

MINUTES
Parking Advisory Committee
Meeting #11
Newport City Hall Council Chambers
May 17, 2023

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

Committee Members Absent: Gary Ripka.

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

1. **Call to Order & Roll Call.** Meeting started at 6:05 p.m.
2. **Approval of Minutes.** Bill Branigan reported minor corrections to the minutes.

MOTION was made by Aaron Bretz, seconded by Doretta Smith, to approve the April 19, 2023 Parking Advisory Committee meeting minutes with minor corrections. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

3. **E-Permit Pricing and Availability.** Tokos reviewed the staff memorandum and noted there would be a kickoff meeting happening with T2 Systems and city staff that Friday. He reviewed the ePermitting pricing and talked through some of the options with the group. Tokos covered the Bayfront parking permit zone options for Zones A through D and the number of parking spaces available in each. He noted interest on the permits would be different on the east and west sides of the Bayfront. He thought that Zone A would sell more permits than the number of spaces that were available. It was a common practice for more permits to be sold than spaces were available, because they never assumed 100 percent utilization at any given time. Tokos suggested they over subscribe the number of Tier 2 timed permits and thought 120 percent would be appropriate. If they took the approach of 100 percent of spaces in Tier 1 areas (Zones A and B) then 120 percent of available parking stalls for Tier 2 (Zones C and D) there would be around 630 permits available.

Emond asked if 120 percent overflow would be enough and questioned if it should be more than 120. Tokos noted that the 120-140 range was typically what they would see. Smith asked what other cities did. Tokos reported they were all over the place on this. He thought that Newport would want to make sure in the metered permit zones that there as a healthy number of spaces available for people who were arriving and wanted pay at the meters. This way they wouldn't get too high on the numbers. Tokos thought they could be comfortable changing it to 140 percent in the Tier 2 areas. Emond pointed out they could always changes this the next year. Bretz noted the people that purchased the permits would be revolving. The people who wanted them in the summer would be different from those that wanted them in the winter. Bretz thought that because the permit was for one month, it would be sufficient to set it at 120 percent on Tier 2. Emond asked if that included both the 72 hour permits and the 12 hour permits. Tokos noted the 72 hour permits would be done by Port invite only in either Zones B or D. He noted this was part of the thinking to break it up by west and east ends. This wasn't an issue on the west end at all. Tokos noted it would be 100 percent on the Tier 1 pricing zones, which were Zones A and B, and 120 percent on the Tier 2 zones, which would be Zones C and D. The commercial fishing would be by email invitation, which was the 72 hour period and limited to zones B and D, which would be the east end zones. Smith thought that a commercial fishermen who paid \$45 a month for a permit wouldn't be happy if permits were oversold and they had no parking spots.

Bretz thought it was hard to gauge this because the Port's permits were so inexpensive. Tokos reminded that the people who would engaged in commercial fishing permits would also have the Port parking available for them. Bretz reiterated that it was hard to tell how many permits they would need. They had somewhere around 260 Port property permits. It was hard to compare both because they were a different price and product. Tokos reminded that all of the permits had no guarantee of parking spaces.

Goplen asked how often they could change the rules once things were set. Tokos thought they would have flexibility and if they saw something wasn't working they could make changes. There would be reports to the Committee about permit uptake. Goplen thought the Tier 1 pricing was too low. Emond suggested picking a number and sending out invites. Then, when they saw the response they would know how many permits to provide. Guevara thought they should start low and increase the numbers later. Smith thought they were going to have PR issues when implementing the system, and didn't want to start upsetting people right off the bat. She thought they should start off low. Tokos suggested they start with 100 percent in the Tier 1 and 120 percent in Tier 2, then give it three to six months to see what happened.

Goplen asked if this would be implemented in October, when would the meters go in. Tokos reported the installs would be done in late September or early October. This would be an advantage because they wouldn't be implemented in the busy season. Tokos noted the article Goplen shared about what Newport, Rhode Island did was something they should look to do for the next summer season.

Branigan asked if businesses should be allowed to buy a bunch of the permits for their employees. He also asked if they would allow employees to have first crack at getting permits before opening them up to the general public. Tokos noted they didn't have any limitations on who got the permits, so if an employer wanted to cover the cost for their employee's permits they could do that if the permits were available. He thought they should do one launch date instead of multiple dates. The commercial fishing permits would be done by an invite only and they would coordinate this with the Port. Smith questioned who else, besides an employee would want a monthly permit. Branigan thought employees would want the permits the most, but there would be others who came to Newport multiple times that would want them. Goplen thought an Uber or an Airbnb might want them as well.

Emond asked how the daily lodging permits and charter fishing permits would work. Tokos said they would be separate from what they were talking about here. The charters and hotels would have a number of permits that they would hand out. Emond thought it would be nice to be able to track this. Tokos reminded they would have the data from the system that would show how many were handed out.

Tokos asked if the Committee was generally okay with the zone break out. Goplen thought Tier 1 should be more expensive. Bretz wanted the commercial fishing permits to be 96 hours instead of 72 hours. Emond was concerned that people who worked on the Bayfront would be upset when they saw the fishermen had more time to park. Tokos didn't have a problem with setting the commercial fishing permit to 96 hours if that was functionally what they needed. He didn't think a retail person should pay the same as them and asked if \$65 was better for extended stay. Bretz thought if they were going to do that they should leave it at 72 hours. Then if they got blowback on the 72 hours they could say that we can add more time, but it would be more expensive. Emond thought it should be \$55 for fishermen so it was a nominal price difference. Kaplan agreed but noted they didn't want to make this too complicated. He thought it got confusing when there were too many different options. Smith didn't think it would be because the commercial fishermen would be concentrating on their own price. Tokos noted he was inclined to go with \$65 for 96 hours. Bretz reminded that fishermen still had the option to go with the Port parking if they were going to be out for a fourth day. He thought \$65 might be at

the point that a lot of the fishermen wouldn't purchase them. Goplen reminded they could always change this, but they wouldn't want to post a lower price upfront and then say price was being bumped up. Bretz thought if they were going to be bumping it up with a new product it would be okay. Smith was concerned that retail staff would be paying \$45 for 12 hours a day then fishermen were paying \$45 a month for 72 hours. Tokos reminded that on the flip side of this, it met both needs because why would someone who worked retail need more than 12 hours. Tokos said what he was hearing was the Committee thought this was a reasonable framework for this currently, and then look to adjust the fees based on the feedback they received.

Tokos reported that they held the meter cost at a \$1 an hour. Some jurisdictions were bumping this up and he asked if \$1.25 an hour made more sense. Emond and Goplen thought \$1 was too cheap. Bretz reminded this was saying the cost would be \$1 an hour and he didn't think it would price anyone out. Smith questioned if locals would say it was unfair to charge them and mean that cause them to choose not to shop local. Goplen reminded they had discussed allowing businesses to do parking validation for customers. Tokos confirmed they would have the coupon codes for this. Bretz noted the current people parking weren't paying for anyone to maintain the parking areas. He thought it was reasonable to have local people pay for a couple of hours which would go into maintenance and add to turnover.

- 4. Updating Special Parking Area Requirements for the Bayfront.** Tokos reviewed the updates to NMC 14.14.100 for the special area parking requirements. He noted that when the City Council adopted the Parking Study into the Comprehensive Plan, they agreed that when metering was implemented there would be a reduction or elimination of off-street parking requirements. The draft of these revisions would achieve this and would become effective at the same time that metering was live.

Tokos reviewed three options of revisions, starting with Option B.1 that would eliminate off-street parking requirements. This would only apply to the Bayfront because it would be the only area where the city required payment for parking. Smith asked if the purpose of B.1 would just be for new development. Tokos said it applied to both new development and redevelopment. Kaplan noted Nye Beach was mostly residential and asked if this would apply to Nye Beach once the metering was implemented there. Tokos said it would, and pointed out B.1 would be the easiest of the option to implement because it was straightforward and there were no off street parking requirements.

Tokos covered Option B.2. that would allow developers to pay a onetime fee in lieu of providing the off street parking required in special areas where payment was required for the use of public parking. Goplen asked if they could build housing on the Bayfront. Tokos explained they could put housing on anything other than street grade, but they wouldn't expect to realistically see anything meaningful come in because of terrain constraints. Option B.2 gave a fee in lieu which gave progressively expensive options for the additional parking demand they placed. Tokos reviewed the examples of how much it would cost for eliminating parking space requirements. Goplen pointed out the retail use example that was listed on the document wasn't currently being used for retail. Tokos said this would have a credit for the previous use. The parking code said that the city was to give credit for the old use, but it didn't say for how long. They may have to put a fixed timeframe on the credits with this policy change, and he guessed that policy makers would want that number to be that same as System Development Charges, which was 10 years. Goplen asked if they had the number of spaces currently necessary for all the businesses in Newport. Tokos could get it but thought it was around 60-90. Goplen thought if they removed this and let people build, it would change how people viewed the meter conversation and all the work the Committee was doing. Tokos noted there was an equity issue when they had some businesses providing zero parking spaces and others providing some. It would become a question on why someone would be obligated to dedicate what was a pretty expensive chunk of real estate for off street parking, when others are doing nothing. Tokos thought a fairness piece would be

to eliminate the parking requirement, and then not allow major development and keep development to a smaller scale.

Emond asked if it was possible that this ordinance wouldn't apply to all three districts because he thought each district had radically different needs. Tokos thought that was fair but expected they would have further adjustments once they had solutions set for Nye Beach. Since they didn't know what the solutions would be for Nye Beach, there was no reason to sort out what the special parking area would be for it. Kaplan reminded that the special district areas already had different requirements. Tokos agreed and noted that the existing requirements would stay in place for 90 days and codified after the last changes were adopted. Emond asked if these code changes would be drafted and adopted by the City Council after public input. Tokos confirmed they would. Emond thought this made it harder to make changes. He noted this was why he questioned whether or not they wanted to put down rules that would be harder to change in the future. Tokos said this was something they would expect when dealing with when rolling out a new demand management program for areas like this. He reminded there would be residential permits in Nye Beach that weren't in the Bayfront, which would have to be dealt with it at that time.

Tokos reviewed Option B.3 that would give a hard wire a limit on the demand a project could place on the limited supply of available public parking before off-street parking must be provided. He covered the examples of what this would look like. Goplen asked if the five examples were current projects that were waiting on the changes to go through. Tokos said they didn't have any specific projects that were waiting. Emond thought this option made more sense for retail and restaurants, but made less sense for fish plants or industrial use. He asked if they could limit this to retail and restaurants, and have B.2 apply to industrial. Tokos thought this might create an equity issue. He thought they could go with B.3 and scale it with fees. They could also hybridize it with B.2 and B.3. Emond thought because retail and restaurants had a higher turnover, this would be fine for them. He had a problem with uses that required their employees to be there all the time, who created congestion. Edmond thought this was contrary to what they set the goal for turnover at.

Tokos asked for the Committee's thoughts on the three options. Smith asked which option Tokos leaned toward. Tokos favored B.2, or a combo of B.2 and B.3. He also liked the simplicity of B.1 but was concerned it would lead to some unintended consequences. Emond liked basing it on the number of parking spots and the building use type because different uses had different customers. Tokos thought they could look at the ratios which would be citywide. The ratios were development based and typically done by the types of uses. Tokos asked if there were any other options that the Committee had in mind to loosen up the rules. Emond thought they should do B.3 at a smaller number and B.2 as an average. They should set things at a number of spaces, then if demand was over that they could then charge a fee for additional spaces. Tokos asked if what he was saying was to pair B.2 and B.3 and then do something smaller than 25 spaces. Emond thought that was fine, but thought 25 would work on the Bayfront but wouldn't work in other areas. Goplen needed some time to think about it. Tokos asked the Committee to send him a note on their thoughts.

Kaplan asked if B.3 was saying a business was not required to put in parking. Tokos explained was for redevelopment in a manner that was more intense than what the use was currently, or for new development. Tokos gave examples of the properties on the Bayfront that might develop with these changes. Bretz pointed out that it wasn't economical to put parking spaces over the water. If someone was looking to put in a processing plant, they would want a parking lot across the street. Bretz asked if having parking across the street would be allowed. Tokos confirmed it could be allowed as satellite parking. Bretz liked a mixture of B.2 and B.3. Before they establish the fees they look at what it was that they were looking to be incentivize and discourage. They needed to determine if they wanted the added fees to be difficult to be absorbed by the developer or not. Then they could answer what the city

would want to do with the funds. Tokos thought they would look for it to go into the parking fund to supplement the meter revenues so they had money to make a go at constructing a parking structure at some point.

Tokos reviewed the addition of Section C which would make it clear that the few businesses currently providing off-street parking in a meter or meter/permit area would no longer be bound to do so, meaning they could develop these properties. Kaplan reminded that they were trying to manage parking demand. If they decreased the supply it would be contrary to what they were trying to do. If they didn't have a way to obligate additional parking, they would be adding more demand without resources. Emond thought this went back to how B.2 and B.3 worked best in Nye Beach, and B.2 worked only on the Bayfront. Tokos stated he wouldn't expect a gold rush of people eliminating their off street parking that was privately held. In most cases, they were there for a reason. Tokos noted how other jurisdictions who had eliminated off street parking requirements was working for them because they wouldn't generally have businesses coming in that were going to be a massive traffic generator. Smith asked if they adopted B.2 would there be any forgiveness for housing on the Bayfront. Tokos said the direction the state was going was to have a full blanket prohibition on requiring off street parking for residential development because of the housing crisis. Smith thought this would make residents have to use street parking and would set up a whole new dilemma. Tokos thought that this got to the City Center area, where he didn't see a lot of residential opportunity because they couldn't add additional stories to the buildings given their conditions. He also didn't see any real estate available for multifamily projects. Tokos reminded that the residential demand for parking was different than commercial use. Kaplan was in favor of more housing than more commercial. Emond noted this was why he like B.3 because it didn't eliminate all of the parking requirements, just a few. Tokos asked for feedback on the examples from the Committee. Emond thought the examples were good. Bretz thought that for over the water they should look at how far away the parking should be. Tokos explained that not all of the Bayfront was eligible for housing. The areas that were water dependent were not allowed to have houses in the water.

5. **Timing and Location for Outreach with Affected Stakeholders.** Tokos reviewed the implementation schedule, and the list of public engagement groups they would like to engage. Bretz thought that having commercial fishing group meeting in August would work best with the help of the Port. He thought it would work better for businesses if they were directly contacted them directly to get them involved in the engagement instead of sending a blanketed notice.

Tokos reported they would be working on the license plate recognition to get it linked up and the officers trained. He reviewed the parking lot improvements timeline; the sign pole installation; the regulatory sign install timelines; and the pay station install timeline. Tokos noted this schedule was subject to change.

Tokos asked if there was anything the Committee wanted him to bring forward to the next meeting. Smith wanted to see information about the general public outreach that would be done. Goplen thought the city could be more proactive how the information came out. Smith reminded that everyone on the Committee had connections to different groups who they could present to. Emond asked if they were set on the pricing. Tokos thought they figured out pretty much where people wanted to start with.

6. **Public Comment.** None were heard.
7. **Adjournment.** Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherrri Marineau

Sherrri Marineau
Executive Assistant