

**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE**

**PLANNING COMMISSION
PARKING SUBCOMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

April 11, 2018

**Council Chamber
2:00 p.m.**

Present at the 2:00 p.m. meeting were:

Chair: Frank McIntosh

Committee Members Present: Jordan Abada
Rob Cappiello
Will Hurd
Chris Locke
Lee Mikles
Rich Rind
Alan Silverman

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Mary Ellen Gray, Planning and Development Director
Mike Fortner, Planner
Marvin Howard, Parking Manager
Courtney Mulvanity, Parking Supervisor

Mr. Frank McIntosh called the Parking Subcommittee meeting to order at 2:12 p.m.

1. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Mr. McIntosh: We call this meeting to order at whatever time it is, somewhere around 2:00 p.m. This will be our last formal meeting. A sigh is appropriate for our last formal meeting. We will have a public meeting to educate the public on what we've been doing the last five months or so, and that will be on May 7. It will be an educational meeting. It will be here, in this room, at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Will Hurd: That's a Monday, right?

Mr. McIntosh: Yes, I believe it's a Monday.

Mr. Lee Mikles: It is.

Mr. McIntosh: There were only a few dates that were available to us and so we grabbed that one. So that was #1. Number 2, on May 1 we will be presenting our conclusions to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Mikles: May 1? Tuesday?

Mr. McIntosh: May 1, Tuesday at 7:00 p.m., as well. There is one other date of interest to you and I actually don't have the date, but we will be presenting to Council probably in June. I'm not sure what the Council agenda is, but we're working on that at this time. So those are the upcoming dates. None of them do you have to be at unless you are part of the presentation team, and then you will have to be at at least two of them, which would be the Planning

Commission and the City Council. But we would encourage you all to come and invite other people to come, particularly to the public meeting. I think it's really important that the community gets to hear from us as to what we've done, why we did it, and so on, and to ask us questions, such as there may be questions, and just to understand better, and in a more informal setting, of the whole process that we went through. And we've gone through a pretty good process, and I think we've produced the results that a good process will give you. So those were the things that I wanted to point out at the outset.

2. MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2018 PARKING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. McIntosh: With that in mind, the minutes of the last meeting, March 1, 2018, is there a motion to accept the minutes as put in front of us?

Mr. Jordan Abada: Second.

Mr. Hurd: I'll move.

Mr. Abada: Second.

Mr. McIntosh: Jordan seconds, twice actually, which is kind of like a second, right?

Mr. Hurd: Yeah, it's a second second.

Mr. McIntosh: And Will made the motion. All in favor? Opposed? Thank you. We have approved the minutes.

MOTION BY HURD, SECONDED BY ABADA, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2018 PARKING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING BE APPROVED.

VOTE: 8-0

AYE: ABADA, CAPIELLO, HURD, LOCKE, MCINTOSH, MIKLES, RIND, SILVERMAN

NAY: NONE

ABSENT: NONE

MOTION PASSED

3. REVIEW OF UPDATES TO PARKING POLICY MATRIX WITH FOCUS ON GAP ANALYSIS

Mr. McIntosh: Now, Mike, it looks like you've got the big . . .

Mr. Mike Fortner: Yes.

Mr. McIntosh: So, you finally got the message that most of the people here can't see.

Mr. Fortner: Alright, so, in front of you, you have . . .

Mr. McIntosh: Mike, you need a mike.

Mr. Fortner: I'll get a mike, yeah. Alright, so, you have a sheet, which is a simplified kind of implementation sheet with the strategic issues and sort of the proposed implementation toward that issue. It's based off the other matrices, and that's just for easier reference.

And then you have two revised matrices. The first one is called the Policy Layers 1. This is a revision from our discussion at the last meeting. Some of the most significant changes are we break up marketing strategy from the wayfinding. Marketing strategy is in all three layers, so you have, as was discussed, Policy Layer 1 is efficiently managing the existing parking. And then there is the marketing strategy is, of course, wayfinding and systems education. And then you

have Evaluating Demand, which is mostly Zoning Code reforms and changes to policy. And that has a marketing strategy, as well, about changing the perception. And the third one is Increased Supply, which also has a marketing strategy to that. So, we kind of break it out to make it clear that's a big component of all of these initiatives.

The next one is part of the Gap Analysis. As you go through it, Policy Layer 1 is little or no gap. These are things that are pretty much feasible that we're in the process of doing or can do with changes. Different kind of policy proposals that are color-coded to the strategic issue. As you go up, you have the Feasible Gap. These are additional funding or technical assistance is needed, but it's very much or fairly feasible to do. And then the third layer is Significant Gap that requires significant additional resources and planning to flesh those ideas out more, or would be more difficult to implement.

Mr. Hurd: On the second one, I just noticed two, well one . . .

Mr. McIntosh: Is this the analysis?

Mr. Hurd: Yes, the Gap Analysis. So, the bottom one says efficiently managing the existing parking and you say demand, but I think on the first one we said managing existing supply. I think we wanted to keep that supply.

And then partly based on a webinar I attended last week with Dr. Wilson, the guy who wrote the book after [Donald] Shoup, this matches very closely to his presented way of sort of addressing zoning code changes to parking demand. In the first thing he said, he said you have to manage what you have existing, then you have to figure out what you're going to need, and then you need to match those two. So, I was going to make a suggestion that Layer 3, instead of saying increase supply and access, we say match supply to expected demand. Because then maybe after doing the calculations and projecting to the future, we may find that supply is not actually as high as we think it is.

Mr. Alan Silverman: We just switched over to Parking Policy Matrix . . .

Mr. Hurd: I'm sorry, I'm back to the Matrix Policy Layer 1.

Mr. Fortner: Oh, it's not for the Gap Analysis.

Mr. Mikles: It's not for the Gap Analysis.

Mr. Fortner: You're on the . . .

Mr. Hurd: Well, it's . . . retitle that Layer 3 that it has the same title.

Mr. Fortner: Okay, so, that one does say supply. So, manage the existing . . .

Mr. Mikles: Well, he's saying matching supply to expected demand.

Mr. Hurd: So you say increase supply and access to parking, and I was suggesting we title that match supply to expected demand. Because we're going to . . . that's what Policy Layer 2 is going to do. We're going to calculate what's the future demand on parking. And that's the one that Dr. Wilson wrote a huge book on. Not a huge book, but a very informative book on, where there's a 12-step process where you evaluate what you've got, and you project in the future. It's a whole process. And out of it should come a parking rate that supports your calculated, your conjectures, I guess. And then, at that point, that's when you can say, okay, we can do no required parking, or we can do half parking minimums, or we need a garage. That's the point at which you can say this is what we're going to need to supply. That was just my suggestion.

Mr. McIntosh: Any comments towards that? Mike, could you pass . . .

Mr. Chris Locke: On Gap Analysis in the blue section, Layer 2, I don't recall this, so refresh me. You've got here a consultant service to provide technical assistance and then a consulting service to develop . . . that costs money and why not the Planning Department do that with the consultation of the City Solicitor?

Mr. Fortner: Okay, so you're talking about the two bullet items on the right side, right? So, a consultant service to provide technical assistance. We determined that is a significant undertaking with the limited staff to take on that. We would require more expertise to do that. Someone that could focus on it. Particularly, when you're revising the Zoning Code and the parking, the issue is creating parking districts. It's very complicated, or could be very complicated, legislation, and we were asking for assistance.

Mr. Locke: With all due respect, Roy Lopata did the entire Zoning Code almost individually by himself. This is a . . . though it's a significant impact on the future culture of the City, I think the actual amendment to the Zoning Code is definitely something that I think is capable and can be done in-house. My concern is when you start promoting consultant services, you add 18 months onto the process. Which may be fine, but also costs taxpayers money that I think they're already paying by having the employees of the Planning Department.

Mr. Fortner: Well, I'm not sure you've been following Council meetings as you maybe should be, but we've done some very simple legislative things that have taken a lot of time, and I think a consultant service could actually streamline the process.

Mr. McIntosh: Are there any comments on the comments? That being Will or Chris. Okay. Well, I think . . . I don't know if that's something that we want to change in either case. Will had recommended that we change on the Policy Layers to take out expansion, increased supply and access to parking, and replace it with match supply to expected demand. Is that okay with everyone? Nod. For the record, everybody nodded. Some were sleeping and that's why they were nodding. And then in the Gap Analysis, in Policy Layer 1, it says efficiency, managing the existing parking demand, and Will had recommended changing that to supply. Again, a nod will do. Or a yes. Folks are not very compliant.

Mr. Locke: How about an offer of a friendly amendment, Mike, to state that . . .

Mr. Silverman: Chris, can you go back through your question for Mary Ellen? I think she may have an answer for you.

Mr. Locke: Okay, great. Mary Ellen, the issue I raised was on the Gap Analysis in Layer 2. My concern was the proposal of a consultant service to provide technical assistance and then the second bullet was a consulting service. My concern is hiring a consulting firm, and, you know, I think the department has definitely the skill set and capability to do it in-house, and I think has a unique view of it. So, I said maybe we need to change that. Mike is a little reluctant, I guess, would be the word. So, now I guess I'm offering a friendly amendment to say a consulting service and/or the Planning Department.

Mr. Mikles: Do you have any thoughts on that?

Ms. Mary Ellen Gray: Yes, and thank you. And I apologize for being late. I was cutting it close leaving a meeting from Dover and then there were traffic incidents. So, anyway, my thought on the consulting services are two-fold. One is resources and that we don't have a deep bench in Planning to do this writing because starting with the ordinance amendments for parking, that ordinance . . . parking is in a bunch of places in our ordinances, and I think someone from an outside group might be helpful looking at that. I think it also might be helpful to have a third party present it. They might be better received instead of staff. That's just a reality.

Mr. Mikles: And you were concerned about time, correct?

Mr. Locke: Time, as well.

Ms. Gray: And, timing, certainly this . . . I'm not sure how . . . it certainly would impact the timeline in that we would have to put in the proposal and the bid and then have to go to Council. That's to be weighed with the staff time because, basically, it would Mike and I writing it. And I'm just concerned how that would get done given what's on our plate.

Mr. Locke: Right. I guess my concern is the taxpayers are already paying City employees to do this and, you know, the budget of doing this. This could get very reasonably expected to be voted down by City Council for budgetary issues.

Ms. Gray: That's a good point. I had not thought of that component. Planning staff does have, the Planning Department does have \$47,500 for consultants set aside for 2018. Whether that would cover that amount, I hadn't thought that step through. So, that's a good point, Chris.

Mr. Locke: Also, in the past we've had a consulting report about parking which was pretty much, oh, they don't understand the City and they kind of threw that report out.

Ms. Gray: Okay.

Mr. Locke: And then we had the Rental Housing Needs Assessment, and they were like, oh, they don't really understand. So . . .

Ms. Gray: Okay. I wasn't here for those two, so it was kind of a reverse in that because, in my experiences, sometimes a third-party consultant is sometimes better received than Planning staff.

Mr. Locke: Right.

Ms. Gray: So, but if the last two consulting firms were not embraced because they don't come from here, then that raises a good point.

Mr. Locke: Maybe the City Solicitor could help the Planning Department with the actual language, you know.

Ms. Gray: Oh absolutely. I have no doubt that we have the capability of doing it. It's just those are my two reasons – a resource and the optics of it.

Mr. Locke: Right.

Ms. Gray: So, certainly I think and/or would be something that we would have to, you know, work out internally. And we would need Council's buy-in as far as this is a priority.

Mr. Locke: Right.

Ms. Gray: And if another priority is given, then something needs to come off.

Mr. Locke: Right, and maybe that's where the and/or language is helpful, that if you're letting Council decide which way we want to go. Rather than saying a consultant service, say and/or.

Ms. Gray: Yes.

Mr. McIntosh: Okay.

Mr. Silverman: Plus, we have another actor we haven't taken into account and that's going to be the new City Manager.

Mr. Locke: Excellent point.

Mr. Silverman: However this new City Manager's priorities lay out, the new budget process or cycle that the Manager may get into, and hopefully we'll have a champion here that can help decide some of those priorities.

Mr. Locke: Exactly. Good point.

Mr. McIntosh: Well, I'm just going to say is it acceptable to put and/or?

Mr. Silverman: Yes.

Ms. Gray: Yeah, from our standpoint, it is.

Mr. McIntosh: And, if so . . .

Mr. Mikles: Yes.

Mr. Hurd: The only thing I'd like to say as an alternative to that is to just have a blurb that says that the Planning Commission and the Planning Department will consult on the best way to achieve these steps. Because I think that's often what happens is that, you know, we have a work plan where we're working with staff, and if this falls . . . because updating the Zoning Code is kind of in the Planning Commission wheelhouse and, so, we would have the ability to say to the department, so we're getting ready to do this, in-house staff, how does it look? And maybe we say, okay, if this important we could say, yes, a consultant. Or we'll do it in-house or from a subcommittee, or something. But I think you're right. Either we say and/or, or we just sort of pull it out and say, you know, that the Planning Commission and staff will consult on doing that.

Mr. Silverman: I support that mainly because the Planning Commission's work program is independent of City Council.

Mr. McIntosh: Well, I like the idea, personally, of the verbiage that's here. And I think a second sentence after that, if that's all one sentence, it looks like it is, as to what you were just saying.

Mr. Hurd: Sure.

Ms. Gray: Which is what?

Mr. McIntosh: What Will just said.

Ms. Gray: I know but you said many sentences, and you're saying one sentence.

Mr. Hurd: I think what he's saying is that a consultant service may be needed to provide technical assistance. The Planning Commission and Planning Department will work together to develop a path. Is that . . .

Mr. McIntosh: Yeah, call them up later.

Ms. Gray: No, I got it.

Mr. Hurd: This is the best I got. This is it.

Mr. McIntosh: Don't admit that. Okay, do we have nods on that? Everybody nods. Okay, good.

Mr. Hurd: Do we want . . . when we were talking about consulting for the marketing, that also needed to be in consultation with, like, the City Manager's Office and the Communications Department to see if they feel they need external support for that. So, we may want to push this down a little. I don't know.

Mr. McIntosh: I, personally, think that we'd be better served if we had an outside service in that regard, the expertise that could be applied to that. Now we may have that expertise internally. I don't know that. But I do think that's a key to this whole thing. If that doesn't happen, the rest of it probably isn't going to happen, at least the way it's been envisioned.

Mr. Silverman: Or no one is going to know about it.

Mr. McIntosh: Or no one will know about it if it does happen and then it's sort of like the tree in the woods, and so on, falling.

Mr. Hurd: So, maybe we need similar language there to say a consultant service may be required to develop an outreach and marketing strategy, and then something about, you know, this will be done in consultation with the Communications Department.

Mr. Locke: You could actually add into the second bullet of the Gap Analysis on Layer 1. More promotion can be achieved through the City's and DNP's existing social media, as well as possibly engaging consulting services to enhance parking proposals.

Mr. McIntosh: Personal opinion, again, it needs to be a lot stronger than that, I think.

Mr. Locke: Okay.

Mr. McIntosh: Just my opinion.

Mr. Silverman: If we believe the success of the program is that the foundation is a marketing program, then we need to say that.

Mr. McIntosh: Yeah, I don't think we should get wishy-washy with this.

Mr. Locke: No, I agree with you, but I'm just trying to look at the political aspect of the cost of implementing this stuff. And if we've got this consultant, that consultant, that consultant, and now we're looking at \$200,000 worth of consulting fees, this thing is going to go right down the tubes. So, if we can use as much infrastructure and in-house people, I think it makes the presentation an easier presentation.

Mr. McIntosh: Well let's agree on that, okay? And let's say that in conjunction with the Communications Department, you know, and put in that. But I think, you know, in a gap analysis, it identifies the gaps, so we know that this is a gap. But in identifying the gaps, what you then have the opportunity to do is figure out how do you get past those gaps. Not just say, well it's a gap so we're not doing it. It's too big. What you say is, is that important? We're saying it is important. And, so, if it is important, then the job of the implementers is to find a way to get it done. And, so, that, in this case, may require an outside revenue source that's not currently available to the City, but could become available to the City if we did it right. So, keeping in mind the gap analysis is not to throw the thing out, it's simply to say, here's the problem, now what's the solution to that problem? So, is that okay? That kind of shift that we just made there. You captured that? Okay. Any other comments on either the policy layer or gap analysis?

Well, as The Beatles said, a long and winding road but, Michael, excellent work.

Mr. Mikles: Yeah, nice job.

Mr. McIntosh: Thank you very much. That's about . . . and it's well done in every possible way. And, Mary Ellen, well done. Sorry. I didn't mean to cut you out. Sorry.

Ms. Gray: Oh, no, that's alright.

Mr. McIntosh: Don't be humble.

4. COMMENTS REGARDING NARRATIVE

Mr. McIntosh: Alright, so this is going to be a principle piece of work that goes before the Council and the Planning Commission – the Policy Layers and the Gap Analysis. But along with that is going to be a narrative. A narrative that just sort of gives a contextual view of this, and probably some heavier background information – why did we move in this direction, etc. – so that it stands on its own when we're not there. So, somebody can read it and pick it up and kind of see how this all flows. Because if you just dropped in from Neptune or someplace and you looked at this, you'd say what does that mean? So, a narrative would be very helpful to that. And we have, at this time, two similar versions of a narrative produced by Will and Alan that have been reviewed and upgraded a little bit. But that's kind of where they stand at the moment. Somewhere between now and May 1, they will no longer be that. They will become a document that's a body of work that has been put together and ready for publication, if you will, that will encompass both of these things. They each approach it a little bit differently, but they cover all the bases. So, some of it will stay and some will go. The narrative is, to some extent, the marketing document. So, it will have that tinge to it, as well. You know, not slick or anything like that but, you know, accentuating the positive. Let's put it that way. So, that is underway and I think, who do we have working on this now? We have you and Michael and then the three of us. Okay. Any of you are welcome to join us if you'd like. It's entirely up to you.

Mr. Mikles: What's the difference between the narrative and the presentation?

Mr. McIntosh: Parts of the narrative will be in the presentation, not all of it.

Mr. Mikles: Okay.

Mr. McIntosh: So, if you were to look at a formal document, you would see the Policy Layer and the Gap Analysis, the narrative, and any other supporting material that probably is attached to the narrative anyway.

Mr. Mikles: Okay.

Mr. McIntosh: But we would not present that in its detail in its entirety. The presentation will then be, how do we get this across succinctly and positively to the various organizations that have to vote on it and the like. So, that's essentially it.

Mr. Mikles: Okay.

Mr. McIntosh: The other part of it is that some people are more visual than others, and others like to see text. They want to read that. They want to get into it. Somebody will be able to go both ways with this, or have it all, and it makes even more sense when that comes to pass.

Mr. Mikles: We've put a lot of thought into this and a lot of work into this. What's the best way to get people to adopt this?

Mr. McIntosh: That's coming up on the agenda.

Mr. Mikles: Okay. Then I'll wait.

Mr. McIntosh: Because I won't say I'm losing sleep over that, but it is very cognizant in my mind as to the challenge that's ahead of us, so we will get to that very soon.

5. PROVIDE INPUT TO PLANNING DEPARTMENT ON IMPLEMENTATION TASKS

Mr. McIntosh: Alright, we have the implementation guide and, as I've said on several occasions in the past, implementation is up to the Planning Department to do, not us. But because we created this document in conjunction with the Planning Department, it has always been my view that we should advise and counsel the Planning Department as to what we think is the best approach. And, having said that, I also would suggest that people in the audience, if you have some thoughts about that, that you'll have your opportunity to say that, as well. Not just us. Okay?

So, that's kind of where we're at, and so we've got the document and we pulled it aside because it's really not part of our presentation, right? It looks like this. It's a separate animal and it says Proposed Implementations 3/21/18 at the top. It's a couple of pages. So, any feedback from any of you that you would like to say, hey, how is that still in there? Didn't we talk about that? Or, why isn't this in there? Or, maybe you want to think about this a little differently. Those kinds of things. This would be your time to give that. And I would also say if you take this away from this meeting today and, you know, you're sitting at home and waiting for the ballgame to start or something and you come up with something, there's no reason for you not to pass that along either by telephone or email, as well, I don't think. Is there a FICA thingamajiggy or . . . it's not FICA, is it?

Mr. Fortner: FOIA.

Ms. Gray: FOIA. No, not . . .

Mr. McIntosh: FOCA? What is it?

Mr. Silverman: He's doing your taxes now.

Mr. McIntosh: Does anybody have any comments?

Mr. Fortner: Frank, does Will have them? Okay. I just wanted to comment on page 2, economics of parking, the dynamic parking fee structure, if that's still what we want, being the Council action, and do we want to put that in our report?

Another one was, and it's not in there, I just wanted to bring this up, but some sort of reinvigorating the Parking Committee, or if that could be something under the Communications Plan. There's a Parking Committee that's been dormant. Not us, but the other Parking Committee. That had a role in managing parking and developing policies and proposing them. I understand that there's been some hold-ups in putting them back together, and maybe it would be something that would be valued to have a committee that's constantly meeting and working on this.

Mr. Silverman: I'll shout at the microphone. This Parking Committee was constituted by whom? Is it a City committee or is it a Downtown Newark Partnership [DNP] committee?

Mr. Fortner: Oh, it was Downtown Newark Partnership's . . . well kind of both, right?

Mr. Marvin Howard: Right.

Mr. Fortner: So, the City and Downtown Newark Partnership. It was a Downtown Newark Partnership committee, but it came from the City and they . . . Marvin could explain it better than me.

Mr. Locke: I would say with the flux of DNP right now, we would not put that in. Let's see what the evolution of DNP comes in the next year or so, and then we can re-address that issue.

Mr. Hurd: I'm just going to put in a pitch just because I've sort of been reading them and I know you guys haven't, but Dr. Wilson's book about parking, there's one about parking supply

but he wrote one after that about managing parking demand. In the webinar he noted he wrote this big book about how to evaluate parking demand and update zoning code, and then realized that before you can do that, you have to effectively manage your existing supply and demand first. That's step one, managing what you've got. Step two is figuring out what you're going to need. And then step three is implementation. So, while we have sort of separate items here about, you know, revise or change the Zoning Code to decouple parking, I think there's a lot of steps to take place before we get into that one. Basically, you have to go through this 12-step process to figure out what's your expected demand and, at that point you can go, alright, now, does decoupling make sense? Do minimums make sense? Do maximums make sense? What's the outcome going to be? So, I just want to kind of make sure that we're thinking about there's a lot of work behind some of these. It's not, I think, as easy as let's revise the Zoning Code. There's sort of background work to be done before you can say here's a proposed Zoning Code for that. So, I just wanted to put that out there.

Mr. Silverman: Referring to page 2, economics of parking, the dynamic parking fee structure, I think it should be left in there. I think we should ask Council to revisit the whole notion. I believe Council does not have a clear picture of what dynamic fee structure is. They appear to be reacting to a demand of a constituency group, and trigger words like increased parking meter rates. And I'm not quite sure they comprehend the whole picture and what dynamic fee structures do.

Ms. Gray: I think it would be helpful to have the dynamic fee structure embedded, which it is. Right now, it's standing alone. And with this, the dynamic fee structure is part of this package. So, that's something that I think we should articulate in the narrative, at a minimum, and also bring that forward when the presentation is made. That this is part of it. This is a part of the whole thing.

Mr. McIntosh: It seems to me that's incumbent upon us to do that because the issue, presumably, has been decided in absentia from what this committee was doing, even though some said we already did that.

Mr. Hurd: I'll just add that I think, given some of the concerns that were raised, down here on the Gap Analysis sheet, we've got the negotiated lease agreements with the University lots. That's sort of an early thing that we can do in [inaudible]. And I think if we can, I know, Rich, you were talking about, like, daily passes to the Pearson lot, I don't know if that's in place yet, or soon to be, but I think when that comes online, that gives us some strength to say, okay, we've got a mechanism for handling employee parking, at least at some parts of the day, and we have sort of some way to take that concern piece out of the dynamic rate conversation and mitigate it to say, well we heard you talking about that and that was, in fact, part of our bigger picture about employee parking, and we've got this. And, so, we're not going to come back again and just, no, we still want to raise the rates. We're going to go, so we're handling employees and we've got this, and we're really just focused on . . .

Mr. Rich Rind: Yeah, I just wanted to say that, first of all, those rates, those passes already exist, daily, monthly, and annually. The monthly is probably the sweet spot for employees that work in the downtown area because it's only \$17. The daily is like \$8, so after two visits you might as well just buy the monthly, right? And that's by design. We want you to buy the longer period. So, that already exists. But I know we've talked about this in the past and I cannot remember why it didn't end up in the final document. There's a lot of language here about negotiating with private lot owners and University lot owners, but there are City lots that are empty at night, also, and they're not included in here as a way to re-use those at night. For example, my daughter lives above Lot 2, and she continues to complain that the lot is mostly empty at night and why can't people park there. And I didn't really have a good answer for her. And I do remember us talking about that, but I don't know why it didn't end up in here.

Mr. Locke: No, you're right. You're absolutely right.

Ms. Gray: Where do you want . . .

Mr. Rind: I guess it would be in employee parking, because that was the user group we identified that would make the most sense to put them in there.

Ms. Gray: Okay.

Mr. Rind: Because it's a shorter walk, it's safer even, because it's right on Main Street. But it's hidden really well, but it's right in the center. She lives above, I guess it's Honeygrow, which is where Lot 2 is, I believe.

Mr. Rob Cappiello: I thought we had talked about driving the employees off Main Street and then turning that into short-term parking . . .

Mr. Rind: For visitors.

Mr. Cappiello: For visitors.

Mr. Rind: Yeah, that was also discussed.

Mr. Cappiello: So somebody coming to Honeygrow that would be here for a half-hour or an hour, you know, free up some more . . .

Mr. Rind: But I just don't recall what happened with that.

Mr. Locke: I think you make a valid point. Rather than say pursue lease agreements with the City's municipal lots, I think you need to say maximize the use of City municipal lots through, you know, for example, Lot 2, you could give permits and say this permit is good from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., so that a resident can then buy a permit from 8:00 to 8:00 the other way. You know, it's a very simple thing. You give them a color code system and that's it. So that now you're getting 24-hour use of the parking lot and . . .

Mr. Silverman: The overhead is there 24 hours.

Mr. McIntosh: Would you pass the microphone?

Mr. Jim Jones: Thank you, I'm Jim Jones, a member of the public. In looking at page 3, the last item is stormwater issues. I'd suggest you might want to add just a couple words so that people who haven't been to all these meetings can understand the connection between stormwater issues and the two implementation items. The words I'm thinking of would be reduce impervious surfaces. And that might be enough, because once you do that, then you can add your oil/water separators and all the rest of that kind of stuff.

Mr. Silverman: The buzzwords water quality should be in there.

Mr. McIntosh: Say that again.

Mr. Silverman: The words water quality should also be in there. It's a key activating word.

Mr. McIntosh: Any other thoughts? Audience? Speak now or forever hold your peace. Okay, hearing none . . . so we provided . . . let me see if I can summarize what's happened so far. I made some brilliant remarks at the beginning . . .

Mr. Silverman: I'm sorry, I fell asleep.

Mr. McIntosh: I'll leave it go at that. We passed the minutes, and so on. We reviewed the policy matrix and gap analysis. We added and made some minor changes in it, but we've captured that and we just discussed the narrative and the importance of that. Having not just a

visual piece, but a written piece so that people can get it. And the narrative will be such that it will go into a lot more detail and people that like the detail will have that, and people that like the other will have the more visual piece, and then together, they've got the whole enchilada. So, that is being done by the Planning Department in conjunction with the three Commissioners from the . . .

Mr. Hurd: Planning Commission.

Mr. McIntosh: Yeah, the Commission. Is there anybody else who wanted to be involved with that narrative writing? And Chris.

Ms. Gray: A thought would be once we get a draft to circulate it around to the group for comments with an end date. Like, hey, we need this in 2-3 days, and that way everyone can participate.

Mr. Locke: Excellent idea.

Mr. Mikles: Perfect.

Mr. McIntosh: Yeah, we'll definitely do that, but I'm talking about doing the heavy lifting.

Ms. Gray: Yes. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. McIntosh: Okay, so we'll add Chris to that. Then, we've just finished supplying some additional direction with regards to the proposed implementation plan, which I thought was pretty good discussion.

Mr. Hurd: I have a small question on that.

Mr. McIntosh: Go ahead.

Mr. Hurd: Do we have a consensus to add language to basically examine the usage of City lots as a general to one of these? Like, if we want to say examine how Lot 2 is being used, for instance, does that go under parking distribution and availability or does it go under the employee parking section?

Mr. Locke: Great point. We originally talked about employee parking but I think you're absolutely right, it should go under parking distribution.

Mr. Rind: The one on certain times of day.

Mr. Hurd: Yeah, right.

Mr. Hurd: So to summarize, there was specifically speaking about Lot 2 but I think speaking more generally about examining the usage of City lots and the possibility of restructuring, perhaps, or using them in a different way. Specifically, Lot 2 because that's a leased lot and it's kind of a big topic but I think it's something to sort of say we could put to planning our parking to say, is there a better place to put these long-term parking people and use that lot in a prime spot for a different use and still accommodate the uses?

Ms. Gray: Okay.

Mr. Silverman: I'd like to simplify it and have it paint a picture that we want to maximize the availability of parking in City lots to make sure that it's used 24 hours a day. Whether that means issuing a daytime work . . . re-selling the lot over and over again, continuously. Whether that involves a daytime parking permit, like somebody said, an 8:00 to 8:00 kind of thing.

Mr. Locke: Yeah, I can't emphasize enough how effective it can be. We have certain lots where that's what we do. We have certain spaces that are reserved for commercial tenants from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. . . .

Mr. Silverman: This is your properties . . .

Mr. Locke: Our personal private parking lots. And then those spaces are available for customers of restaurants or even the residential tenants, or whatever. And it's a great way to really maximize the use of space rather than just have a bunch of spaces open at 8:00 p.m.

6. VOTE ON FINISHED PRODUCT

Mr. McIntosh: Okay. So, that brings us to Item 6, vote on finished product. Now, the only problem with that is that you don't have the narrative in front of you. So, can we make this . . . I'm asking for sort of a semi-legal, knowing you're not legal. Well, you're legal, aren't you? Don't go there? Well, she comes from Dover. Can we vote on the Policy Matrix and saying that that is part and parcel of the plan? Essentially, saying this is the plan and we approve it. And then take an email vote on the narrative. Can we do that?

Ms. Gray: If it's okay with everyone.

Mr. McIntosh: Is everybody comfortable with that? I don't think we can vote the whole thing in, because we don't have it in front of us, and I don't want to hold up approval of this.

Mr. Mikles: I think it's the right way of doing it.

Ms. Gray: That works for Planning staff. I don't see an impediment to doing that process, as long as everyone agrees with that. I think Alan has a comment. Wait . . . Chris, okay.

Mr. McIntosh: He's a lawyer.

Mr. Locke: I'm not speaking as an attorney right now, for the record. I'm speaking strictly as a member . . .

Mr. McIntosh: When do you never not speak as an attorney?

Mr. Locke: Right now. I think your description of the narrative as kind of a, for lack of a better word, marketing piece, I have problems with us voting via email. I think there could be public concerns with that, as well as maybe governmental concerns. So, I think you vote on this and the narrative is kind of a summary, as you say, for somebody who likes to look at text, and you'll probably have some pretty pictures maybe in the public presentation and all that. So, I think this is kind of the guideline for your narrative, if I'm understanding that correctly. So, if you vote for this, you're going to assume the narrative is going to include these two things. So, therefore, we don't vote email and maybe have a public issue.

Mr. McIntosh: That's fine. I would prefer it to be that way.

Mr. Silverman: And don't forget, Mr. Chairman, we've laid out a two-step presentation process. One is to the Planning Commission and I expect there will be tweaks and potential changes. So, doing a final vote on a document, all we're doing is moving it from this committee to the forum for the Planning Commission for their adoption.

Mr. McIntosh: Okay. So, then that's what we'll do. Parenthetically, I'm not expecting any changes.

Mr. Hurd: Well, we did just add several things today.

Mr. Jason Lawhorn: [inaudible]

Mr. McIntosh: You need to say your name. If you don't say your name, you're not a person.

Mr. Lawhorn: Jason Lawhorn, District 5. First of all, I apologize to you guys as I was quoted as saying we should have a parking committee and then I was called and informed that we have one, which I think is great. And this is exactly what, in my mind, should happen, a problem-solving process. My concern is whenever, just as a resident talking, whenever we talk about parking, and it was at a recent Council meeting, it's a real complex issue which obviously this map shows. So, when you guys are talking, I'm following, and there are a lot of great ideas, but I'm having a little trouble following because you guys have been talking about this for six months and you all know what you're saying. So, my concern, and it goes to voting on it as a final document and any revisions that are made in Planning and then when you have a public forum, is that by the time it gets to where you want action to happen, it needs to be, I think, crystal clear because it's such a complex thing. So, however it evolves, you know, I've heard references to how difficult sometimes it is to get things through Council, and then you say you have seven people who are going to be debating it. And then you have the public that's going to debate it. All these great ideas need to be really crystal clear in your plan, and maybe that's the narrative you're talking about and all, but as it evolves, making sure that that presentation and what the ideas are are crystal clear. And some of them may be able to happen independently and that would be a good idea in itself. And some, I think, like, may need to be grouped. Like they may need to happen together. So, just so that's really crystal clear by the time it gets to where you want action to happen. Because my fear is that you did all this great work and if it's not crystal clear, it's going to fall because people don't understand exactly what you're recommending. That's all.

Mr. McIntosh: Thank you for that comment. Okay, so is there a motion to approve the . . .

Mr. Hurd: I'll give it a go. I move that we approve the submission of our work products for presentation to the Planning Commission for review and discussion by the Planning Commission.

Mr. McIntosh: Second?

Ms. Gray: Can I do an amendment to that? A friendly amendment?

Mr. Silverman: Well, it hasn't been seconded so you can still form it.

Ms. Gray: Well, I'm not part of the committee, do you want to . . .

Mr. McIntosh: Yes, you are. You've just been deputized.

Ms. Gray: Well, I'm not voting then.

Ms. Gray: So I would just like to articulate the products that are being approved, which would be the Parking Policy Matrix Gap Analysis dated 3/21/18, the Parking Policy Matrix Policy Layers dated 3/21/18, and the Parking Subcommittee Identified Parking Strategic Issue and Proposed Implementations dated 3/21/18, with the amendments that were discussed today at this meeting.

Mr. Hurd: Thank you. I can get behind that, and move to allow the creation of a narrative to accompany the final work products.

Mr. Abada: Second.

Mr. McIntosh: Jordan seconds.

Mr. Mikles: It's all on Jordan.

Mr. McIntosh: Jordan, you're going to write this. Okay, all in favor? Opposed. [Motion carries.]

MOTION BY HURD, SECONDED BY ABADA, THAT THE PARKING POLICY MATRIX GAP ANALYSIS, PARKING POLICY MATRIX POLICY LAYERS, AND PARKING SUBCOMMITTEE IDENTIFIED PARKING STRATEGIC ISSUE AND PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATIONS, DATED MARCH 21, 2018, AND AS AMENDED AT THE PARKING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING ON APRIL 11, 2018, BE APPROVED, FOR PRESENTATION TO, AND REVIEW AND DISCUSSION BY, THE PLANNING COMMISSION.

VOTE: 8-0

AYE: ABADA, CAPPIELLO, HURD, LOCKE, MCINTOSH, MIKLES, RIND, SILVERMAN

NAY: NONE

ABSENT: NONE

MOTION PASSED

Mr. McIntosh: Well, when we first formed this group, I was told it would take at least a year, if not more, to get this done, and we've done it in six months. And I think we've done it, personal bias, but we've done it well. So, thank you for your great, great work.

7. COMMENTS ON PRESENTATION FORMAT

Mr. McIntosh: Okay so now we are coming to the comments on the presentation format. Just a couple of words before we start. Obviously, I've been very concerned that all this great work that we've done winds up being implemented. Now, maybe not all implemented, but I'd be not happy if we didn't get it all implemented. I think it's all pieced together and it all, you know, in order to get to where we want to be, you can't just take pieces out for whatever reason that you want to take them out. They all interconnect with each other. And, so, that, and I learned a long time ago, particularly in a public policy forum, is not easy to accomplish. But it can be accomplished. And, so, we want to put this in the very best possible light. Nobody was playing any games here. Everybody, when they came into the room, in my opinion, took their University hat off, their restaurant hat off, their church hat off, whatever it might be, the student hat, and parked it, and looked at what was in the best interest in the City of Newark. And I think that's where the discussion went. We involved the community that was here. I wish there were more, but the people that were here were stalwarts throughout, and gave us some very, very good information as, really, part of our group. We didn't say, well, you're an outsider. We didn't look at it that way. So, we got the very best from everybody that participated, and I think that that was a product that we'd come up with. And I think it really will solve the issues that people face when they come to Newark and want to park their car. Now, in addition to that, it might even make it a more walkable city. As a matter of fact, it can make it a more walkable city. It can change the way that we think about how we do things in the City. And that's another positive thing. So, there's a lot that's going on and so this presentation has to be done well. And I would like to see, there's not going to be time to have everybody involved, but I do want to have some of you involved in the process of the actual presentation, both to the Planning Commission and to Council. And for all of you to be at the public session. So, with that in mind, we're going to work it together. We'll put a good presentation together and we'll sell it as best we can. And it should be really sell-able, because this really gets at the guts of what's going on. And everybody is going to look at this and say, ah, I see why you're saying that. And, yes, this will work. I can see why this works. So that's what our end goal is with that. And, you know, there's been a lot of component parts to making this. Not just us on the committee, but the Planning Department and some of the folks who are not here today but have worked hard on it. Our Parking people and our GIF people, which we love the GIF people. We really do. GIS.

Mr. Hurd: We just don't know who they are, but we love them.

Mr. McIntosh: We don't care a rat's behind about the GIF people. We don't even know who they are.

Ms. Gray: Yeah, who are they?

Mr. McIntosh: Oh, they're some family group. I don't know. But the GIS people, in particular, and our friends from the Parking area, have provided us with great insight and capacity to get this job done. So, this has been a tremendous group effort. Having said that now, how do we tell that story in a compelling way to the two bodies that we have to do that with? And, Alan, you look itchy, so I'm going to pass you this [microphone].

Mr. Silverman: I'd like to set the parameters. No death by PowerPoint.

Mr. Hurd: Yes.

Mr. Silverman: If PowerPoint is used, three ideas, three words, three lines, and then we talk around it. And I think as our Chair pointed out, the visuals produced through the GIS group and the IT group with the City, I think really caught our attentions when we saw some of our ideas translated into something that was a useful product. I think that kind of thing, to talk with and to talk around, may be the way to make some of these ideas clear. Take this flow chart and show people how they connect. So, I think that might be a good way to work some of this. I'm coming into Newark and I'm looking for a parking place, this is how I do it. And this is the reason why we need to tell other people marketing it how it's done.

Mr. Hurd: I'll add, and I know this is something I was thinking of when I was drafting the narrative based on comments from some Council members, some members see most stuff that they're doing through the lens of residents only. So, how is your, how are the rates in Lot 1 going to affect the residents of the City. So, part of what we have to do here is to expand their understanding of all the users that we're trying to find solutions for. Because it's residents, it's customers, it's visitors, it's students, it's employees. So, it's a much bigger user group than they may be thinking of. And, especially, to impress upon them that, you know, the health of the downtown is going to affect the health of the City. And if we make it, you know, basically if we make it so people don't come here to go to your restaurant or to go to your church or whatever, they'll find other ones. There are other ones out there where things might be more convenient or more easy. And as those things die off, then the downtown dies, and then the City dies. And then it's just the residents here and there's, you know . . . basically we can't look at just the residents because then that's all you're going to have when it's all over. So, that's been part of my thinking is to make sure that they understand how much bigger this picture is and what we're trying to solve for.

Mr. Silverman: And going back to some of Will's earlier comments, there appears to be no lack of physical parking within the City limits in Newark. There is a lack of how parking is managed and how that resource is maximized. And I think that's one of our themes.

Mr. McIntosh: Anybody else? Lee?

Mr. Mikles: A couple things that, like, when I was trying to look at this, one of the notable things that came out of this that we'd want to make sure we communicate and also make this more attractive is, I think, a clear picture of what success looks like to us in the City. So, if we start with that kind of vision of this is what this means. It's vibrant. It's walkable. And then I wrote down also it was very helpful for me going through this process when people brought forth external perspectives of other cities that are doing this, we're not . . . we'd like to think we're unique and that there are definitely some unique elements to our City, but I think that bringing in this is how other cities approach these problems, maybe not universally, but I think that was something that was useful to bring up.

Mr. Silverman: Successfully.

Mr. Mikles: Yes. Successfully. Or not, if that reinforces . . .

Mr. Silverman: Yes, or not.

Mr. Mikles: The other thing that was notable to me was that there was a real strong partnership with the University. And I know that we, as a City, are . . . me coming in as a business person in the City, building that bond is something that it seems more inane than it has been in function in instances. And I thought that this was one that there was a very strong partnership. How can we work together? How can we leverage these lots?

And, lastly, I think if we were able to show a map of the City, like GIS showed us a lot through those maps, but if we showed a map with target uses, so we're looking at employees to park here at University lots in the evening. We're looking at students to park here. So, we show that we're shifting the desired use around so that it puts the right people in the right spots. And these are the tactics that we're using to approach that.

Mr. Silverman: Along with the . . .

Mr. Cappiello: Along with the church?

Mr. Silverman: Yes.

Mr. Cappiello: I got that. I grew up Italian. I got that. I agree. I think we need to focus on, especially with the relationship with the University, instead of this at-odds, us and them, we're both here. And we're both big players. The City is here and the University is here, and we coexist in the same footprint, and we need to be able to get along because, if we do, we can both come out better on the other end. You don't want a University visitor coming in and saying, oh, parking is terrible. And I don't want a non-University person coming in and going, oh man, the University is just hosing downtown Newark. I can't get any parking in here.

Mr. McIntosh: Great, thank you. Anybody else? Well, I would say one thing for sure, just piggybacking on what you just said, the day I met Richard Rind, I knew we had something that was going to be good because just the way he carried himself during that meeting that Chris and I had with him. No one twisted his arm. He came here willingly, knowing that this was a public forum and knowing that the University is an easy target. That didn't stop him from coming and he, you know, certainly backed up everything you just said in all of the stuff that we've done over the time. So, at the risk of pointing one person out over another, I don't really mean to do it in that way, but I do think, Richard, you do represent the biggest elephant around, and you were a contributor at the community level of, you know, how do we get this done. And that, you know, is a lesson that we could learn in this City across the board.

Mr. Locke: Chairman, if I could just piggyback on that. I think it's important that we have so many people on this committee from so many different perspectives, and we were able to do something that has alluded this City for 20-25 years, which is come up with a holistic approach and a strategic approach to try to solve a problem that everyone's been complaining about for 25 years. I've served on many committees and I'm extremely proud of the work product we all have done here. And it does show that the University, citizens, students, businesses, developers, City staff, and volunteers from the Planning Commission can really come together and work for solutions. You hear each other, you respect each other, and then you come up with a final work product. And I just want to say that I appreciate everybody and I really felt it was an honor to be on this committee with all of you.

Mr. McIntosh: Thanks, Chris. That was really good. Every once in a while, passing him the microphone isn't . . . you don't want to get used to doing things like that because the next thing you know . . .

I had made a comment earlier and that comment was around the Gap Analysis. That that's designed to get you to think about how you close the gap, not how you get rid of something. So, one of the thoughts I had . . . it really doesn't have anything to do directly with the planning ideas that we're putting forward, but it does have to do with the implementation, and that is there's no reason why we can't seek money from outside sources for pay for this. And if we put our thinking caps on, it is entirely possible that we could. And, at the same time, bring the community together in a greater way.

So, without going into any details, I did have an idea that I've kind of floated with a couple of people and it's received some early minor applause. But, it struck me that if we put people in outside lots, if they go to the garage, for instance, the Trabant Garage, they're going to have to walk farther. Well, instead of that being an impediment, why don't we make that something that's a really good thing to do. And not because it costs less, but because it's part of something bigger that's fun. And, so, what if we were to get a sponsor such as, name a company, Fitbit, and have them pay a fee for this sponsorship and do some other things. But when, you know, if you park in the garage and you're going to Grain . . .

Mr. Mikles: Great thinking.

Mr. McIntosh: That's a for-instance . . . well that seems like quite a distance. They're at opposite ends. Why would I do that? It's 1,000 steps. And the more steps you get, it gives you something. You get something in return for it – a badge. You might even get 10% off your meal at the place you go to. Or if you get there and you're still alive, we'll charge you 10% more. But the idea is that the locations within the City, to get to the church from College Square is 750 steps, and so on. I'm not sure how we do all this, but the idea is that we bill this Newark as a walkable city, as a fun place to be, as a place that's concerned about all its people, and we get, I mean I can think of dozens of reasons why Fitbit would want to do this. They're no longer the only one in that marketplace. As a matter of fact, they're just one of many now. So, it's a model that could be moved to other cities and places. There are ways in which we can have maybe an annual step event, you know, and get the University and maybe Christiana Care behind . . . not the University so much as the people down at the STAR Campus . . . and do some things with them. You know, have a tent and fun stuff going on, sponsored booths and things of that sort. We could just do a lot of things like this. I'm just giving you a real broad look at this. That could generate a lot of money. But not only would it generate a lot of money, it would generate a lot of enthusiasm in the City. And it would, I mean, if you're concerned about health and health issues, I mean it's right up your alley. If you're concerned about getting something back for doing something that's kind of fun, it feeds right into it. But it also gives us something to advertise. It gives us something to talk about. And so, all of a sudden, people are saying let's go to Newark. Those folks know how to have fun. They know how to do this. They know how to do that. Let's go there. And we could really revitalize, such as we may need to, or keep us at a high point in people's minds. So, it's just something like that. And there are other ideas. That's the way we should be thinking in terms of how do we pay for this. We don't have to take it out of the City. We don't have to raise the tax rates and so on. There's a lot of different ways we could do this and it would benefit everybody to do so. So, I just wanted to throw that out there as just a thought that you can percolate in your minds. And I'm happy to get back from you any feedback that you have that might enhance this idea because I think it's got a lot of legs and it fits right into the overall plan that we have for parking. So, it's sort of like the topping. The cream on the cake. The cream on your coffee. Or just cream. Cream is good, right?

Mr. Hurd: The icing is on the cake.

Mr. McIntosh: It's the icing? Icing is on cake. Cream is on your coffee. No, it's actually in your coffee. If it was on your coffee it might wind up on your tabletop and that's not good. Okay.

Mr. Silverman: Must be a Boston thing.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. McIntosh: Is there any public comment? Yes, Jim? Go ahead.

Mr. Jones: I'll even stand up for this one. Jim Jones, member of the public, resident of District 5. I've been here just over a year, which now I got to vote for the first time the other day and, as all you guys already know, I lived in Newark before, but now I'm back. Actually, I want to speak a little bit longer than I have in the past, but not too long, I promise. I have four points. First one, a guy that I met by chance from the Downtown Newark Partnership said, you should go to these meetings, you know some stuff about parking, so I did. And you've made me feel very welcome and I want to thank you very much for that, and I try not to abuse that. When I got here, though, one of the things that initially I was cautious about was the make-up of the group. Because I've been part of groups that dealt with parking that were composed of constituents, and you wind up with everybody fighting for their own thing and kind of ignoring the big picture. And, so, for what it's worth to you, I think you guys did a really good job of not fighting that way. Everything that everybody has already said about how you all worked well together, I second or third that. As far as what you actually did, you've worked on solving a technical problem. I wrote here in my notes, a geometry problem – how to fit the cars into the spaces. And that was what you were supposed to do, and I think you did a really good job on it. But it's going to leave this room, and now I'm making my fourth comment here, in part because we have a member of City Council over here, and because you guys are all going to have to talk to it at some point. The opposition is going to be formed by people who are not interested in the geometry problem. They want to stop development, punish the University, make people exercise. You know what all the arguments look like. And, so, I only hope that maybe the people who actually are going to have to face that are either going to read your minutes and hear me say this now or figure it out on their own, that when somebody gets up and says something like that, call them on it. Say are you helping us to solve the parking problem or are you trying to further some other idea. So, but you certainly gave them a good plan to work with and I applaud all of you for the stuff you guys did. Thank you for giving me a chance to speak.

Mr. Mikles: Thanks.

Mr. Hurd: Thanks.

Mr. Rind: Thanks very much.

Mr. McIntosh: Jean? We haven't heard from you recently.

Ms. Jean White: Jean White, District 1. I haven't studied this and I don't have important things to say but the parking and the things in here are really an overlay on the whole town, and one must be careful not to assume what should happen in the different parts of the town. For example, there is concern by some that it's hard for anybody other than a student to live in the downtown area. And there are desires, I don't know how this could happen differently, but there are other people, not necessarily with children, who would like to live there but the rents are so high. But not to get into that in particular, but there are, if the Comprehensive Plan was looked at in certain ways to decide which parts of the City should be augmented for apartments, students and other types of people living, not maybe the extreme residential area. And, of course, parking fits into all of this but one needs to not assume what kinds of things will be going in the different areas that you're talking about, like employee parking and that kind of thing. I'm not sure if what I'm saying is very clear.

The other thing is, speaking of parking, the University had a meeting last Wednesday in Brown Lab to which one member of this committee was at, and it revolved around the issue which maybe doesn't exactly fit into this but it does affect parking, of the University building a dormitory on the parking lot that's next to the Morris Library. And I would say that it seemed to me, sitting in the audience, that most of the people that came there were those who parked

in that area and worked maybe in the library and other nearby places. And, obviously, they were very concerned about where they would be parking. And I'm sure that this is being addressed. And if, for example, I think something was said that students who are now parking in I think it was the Perkins Garage, will lose their chance to park there because it needs to have some of these other people park there. So, I don't know how this is going to wash into the City. It may in some way, but I can't speak to that. Anyway, it was an interesting meeting.

Mr. Rind: That it was.

Mr. Lawhorn: Hello, Jason Lawhorn, District 5. I'll kind of just re-say what I said before again. So, I think, in my mind, you guys were talking about it, but I think this is how problems are solved. You have all the stakeholders that got together and evaluated what the problem was, defined it, and then worked through to a solution. I just wanted to state again, as you move forward, because I want the fact that you guys did it the right way to really be successful. So, I think that you talked about it, that it's presented the right way. And when people talk about parking, it kind of goes to what you were just saying. It turns into a mess of a conversation because it's so complex. So, I just think that it's really critical that when you do work through your final presentation, that you make it clear what the present state is, because I learned things today about the present state that I didn't know. Every time I hear a conversation I learn something new about a new parking lot that I didn't know about, or passes or whatever. It's just a complex issue. So, understanding what the current state is and then what your plan is kind of like short-term and long-term so people will have a vision of parking is going to look like if this plan is successful. I just think it's really critical that that presentation come out well so that people understand exactly what your work product is. Because I think it's great and I want you guys to be successful, because I think this is the way to solve problems. I just wanted to reinforce that I think that's really critical because you're going to get a lot of opposition for specific items throughout this plan because there are people that on either side of many of these things. So, I just wanted to reinforce that.

Mr. Hurd: Thank you.

Mr. McIntosh: Anybody else? Okay . . .

Mr. Hurd: Just one quick thing. This is just sort of piggybacking on your sort of starting the conversation about funding, and just putting another thought out there that one way that other municipalities have started to deal with this is that they define a parking district, so that all the revenue from parking in that district goes back into that district, and it's identified. So, you see it on the meters. It's like some way of sort of saying this money is going towards . . . you know, it's not like building a garage . . . but that may be one way, depending on how the revenue stream is and maybe it's part of the dynamic pricing, to sort of say some of that money could be used for the consultants to do the analysis of the parking. Because the parking district is where the needs are and so that's where the money should come from and gets spent. And there's obviously more information on that out there, but I just sort of wanted to throw that in as an item of consideration down the road as we're looking at implementation.

Mr. McIntosh: Thank you.

Mr. Silverman: I think we're very fortunate in the work done by Mr. Howard and his group and some of the people on Council. We have a movie trailer out there and that's the countdown equipment that's existing in Lot 3, so people have a place that they can literally identify with the kind of things we're talking about. And we need to make sure that's built into our presentation.

Mr. McIntosh: Yeah, the visuals probably should be a sign or people in the parking lot having fun. Okay, is there somebody within the group, of those amongst you, someone who would like to be on the presentation team?

Mr. Rind: Don't stare at me.

Mr. McIntosh: I'm just used to looking at Chris. I'm sorry.

Mr. Mikles: Yeah, I will.

Ms. Gray: Oh, there you go.

Mr. McIntosh: Lee.

Mr. Mikles: I will.

Mr. McIntosh: Richard?

Mr. Rind: My time constraints are many.

Mr. McIntosh: We'll make it easy for you.

Mr. Rind: Especially with commencement and move-out and all of that, and Alumni weekend coming. It's going to be very difficult.

Mr. McIntosh: If we made it easy for you? Think about it. Okay, anybody else?

Mr. Hurd: I'm assuming I'm . . .

Mr. McIntosh: Yeah. You should never make an assumption. You know what they say about assume . . . never mind. Okay. Well, listen, thank you again sincerely for all your help. We will live up to what we said . . . what?

Mr. Fortner: With the May 7 meeting, she just asked a question. Sorry.

Mr. McIntosh: Okay.

Ms. Gray: Did we talk about the May 7 meeting?

Mr. Locke: We did, yeah.

Ms. Gray: Good. Okay, thank you.

Mr. McIntosh: You were in Smyrna or someplace.

Ms. Gray: Traffic, driving through Middletown.

Mr. Silverman: She was looking for a parking place.

Mr. McIntosh: No, she probably wouldn't have that problem. Okay, well thank you all for being here. Thank you in the audience for being here. Thanks to our Parking and GIS people.

Mr. Rind: Thank you, Frank, for leading the effort.

Mr. Locke: Motion to adjourn.

Mr. Hurd: Second.

Mr. McIntosh: I don't have a gavel.

There being no further business, the Planning Commission Parking Subcommittee meeting adjourned at 3:36 p.m.¹

As transcribed by Michelle Vispi
Planning and Development Department Secretary

Attachments

Exhibit A: [Parking Policy Matrix Policy Layers \(1\)](#)

Exhibit B: [Parking Policy Matrix Gap Analysis](#)

Exhibit C: [Identified Parking Strategic Issue & Proposed Implementations](#)

¹ This was the final meeting of the Planning Commission Parking Subcommittee.