyone going further north, would be looking to get their people to park at different areas. Ripka noted his crew made adjustments on how they parked when they knew they were going to be gone a long time. Bretz thought that once people understood what was going on they would get used to it. Ripka wanted to keep this to the vehicle as much as possible. Bretz noted people lost the incentive to deal with permits when they gave them an option to have their bosses deal with a ticket. He expressed concerns that people would give out their codes to other people. Tokos noted the system kept records on chronic bad behavior. Bretz pointed out there would be people who would have multiple vehicles. Tokos noted they had the ability to control pricing and that would influence how many codes they would want to buy. Bretz noted that the Port usually let things go on parking violation tickets for people where were out fishing, as long as they bought a parking pass. Emond wasn't convinced on the price for commercial permits and thought it should be a higher price if the main goal was to change behavior for parking. Ripka thought they were trying to change the behavior of the tourist, not the fishermen. He understood that if they changed their behavior there would be more parking for commercial fishermen.

Tokos reviewed the legend on the map and the proposed prices for parking and permits. Goplen noted there were several retail shop owners that approached her expressing concerns that the commercial fishermen could buy permits but they couldn't. Tokos thought they needed to make this clear with everybody so that they understood how it would work.

Bretz asked about the charter boat permits and if they would run through the charter offices and assign them to their clients. Tokos reminded the charter offices would buy the permits and give them to their clients. Goplen asked who would run this. Tokos explained that this would be done through the epermitting system and they would give their clients the codes. This hadn't been sorted out on the staff side yet. It would either be done through finance or parking enforcement.

Ripka understood the retail owners' concerns on the permits, but reminded that retail had parking lots available to them. The commercial didn't have an option of a parking lot close by and was an argument on why they were getting permits. Goplen noted the complaints she heard about were from businesses that didn't have loading zones in front of their businesses and had to park elsewhere to load things into them. Smith asked if the lots in yellow and pink on the map were permitted. Tokos explained there were permit options for these and retailers could purchase permits for them. Goplen noted this

was something that needed to be communicated to retailers. Tokos noted this process was about changing behavior and it would have some impact of commercial fishing fleets. He thought they did a good job of structuring this to show that the needs of the fishermen had been met. Tokos thought the way this had been mapped out was done pretty effectively and priced appropriately. Ripka thought the fishermen would gain more availability for parking because they were changing behaviors.

Smith asked for clarification on the paid parking fee. A discussion ensued regarding whether paid parking should be \$1 per hour for up to either four or eight hours. Bretz thought limits were a good idea. Tokos noted they could change it to four hour limit. Goplen asked if this meant someone would have to move their car after four hours. Tokos noted they had measured the normal turnover rates on the Bayfront and people parked an average of 2.5 hours. He didn't think tourists that had a problem with four hours and thought it was generous. The committee was in general agreement to keep it at four hours.

Tokos reviewed the changes they were doing for improvements to Abbey, Fall Street, Bay Boulevard, and Hatfield Drive lots. Ripka asked why there wasn't a kiosk on the Lee lot. Tokos explained they always had this lot as an option for timed permits and an option for people working on the Bayfront. They would be discussing this at further meetings to see how to limit these and how many permits they should make available in each tier.

Tokos reviewed the cost estimate sheet for the Abbey Street Lot. Goplen thought since they were making improvements in the lots they should look to add EV charging stations in them. She reported there were grants available to add charging stations on lots. Tokos noted EV charging stations were an additional cost and expensive. There was already one at City Hall and the Ernest Bloch Wayside. These ran around \$50,000 apiece and brought up additional costs the city would have to deal with. Tokos explained these could be added later and they could identify where the stations could go. The city didn't have the budget to put in a lot of stations. Goplen noted that Travel Oregon had grants that paid 90 percent of the costs for them. Tokos thought they could look to see which of the lots would be good for them. Smith asked if someone who was taking up a charging station would have to pay for their parking. Tokos thought they could make changes to add the time they were charging their vehicle to the parking fees.

Bretz thought that it looked like they were using what was left of the budget to update the lots. He wondered if it was better to focus on a few lots to make them nice with things like EV charging stations and lights. Tokos explained that when they looked at the state of the lots they showed a lot of wear and tear, and needed improvements for striping and things of that nature. Bretz noted the study suggested they could benefit from lighting and motivate people to use those areas. He thought an investment for lighting and wayfinding would be a better use of funds.

Bretz asked if the Bay Boulevard lot was on pilings. Tokos didn't think it was and noted it wasn't on the water. The dock portion was on pilings and leased to the fish plant who were responsible for maintaining it. Bretz thought if they were doing work on the lot, they should make sure the fill was in good shape before they did anything. Tokos explained that the Engineering Department walked through these lots. They recommended a grinding and inlay to the Bay Boulevard lot. Tokos noted that when they did this they would typically see any defects below.

Smith agreed that they should look into grants for EV charging stations. Goplen said she could share the information she had for the grants. Tokos noted they would need to have a discussion with the City Council to add multiple stations and determine how they would be maintained. Goplen thought that if Newport was going to be a competitive tourist city they needed to implement the EV charging stations. Tokos wasn't sure, even with the grant funds, they could make the timing match exactly.

What they could do was make sure when they wanted to do this work they flagged the areas where they should implement them. Ripka noted the projection of the population who would have EVs in 2035 was 90 percent.

Ripka asked what the slurry cover life expectancy would be. Tokos noted when they did the parking study they did a life expectancy of a slurry seal and when they would need a full overlay. They wanted to avoid a full reconstruction by just doing slurry seals. Bretz asked if they needed to look at the level of changes for stormwater improvements. Tokos said they didn't.

Tokos covered the Fall Street lot updates. Emond asked if they broke the cost down per stall. Tokos reported they hadn't.

Tokos covered the Bay Boulevard and Canyon Way lot improvements. Goplen asked what the public notification cost was. Tokos explained they had to reach out to potentially impacted parties to let them know about the work. Goplen asked if the cost estimate could be lowered. Tokos noted this was a lump sum and the actual costs would be determined when it was done.

Tokos covered the Lee Street and Hatfield Drive lot improvements. Emond asked if the prices included signs for the lots. Tokos explained that was a separate item. The city had a sign shop where most of these would be generated. Tokos noted that signage was a minor cost. The Committee was in general agreement that this was a reasonable approach.

Goplen thought they should identify all the lots that had power and could have EV charging stations. Tokos noted they had to flag and identify areas where they needed additional poles. Kaplan asked if the current budget covered this. Tokos noted the current budget was for \$640,000 over a five year period. and opened up doors for them to do more.

Goplen asked if Tokos could get information for the next meeting on lighting and EV charging stations. Tokos wasn't sure he could because it would be involved and would take some time to research. Bretz thought they should be looking at the lighting gaps and upgrading the lighting to LEDs. He also thought landscaping was another thing they needed to consider. Tokos reiterated that what he was hearing was that the improvements were feasible and that they needed to pick up additional lighting that wasn't included. Bretz thought they should look at lots that transitioned from shore to water to make sure they were covered. Ripka thought the public notification had fluff in the costs and didn't have any rhyme or reason. Tokos noted these were estimates and the actual costs would be what they were in the end. He would add lighting and talk to Public Works to tighten up the notice estimates, identify EV install opportunities while being sensitive to the structural conditions, and look for opportunities to swap out any non LED lights. Goplen requested the lights have hanging features.

6. **Continued Discussion Regarding Regulatory Signage and Pricing.** Tokos reviewed photos of the existing sign posts on the Bayfront, and the signs that they wanted to change to. He questioned if they wanted to have RV parking on the Bay Boulevard. A discussion ensued regarding current locations that RVs could park. Tokos asked if they should allow RV parking on the Bayfront at all. Ripka thought allowing them would give an open invitation for homeless people to do RV parking. Goplen thought taking down the RV signs would be great but questioned if this would mean that RVs wouldn't be allowed to park there. Tokos explained they needed to extend where they had the marked parking spaces. Bretz noted that the 18 wheelers used this area for parking and queuing. Ripka didn't want to give people an avenue to fight the city on parking RVs on the Bayfront. Bretz thought the time limit would be prohibitive enough to help with behavior. Emond asked what the problem would be if it was just four hour parking for RVs. He thought if they were camping there and they received



tickets they would be addressed through the ordinance. Tokos explained it would be addressed through enforcement. He thought that what this discussion suggested was that they mark the area as a standard stall. Smith asked what other options for parking the RVs would be provided. Tokos reported there were specific parking spaces in the 9th and Hurbert lots but not on the bayfront. Kaplan noted at one point there was discussion to do a shuttle and asked if this was something they could do for RVs. Tokos noted the shuttle was part of phase two because they needed a revenue stream to pay for the bus driver, advertising, and ongoing things for a shuttle program. They never pinned it down if the shuttle would be tourist or employer oriented. The costs were mapped out, which they understood the real cost would be around \$220,000 a year to make it work. They needed a revenue stream before they could do this. Tokos stated that what he was hearing was the sign for the RV wasn't useful and at a minimum they needed to get rid of the sign. Bretz thought they should take the sign down and leave the spots unmarked for industrial use. Ripka and Goplen agreed with Bretz. Ripka didn't want a sign but thought it would open up the city for problems with the homeless parking an RV there.

Tokos reviewed the color choices for the poles, that were brown and black. The committee questioned why there had to be two colors. Tokos explained there were brown lights and black lights, and which ever light poles they were by they wanted them to be painted to match. This area was a view corridor and they were trying to match up signs with the poles. The Committee was in general agreement to go with the Black Brown color on all the poles.

- 7. Timing and Location for Outreach with Affected Stakeholders.** Tokos reported the Committee would talk about the outreach and timing of when the kiosks would be coming in at the next meeting. Goplen asked if the outreach would be done by the city or if they had a RFP to do this. Tokos reported the Committee would be doing this. They were most effective when they engaged people as a team. Goplen requested the marking effort include social media. Ripka reminded they went through this before the pandemic with the Port Commission. He thought they had a good response at that time. When they sprung things on people the response wasn't ever good. Ripka thought they needed to make sure to sell this. Smith thought they needed to get correct information out to the media. Emond thought they needed to determine the pricing as well. Ripka noted when they sold this to the fleet they needed to have a hearing and get the Port Commission behind this. He felt they needed to be prepared and have everything as finalized as they could be. Bretz thought the Port Commission would be happy to talk about what they were doing. What mattered most was the reasons why Newport was doing this. People worried about this impacting tourism, and making Newport unfriendly. Tokos pointed out that previously the question had been what the right solution was. They had picked a solution, and the question now was if they had set this up right and what were the changes should be making. Tokos noted they had to convey that the City Council made the decision. Bretz thought they should demonstrate how it would work. Ripka thought this wasn't a bad thing for the commercial fishing fleet. Currently there were people who parked in spots for long periods of time. Ripka thought the way they needed to sell it was to say that when there was rollover they had more of a chance of getting a parking spot. Goplen asked if they would do work on this at the next meeting. Tokos reported they would be meeting to talk about outreach and what the details were when they held the meetings. He would try to frame what this could look like to guide the discussion. They could work this out at the next couple of meetings. Tokos reported they would be doing the outreach sixty days before the implementation.

Smith asked if the pricing would go to the City Council to finalize. Tokos confirmed it would and it would be built into some code changes. This would be set by resolution. Smith asked when this needed to go to City Council. Tokos reported it needed to go to them by their first meeting in June because they didn't want to force the implementation date.

8. **Public Comment.** None were heard.

9. **Adjournment.** Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Sherri Marineau  
Executive Assistant

## Regulatory Sign Discussion

Paid (Meter) Streets  
Green Dots on Map



Paid/Permit Streets  
Yellow Dots on Map



Paid/Permit Lots  
Yellow Dots on Map



Permit/Timed Streets  
Red Dots on Map



Permit/Timed Lots  
Red Dots on Map



Loading Zones



Note: Commercial Fisherman Zone Permit to Allow 72 Hour Occupancy.



## Sherry Marineau

---

**From:** Derrick Tokos  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 19, 2023 7:59 AM  
**To:** Sherry Marineau  
**Subject:** FW: For today's PAC meeting

Please post to the packet.

---

**From:** Derrick Tokos <>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 31, 2023 11:38 AM  
**To:** 'Cris torp'  
**Cc:** Erik Glover ; Sherry Marineau  
**Subject:** RE: For today's PAC meeting

Hi Cris,

I was in the field Wednesday afternoon and didn't catch the email that you sent shortly before the Project Advisory Committee meeting that evening. We can include it in the packet for the Committee's upcoming meeting on April 19<sup>th</sup>.

I'll try to answer your question as well. We had hoped to minimize the number of required pay stations, and during the RFP selection process had discussed a need for up to six of them with the vendors. The contract that the Council approved with T2 Systems, Inc. included funds sufficient for that number of pay stations along with a contingency in the event adjustments were needed. Subsequently, I prepared the detailed map that you are referring to after walking the proposed meter and meter/permit areas with City Engineering staff. That is when it became apparent that at least 10 would be needed given how parking is arranged in the area.

The Parking Advisory Committee reviewed the map with the 10 pay station locations at its February 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, and there was a general consensus that we would need the 10 pay stations. There was also general consensus that a coin option would need to be added, which increased the per station cost. I undoubtedly mentioned that the approved contract included a "not to exceed" amount of \$260,000 over a five year period and had hoped that the contingency would be sufficient to cover the adjustments. Once T2 updated their quotes to pick up the changes it became evident that it would be necessary for the Council to execute a change order to increase the "not to exceed" amount to \$320,000. The Council took that step on March 20, 2023, and the map showing the 10 pay stations was included in the meeting packet.

*Derrick I. Tokos, AICP*  
Community Development Director  
City of Newport  
169 SW Coast Highway  
Newport, OR 97365  
ph: 541.574.0626 fax: 541.574.0644  
[d.tokos@newportoregon.gov](mailto:d.tokos@newportoregon.gov)

---

**From:** Erik Glover  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 29, 2023 1:42 PM  
**To:** Spencer Nebel ; Dean Sawyer ; Derrick Tokos  
; Jason Malloy ; Brent Gainer

**Subject:** FW: For today's PAC meeting

Derrick, can you forward this correspondence to your PAC? I don't have their contact information readily available.

Erik

**Erik Glover**

Assistant City Manager/City Recorder  
City of Newport, Oregon 97365  
541-574-0613  
[e.glover@newportoregon.gov](mailto:e.glover@newportoregon.gov)

---

**From:** cris torp  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 29, 2023 12:08 PM  
**To:** Erik Glover  
**Subject:** For today's PAC meeting

**[WARNING]** This message comes from an external organization. Be careful of embedded links.

---

Eric,  
Please disseminate to the listed recipients. Thanks. Cris Torp, South Beach (541-867-4241)

TO: Members, Parking Advisory Committee; CDD, Derrick Tokos; Police Chief Malloy; City Manager, Spencer Nebel; Honorable Mayor, Dean Sawyer  
From: Cris Torp (Former member of the former PAC)

Subject: PAC Minutes of Feb 15, 2023 and Change Order [Additional funds] action at CC Meeting March 20, 2023

Dear Gentlepeople:

Although the minutes of the PAC's Feb. 15 don't reflect it, I seem to recall some discussion of both Number and Location of the kiosks. Mention of the "location" is obvious; mention of "numbers" is not. I also find reference to Mr. Tokos' follow-up discussions with T2 Systems regarding potential/possible changes. But it was my understanding (verified by Mr. Tokos' own comments) that whatever changes might be needed, those changes must remain within the approved \$260,000 budget.

The City Council was presented (Mar, 20, 2023) with a Motion to increase the contract amount to \$320,000. This seems to have been presented due to the "additional number of kiosks" from 6 to 10 that had been originally determined. Its presentation was bolstered because of some technological upgrades that were deemed necessary following the Tokos/T2 discussion.

When I attended the Feb 15 meeting I brought with me the Bay Front map of the Parking Meter Management area. Clearly shown on this map are the TEN Kiosk locations; this is the identical map offered to the CC at its Mar. 20 meeting. Just as "clear", it seems to me, that a map that showed TEN kiosks in Feb is the same map that shows SIX "additional" kiosks in March.

Question: How is the same map being used for different outcomes?

Respectfully, Cris Torp