

**MINUTES**  
**Bend Urban Renewal Agency**  
**Wednesday, August 20, 2008**  
**Council Chambers, City Hall**

**1. Roll Call**

The regular meeting of the Bend Urban Renewal Agency was called to order at 5:04 p.m. Members present upon roll call were: Peter Gramlich, Mark Capell, Jim Clinton, Bruce Abernethy, and Linda Johnson. Bill Friedman arrived at 5:36 p.m.

**2. Minutes (August 6, 2008)**

Member Johnson moved approval of the minutes as written with Councilor Capell seconding the motion, which passed unanimously. 5/0

**3. Visitor Comments**

There were none

**4. Greenwood/Wall Parking Management Options/Revenue**

Mr. Russell gave a brief history of the Greenwood/Wall Request for Proposal process and the subsequent backing out of the selected developer. At that time the Board requested staff to research ways to maximize revenue. Staff put together some options for managing the lot: customer parking and permit parking. He emphasized the support for permit parking from the Downtown Association and the Central Area Plan Committee.

Member Capell was concerned that many of the permit holders who transferred to the parking structure will transfer back, which would not create additional revenue and would be taking away customer parking. He is not supportive of Option C, but willing to debate Options A & B and preferred 2 hours free which is consistent with the other lots. Mr. Russell agreed it would initially be a transfer of revenue, but more and more permits are being sold in the structure and with Lava Court and Oxford Hotel being completed, there will be an increased demand for the structure. Member Capell asked how many permits can be sold in the structure and Mr. Clifford answered 290-370 spaces and there are 200 spaces for customer parking only. A lot of employees park in the Greenwood/Wall lot for the first two hours then move to the parking structure. Member Capell noted his previous comments about making it so expensive by the third ticket it hurts.

Member Clinton suggested using a parking machine like Portland does, charging \$1.00 per hour starting with the first hour; make this a test case. Mr. Russell explained that machines have been ordered for the Mirror Pond lots.

Member Abernethy asked about Option B. Mr. Clifford explained that is \$1.00/hour, but from a customer's rationale they would rather park on the street for two hours free. Member Abernethy reiterated that he heard there have been 290 permits sold with approximately 60 remaining to be sold and Mr. Clifford added there is some flex in the

numbers because the permits can be oversold by 30% and the number of permits fluctuates dependent upon the time of years.

Member Gramlich commented on the enforcement efficiency of Option C and Mr. Clifford explained those numbers were taken from their data base and there would also be less fluctuations in the revenue. He had a wait list of 25-30 people for the Greenwood/Wall lot when it was permitted. Member Gramlich asked about the Downtowners not being concerned about using this as a customer lot and Mr. Russell responded they are more concerned about the employee parking situation; it is an ongoing issue. Further discussion ensued about maximizing revenue, steps to make sure employees are not using customer parking, encouraging short term, high turnover parking, increasing parking fines based on the number of citations, using a system like Salem where employers submit employee license plate numbers to parking enforcer and the labor intensiveness of that type of system.

Member Gramlich was supportive of Option C.

Member Abernethy did not have strong feelings either way, but leaned towards Option C and he would support B over A.

Member Johnson was supportive of either B or C and felt one advantage of B was it puts pay as you go in front of people to get the accustomed to it.

Member Clinton did not like the message given to visitors when they see a large, publicly owned lot on main street filled with permit parking only.

Member Clinton moved approval of Option B.

Mr. Clifford noted that the lot would be available for customer parking after 6 p.m.

Member Capell was willing to switch from A to B if employee parking can be limited. Some options were provided for limiting the employees parking there.

Questions were asked about capping the number of hours and how it can be monitored and it was explained about part time employees working four hours it would dissuade them from parking in a lot with three free hours, the moving to evade tickets and that time would only start over if the individual is gone for an hour or more.

Member Johnson asked if Option B is chosen, does the enforcement employees check the tickets and Mr. Clifford explained how the pay and display system works.

Member Abernethy understood Member Capell's concept about significantly increasing the citation amounts, but did not agree because it is not in alignment with the infraction occurring. He would increase the fine some, but \$500 would be too much and limiting to three hours would be an administrative nightmare.

Member Johnson asked the cost of permits and Mr. Clifford explained the costs for permits in the various areas.

Member Johnson seconded the motion.

Member Abernethy asked about putting property back on the market and the timeline. The other consideration is if it is less than a year, the start up costs won't be recovered. Member Capell commented the machine could be moved to another lot. Mr. Russell noted that his sense is the Board wanted to hold off selling the property until the market rebounds so the timeline would be hard to determine.

Member Johnson asked if the pay and display units are solar generated and Mr. Clifford answered they can be either solar or hard wired. He added there is no other place or lot to put the Pay & Display, the Mirror Pond lots will already have one.

The motion passed with Members Gramlich, Clinton and Johnson voting for. Members Abernethy and Capell were opposed and Member Friedman abstained 3/2/0

The meeting adjourned 5:43 p.m.