

Dublin City Council Work Session
Monday, September 17, 2018
Council Chambers

Minutes of Meeting

Mayor Peterson called the Monday, September 17, 2018 Work Session of Dublin City Council to order at 6:00 p.m. at Dublin City Hall.

Members present were: Mayor Peterson, Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, Ms. Alutto, Ms. De Rosa, Mr. Reiner and Ms. Fox. Mr. Keenan was absent.

Staff members present: Mr. McDaniel, Ms. Mumma, Mr. Foegler, Ms. O'Callaghan, Mr. Hammersmith, Mr. Papsidero, Ms. Puranik Ms. Rauch, Mr. Boggs, Ms. Burness, Ms. Richison, Mr. Dearst, and Mr. Plouck.

Mr. McDaniel briefly mentioned a memo that he placed at the desk for each Council member regarding questions that were posed about an unrelated topic to this discussion. He then asked Mr. Papsidero to introduce the first topic.

Downtown Parking Management Study

Mr. Papsidero stated that the first topic of discussion for tonight is the downtown parking management study. He invited Ms. Puranik and Mr. Tom Brown from Nelson Nygaard to begin their presentation.

Ms. Puranik stated that she and Mr. Brown would be covering:

- Background & history;
- Completed work: Toolbox + 2018 Action Plan;
- 2018 Action Plan Overview and Progress report;
- 2019 Action Plan Priorities Preview; and
- Questions.

The downtown area, as referenced, includes the Bridge Park area; on-street, off-street parking; parking garages; loading/unloading strategies; and on the west side of the river, it includes the parking garage, on-street and the public parking lots. Mr. Brown is also a project manager for the Mobility Study so it was a good opportunity to tie the parking element into mobility considerations. She outlined some of the previous studies that have been done regarding parking in the downtown area.

Mr. Brown stated that Nelson Nygaard reviewed the previous studies and found that there were many typical constraints and opportunities with a walkable downtown. The Bridge Street District is a "game changer" on many levels. The current project, Downtown Dublin Parking Strategy, builds upon past work and is not just about Bridge Street District or Historic Dublin. Instead, it takes a broader look at parking. The goal was to develop a toolbox of proven, effective, best practice parking management strategies so that when there is a new area or issues, the discussion will focus on what tools to apply where. The purpose was for this toolbox to be applied citywide with a particular eye toward Bridge Street District and Historic Dublin where it is anticipated more immediate issues would arise. He explained that the maps provided illustrate the parking demand and heavier utilized areas from 2011. One of the key findings from these maps is the dominance of private parking. There were similar findings in 2017. The toolbox provides the City with resources to act on some issues as they arise and to guide discussions on specific options for resolving challenging issues. He shared the vision and mission for the project. The vision is:

Efficient parking management operations that provide a safe and positive parking environment for customers, as well as support and strengthen Economic Development and place-making goals.

The Mission:

Support growth and development of Downtown Dublin through parking management practices and supportive mobility enhancements that are: community focused; welcoming and user friendly; short-term viable and long-term sustainable; and fiscally responsible.

Mr. Brown shared the objectives of this project:

- Economic Development;
- Optimal Customer Service;
- Easy to Access & Utilize;
- Context Appropriate;
- Synergized with Mobility Study;
- Synergized with Technology Advancements; and
- Responsible Resource Stewardship.

Mr. Brown commented on the need to respond to change in the demands for mobility. The future of mobility and parking needs in walkable urban settings is somewhat unpredictable, so being able to respond to the changes in demand is key.

He stated that stakeholder investment was a large part of the toolbox development. It is important for the toolbox to not only reflect the national best practices, but also issues and concerns on the ground with key stakeholders.

The key takeaways for toolbox development in phase one were:

- There is ample supply to meet demand.
- Scarcity and abundance sit side by side, shaping diverse perceptions.
- Management is the big key. Management strategies are essential to ensuring that the value of the supply that was invested in is achieved.
- Off-street abundance.

He shared an overview of the tools:

- Shift demand to distribute parking more evenly across all parking options.
- Reduce demand to minimize supply expansions, emphasize walkability.
- Expand capacities to increase the value provided by existing parking supplies.
- Expand supplies as shared/public parking. He mentioned the valet stand and how that is a strategy that can provide some relief and could use under-utilized parking that people are not aware of.
- Manage event demand to ease strain on "everyday" resources.
- Optimize technology for state-of-the-practice efficiencies and customers.
- Coordinate management to ensure consistency and optimize synergies.
- Providing an implementation guide listing priority strategies and action items.

In response to Ms. De Rosa regarding who owns the parking areas today, Mr. Papsidero stated that it is bifurcated between the City, which has on-street parking and surface parking lots; and Crawford Hoying who is managing their garages. In terms of enforcement, Code Enforcement enforces the on-street parking and the two Darby and southern public parking lots; the Police Department enforce loading under the Code.

Mr. Reiner stated that in reality, a lot of it is owned by private businesses.

Mr. Brown stated that much of the parking in Bridge Street District is owned by one owner. In the Historic District it is owned by many different owners. One of the objectives from the beginning of the project was to determine if a management strategy could be developed where it is managed as consistently as possible, even if there are many different owners. As phase one was wrapping up, it was clear that phase two would need to focus on Bridge Park due to an immediate need with restaurants opening and residents moving in. Specialists were added to the team to guide signage and ordinance development and there was not a need for consensus building as there was a single dominant stakeholder (Crawford Hoying).

He noted that to respond to the immediate need in Bridge Park, the following 2018 Bridge Park Action Plan recommendations were identified:

- On-street time limits
Time limits have been established and there is strategic placement and schedule on primary commercial blocks and all day zones on secondary streets.
- Curbside loading strategies
Districts such as Bridge Street are typically not built with the usual loading and unloading docks that would be seen in a strip mall, for example. The absence of these loading and unloading areas puts pressure on the curbside to accommodate these trucks. Limited curb space requires overlapping peak times of demand, so early morning accommodations have been made on most of Longshore to loading and unloading in the morning, mid-period of afternoon (after lunch crowd thins and before evening crowd). This is considered to be a national best practice that more cities are doing. Another consideration many cities are entertaining is curbside after 8:00 p.m., having designated areas for pick-up/drop-off for Uber and Lyft. It is predicted that 1/3 of the people arriving in the Bridge Park area are arriving by hired vehicle versus driving themselves.
- Pricing pilot for on-street parking
The time limits will be insufficient as a sole means of ensuring availability. He noticed in driving the area that many of the vehicles parked on-street appeared to be employees working in the district. He believes that parking with a fee would be an incentive to those employees to seek out free parking in an under-utilized area and save the on-street parking for the patrons of the businesses. A sub-consultant is working on the pilot to ensure that it is run under the parameters that will provide meaningful information about whether or not this could be a desirable long-term investment for the City. It will also be necessary to make sure it uses the most updated technology. Pay-by phone seems to be the most widely used option and there are a number of vendors who are willing to bid for a free pilot to demonstrate their technology. Effective way-finding can direct people unwilling or unable to use the pay-by-phone to nearby garages or lots.
- Enforcement.
Mr. Brown noted how important it is to begin enforcement now as a long-term strategy for making it effective.

Mr. Brown asked for Council feedback regarding whether or not Council would be interested in seeking a pilot program as he has described.

Mayor Peterson sought clarification regarding how a pilot program would work.

Mr. Brown stated that over the last five years, companies have developed that are willing to provide a free pilot to demonstrate the value of their product. This has evolved into a competitive environment and his company helps cities write an RFP for a free period of paid parking with little to no commitment from the City. The vendor would likely want a substantial area to cover to prove the value of the service. The scale of the pilot and how much will be charged can be

negotiated. The role the vendor will play is one of the most important factors in communicating changes and what to expect, how long it will last and offering customer service.

In response to Mayor Peterson's question regarding a physical meter at the parking locations, Mr. Brown stated it can be a pay-by-space or pay-by plate as examples.

Mayor Peterson asked if the vendor provides the person for enforcement.

Mr. Brown responded that one of the vendors he spoke with does offer enforcement, so the City could ask for and obtain that service from the vendors.

Mayor Peterson asked about revenues received from these services and how it is allocated.

Mr. Brown stated that he was unsure as a pilot how that would work. The vendor that uses pay-by-phone makes their money from the fees. Most cities pass off the fee to the person purchasing the parking and some cities absorb the fees -- he has run a model both ways.

In response to Mayor Peterson's question regarding the fees, Mr. Brown stated they are transaction fees, such as 45 cents for example, which would go straight to the vendor while the City receives the remainder.

Mr. McDaniel suggested that, since several of these types of companies have emerged in recent years, the City could develop an RFP and see from the responses how they might structure the pilot. The City could then negotiate for the technology, staff support and revenues.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes inquired as to whether or not the revenues would cover the cost of enforcement.

Mr. Brown responded that the vendors who provide enforcement are somewhat new and he did not have that information; however, when they ran the model of what a permanent solution would look like, they assumed enforcement as a cost as part of management -- either hiring staff or contracting those services. In either scenario, the revenue that the model projects would be more than enough to pay for enforcement.

Mayor Peterson clarified that this was strictly on-street parking, not the garages.

Mr. Brown stated that was correct. The parking in the garages in Bridge Park is modest and Crawford Hoying does not believe charging for parking in the garage is necessary. Also, the ultimate goal is to move the long-term parking off of the curb and into the garage, so charging a fee for the garages may work against that.

Mr. Brown stated that the process would be competitive with services provided and the cost.

Mr. Papsidero stated that an RFP could be drafted so there are options that companies can respond to and then the City can decide what would work best for them.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the technology is moving very fast.

Mayor Peterson expressed concerned about how residents will know that they have to pay-by-phone, for example, and how to do it.

Mr. Papsidero stated that it would need to be very clear on the signs.

Mr. Brown stated that signage would need to state the cost and the length of time. Cities have tried this and have moved into physical meters, or a kiosk on the corner.

Mr. Papsidero stated that kiosks were explored in 2016 and he recalls there was a large up-front capital cost.

Ms. Puranik noted that there are other options within the environment as well such as pay-by-text or pay-by-call.

Mayor Peterson asked how many spaces are being considered for this pilot.

Mr. Brown stated that there are blocks that are consistently high in demand. As things change, one of the focuses of the toolbox is performance measures and performance monitoring, so it

could be expanded if needed. Paid parking is about redistributing demand for parking. Ms. Puranik stated that there are 337 parking spots built into the model and there are 2,200 spots between the three available garages.

Ms. De Rosa stated she does not understand why this needs to be done. With the garages in close proximity, she is unclear why this is needed at this time.

Mr. Brown responded that when he was in the area earlier, the curbs were full with what seemed to be contractor or service vehicles.

Ms. De Rosa stated she does not see a need for this since there is not an issue of capacity. The focus for a walkable area should be walking and not parking right in front of the restaurant and then leaving.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the dialogue has been how to affect habit relative to parking along curbs and service lots. The current situation in Bridge Park with people parking on the street for long periods of time is a problem that is currently experienced in the Historic District, as well, over many years. With greater enforcement and using this technology as a beta test, he is hoping it will affect the habits of people and that people will begin to use the garages.

In response to a question by Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes regarding whether or not the City has asked them to police themselves, since it involves one property owner, Ms. De Rosa said it was a good place to start. She was questioning whether or not it was a good use of City staff time.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the bigger need for this is on the west side of the river, but he is not advocating that. He would like to beta test this on the east side of the river first, since he doesn't know what effect the new parking garage will have in Historic Dublin.

Ms. De Rosa asked why that is the City's role to manage the parking in that area.

Mr. McDaniel stated that there are challenges regarding the ability for a private entity to enforce parking on a public street.

Ms. De Rosa asked again why this time and energy is being spent on this when there is no capacity issue.

Mr. Brown stated that the reason the on-street parking is such a priority is there are a consistent number of people who, if they cannot find a close spot easily, will not come back as frequently. Store and property owners really stress the need for availability of on-street parking.

Ms. Puranik stated that there are also findings that show an increase in traffic as people circle around waiting for the "perfect" close spot to come open.

Mr. Brown stated that it is easy to spread awareness in Bridge Park of the availability of garage parking, but more difficult in Historic Dublin. There will be more pressure on the on-street parking on that side of the river.

Mr. Foegler stated in broad context that this would be a first step in the implementation of a broad comprehensive parking management strategy. One of the major goals is trying to get people into the structures. In the suburban area like Dublin, we are incentivizing them by making it free. This notion that there will be pricing and parking will cost over time will probably occur as demand grows. The easy place to start that and the place it is needed the most is with on-street parking. When trucks need to load/unload from the businesses, spaces need to be available at those times, or the trucks just stop in the street and load/unload. The on-street parking should be the most convenient for the street level retailers and businesses. They want those spaces turned over for their customers. This is the first step in implementation, beginning with the on-street parking. The enforcement will be a piece of that implementation. The second phase would be the surface lots.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that the City is spending a lot of time trying to solve problems that it just created. What is being done on the back end of this to avoid some of these issues? When the street-grid network was originally designed, it had a number of things happening in the streets; she wants to know what staff is doing in terms of the new applications and new development to make sure that we aren't further complicating things

Mr. Papsidero stated that there haven't been any new applications beyond what is occurring in Bridge Park. To date, it has been a matter of solving part of this issue in the street right-of-way without building additional pavement, for example service alleys. If another development came to the City similar to Bridge Park, we may want to discuss service alleys, but they bring their own host of issues. There is no perfect answer to this, but trying to manage the use of the public rights-of-way that we have with loading issues and enforcement would help.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that the City needs to plan better and if we wait until we have an application in hand to decide a policy on how to handle these situations, it will be too late. She doesn't want the City to create problems that it then has to solve.

Mr. McDaniel stated that he has received some complaints about people not being able to walk on Darby Street. He believes that many of these issues are occurring in Historic Dublin and there is a desire for enforcement at the curb and on surface parking lots.

Ms. Fox stated that she believes staff is somewhat "jumping the gun." Referring to Bridge Street District only, there is currently a great amount of construction and people are parking in front of restaurants. There is still a lot of construction that needs to be completed and there is no place for the construction workers to park with their tools and equipment. When looking at the Bridge Street Code, the need for alleys or loading zones to service the buildings has been ignored. The only place to service the buildings is from the sidewalk. She reiterated the activity in the area such as loading/unloading, residents moving in and out, vehicles for hire and not a lot of handicapped parking. The focus should be on how we want to use these spaces with signage, so there is some allowance for service providers during certain hours, for example. She believes the parking garages are so close and convenient that signage should solve some of the problem. People are looking for convenience and if it isn't convenient they won't return to the area. The garage is convenient and there should be signage directing people to it. She suggested allowing the area to develop a little more and determine if the problem persists. She asked who owns the parking garages.

Mr. Foegler responded that the issuer of the bonds technically owns the garages and Crawford Hoying manages and operates them (with exception to the garage adjacent to the library).

Ms. Fox asked about charging a fee to park in the garages and who would ultimately set that fee.

Mr. Foegler stated that Crawford Hoying could do that, but the financing authority (the issuer of the bonds) and the City would have a seat at the table for those discussions.

In response to Ms. Fox's question regarding maintenance of the infrastructure, Mr. Foegler stated that there are revenue sources from the tenants that fund maintenance in addition to other items.

Ms. Fox reiterated she believes it is too soon to move forward with this because it is only a couple of blocks and it is too new. The concern she has is for the loading and unloading of service providers to service the buildings.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that many service providers have tool racks, ladders, etc. on top of their vehicles that do not make that parking garage clearance feasible.

Mr. Papsidero stated that there are loading zones that have signs, but when too many vehicles come at the same time, there is too much congestion, resulting in double-parking. There are sign-enforced loading zones in Bridge Park today.

Ms. Fox asked if the signage is adequate.

Mr. Foegler stated that we know we do not want people parking on the street. We want people to use the garages naturally. There will be more restaurants opening in the coming months and the demand will increase. The prime on-street space should be used by the prime space first floor users. He pointed out that this parking management is not something that will be subsidized by the City.

Mr. McDaniel stated that it is important to keep in mind that there have been a series of studies. This is a comprehensive view and there can be many tools in the toolbox to use when needed. Staff is bringing this forward because it is important to begin setting habits. Technology is emerging and things are changing. His direction to staff was that nothing would be implemented in the Historic District because the parking garage hasn't opened on that side of the river yet and the impacts of the garage are not yet known. He is recommending that the focus be on the east side of the river in the Bridge Street District.

Mr. Reiner stated that he agrees that currently there may not be an issue, but there will be in the future with many new restaurants opening. He invited Matt Starr from Crawford Hoying to provide input regarding the parking.

Mr. Starr stated that the parking program would be important long-term for the viability of the retail and restaurants. Turning those parking spaces over is very important for retail users. For visitors to a restaurant, there is no reason the garage couldn't be used. As a matter of course, when they have a tenant improvement job that begins, they do review parking with the construction contractors. Constant reinforcement of where to park is required at every stage. He is hopeful that something will be implemented in the Bridge Street District as a pilot of what could someday occur in the Historic District. There may be a perception that it costs to park in the garage. They could do better job of letting people know that the garages are open and free.

Mr. Reiner asked Mr. Starr if he believes Council should implement this parking program.

Mr. Starr stated that he understands Council has to be fiscally responsible and he believes that this will pay for itself.

Mr. Reiner stated the other considerations are the revenue implications, what company is hired, and the end results.

Ms. Alutto stated that she would like to see more information regarding what the costs are year over year. She is appreciative of what was presented and agrees that the premium parking should be used for patrons and services like Uber and Lyft. She is fine with working toward a pilot, but is somewhat concerned about solving a problem that does not yet exist. She realizes that parking will be a problem in the future, however, so it is wise to begin to look at it now. She agrees with Ms. Fox and Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes' comments regarding learning from these lessons as we review additional development.

Mr. Brown shared a slide showing the model of the 330 spaces and what options are available to the City. Many things can be adjusted. The number of spaces is based upon the Bridge Park area, but that can be changed. An option is a management program that enforces time limits, but not charging for parking.

Ms. Alutto clarified that this option shows what would happen if we did nothing and stayed at status quo.

Mr. Brown stated that was correct, but also reflects moving into a proactive management environment.

Ms. Alutto asked if we have a number that shows what the status quo would be as a baseline measurement.

Mr. Papsidero stated that it would be the salary of the part time Code Enforcement Officer. He was unsure what costs the Police department would have related to enforcement, if any.

In response to Mayor Peterson's question regarding enforcement, Mr. Brown stated that this model does not generate any revenue through enforcement; it focuses more on the management and not on revenue. The annual cost is \$130,000 per year; cumulative over five years it is \$624,000. This model includes everything except paying for parking.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated she is not opposed to considering a pilot program, but unless she knows what the number would be if we did an app-based solution and what the enforcement piece of that would look like, she is not interested in adding staff for enforcement. She would want to see a clearly defined package stating what it is, what it will do or generate and how much the City has to supplement. She doesn't want parking meters along Riverside Drive, but in order to make any kind of decision, she needs to know the costs associated to an app-based solution including the enforcement piece.

Mr. McDaniel stated that if Council is genuinely interested in the notion of implementing some level of management as a beta test, he suggests the idea of developing an RFP regarding the technology and application to see what response comes back from the various companies. Staff can compare the companies by running the information through the model shown by Mr. Brown.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes asked if the RFP would have a price tag associated with it.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the RFP would include all costs and technology.

Mr. Brown stated that in his presentation up to this point, the assumption was a free to the City, paid pilot program. The current slide represents what a permanent program would look like. Mr. Brown ran through the various options regarding outsourcing enforcement.

Ms. Alutto stated that she would like to see what the full package would look like and what it would mean. She asked that Mr. Brown send the model to Council members so she could have the opportunity to review the numbers more closely.

Mr. Brown stated this is everything, including software costs, collections, enforcement, website, etc.

Ms. Alutto asked for an example of other cities that do the full outsource package, how big they are and how many parking spaces they have. As she looks at some of these companies and who their customers are, they are much larger with parking authorities in place. Dublin is smaller, so that would be scaled down.

Mr. Brown stated that the last option, contracting all the services out, is the norm. He provided an overview of the pros and cons of the different options. In response to Ms. Alutto's question regarding physical meters, Mr. Brown stated that is what most cities have done, generally due to enforcement, signage, and the fact that it is easier for some users to manage. The cities that have tried the app style parking have liked it.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes suggested that perhaps exploring the app-based programs and writing the RFP could be an exercise for an intern.

Mayor Peterson sought clarification on what direction staff needs from Council.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the tools in the toolbox have been identified, the focus on the east side of the river, and seeing what companies can do for the City by issuing an RFP.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that she does not believe the City needs a consultant to write an RFP.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the RFP would be handled by staff, not a consultant.

Ms. De Rosa asked about the \$400,000 in the CIP for next year and how this ties to that request.

Mr. Foegler stated that was an allocation based on some earlier products that were shown, so if it is decided that this project would be done in Historic Dublin and Bridge Park, this was the placeholder.

Mr. Papsidero stated that was the higher end of what a capital investment would be.

Ms. De Rosa sought clarification on what would be spent next year if the pilot is free and if staff could do the RFP.

Mr. Foegler stated that the pilot wouldn't have costs, but this needs to be done professionally because it should be structured to have the vendor covering all costs initially. This also should be structured to be able to grow to manage thousands of spaces and structures in the future. The 300+ spaces are a starting point for a pilot. We need to look at whether or not the system has the ability to integrate with something in the future that could tell you what space in what garage is available and what it costs. We will want flexibility to grow as needed.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the numbers could be updated to reflect what Council would be agreeing to for 2019, 2020 and 2021.

Mr. Papsidero stated that when the RFP is brought to Council the numbers would be included in that.

Ms. De Rosa stated she is referencing the CIP numbers.

Mr. McDaniel recommended keeping the \$400,000 in the CIP for now and seeing how the implementation of technology plays out. This could also be part of the Smart City application such as sensor technology or video cameras. Not enough is known now about how much of the technology should or should not be implemented. Keeping the funding in place does not mean he will immediately implement it. There are still many phases of the process that would come back to Council for approval and guidance.

Mayor Peterson stated that the number is included because staff sensed an impending need that should be addressed. He has no concern with leaving the funding in place.

Ms. De Rosa stated that Mr. Papsidero indicated this number was the high end. She would appreciate understanding what we anticipate that money covering and what it won't cover.

Mr. McDaniel stated that he had hoped he would have those details and numbers available for Council, but they are not ready. He could have that amount broken down for the next CIP hearing.

In response to Ms. Alutto's question regarding the duration of the pilot, Ms. Puranik stated it was a six-month pilot from the point where the RFP begins.

Ms. Alutto stated she would like to see what this looks like at the highest volume traffic times of the year.

Mr. Brown stated they usually recommend six months to allow for testing during different conditions.

Mayor Peterson stated that staff is seeking direction on whether or not to do an RFP, not the duration or when it starts.

Mr. Reiner stated that there is potential revenue involved, so he is supportive of proceeding with an RFP.

Ms. Fox stated that she supports a pilot program. But she is concerned about the confusion, i.e. we are working toward a walkable environment. There are things that could be done such as a dedicated valet lane, Uber or Lyft area only, or retail customers only. Is it possible to have signage to help with the current demands, prior to going to a pay to park?

Mr. Brown stated that they are focusing on the paid parking because that is something that needs Council direction. One of the reasons that paid parking is a best practice for many cities is because it provides a co-benefit. It is a benefit method to manage parking, but it also pays for itself.

In response to Ms. Fox's question regarding people who might struggle with the pay by phone concept, Mr. Brown stated that one of the asks that needs to be in the RFP is what is the solution to marketing information and making sure people understand that it is paid parking.

Ms. Fox stated that parking by phone is exclusive.

Mr. Brown stated that information could be provided on where people can park without having to pay, which is where the marketing materials come into play.

Ms. Fox is concerned that people will be confused.

Mayor Peterson stated that the RFP process is the first step. He asked Council if staff should go ahead with the RFP.

There was no objection.

Mr. Brown stated that he and Mr. McDaniel met with a group of business owners in Historic Dublin and he was surprised by how many people were supportive of paid parking. If it proves effective in Bridge Park, that will only help the conversation on the west side of the river. After that meeting, he realized that the next phase of this project should be to engage those business owners and share information about what tools are available. In addition, developing an enterprise fund will be key to making sure that parking programs are self-sustaining and self-generating so as they become more successful, they generate more revenue for the area.

In response to Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes' question regarding whether or not a fund already exists with the New Community Authority, Mr. McDaniel stated that there is a fund, but only as it relates to the east side of the river and North High Street -- it would not be applicable to Historic Dublin.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that she would prefer not to have so many layers and authorities involved. It would be nice to use something we already have in place to multi-task.

Mr. Foegler stated that the purpose of the enterprise fund is to have an isolated fund so all parking related revenues and costs come to one place. The enterprise fund builds into the notion of all the aspects of mobility and parking.

Mr. Brown stated that the fund should be established now before there are revenues that are distributed elsewhere. Building upon the parking map that we already have, he suggested building a website that has comprehensive information about parking, what it costs, how to pay for it, and how to get to it.

Ms. Fox asked about utilizing the pay by phone app in Historic Dublin and engaging owners of private lots to make their spaces available.

Mr. McDaniel agreed and stated that the owners could receive the revenue from the spaces.

Mr. Papsidero stated that many apps are set up that way, where the owner could assign the spots and manage the parking in their own lot.

Ms. Fox stated that there is a great demand for parking near La Chatelaine, and there is not good vehicular connection to that area from the garage. It is not easy to get to the parking garage because Franklin Street has not been completed. On the plan, she noticed there was parking marked out on each side of the road on Franklin Street by the church. She didn't understand why that parking would be eliminated.

Mr. McDaniel stated he didn't recall that parking being eliminated on the plan.

Ms. Fox stated that we need to look at the tools in the toolbox to determine how to encourage people to use the garage from areas on the south side of Bridge Street. She wants to make sure the RFP includes the shared use parking with the owners of the private lots in the area.

Ms. Alutto stated she thought the RFP was only for the east side of the river.

Ms. Fox suggested adding it to the RFP to see what is possible while an RFP is being done.

Mr. Brown stated that this is already a tool available in the toolbox and used Asheville, North Carolina as an example. Business owners had their lots added to an app to charge for parking and signs went up without the City of Asheville even being aware it was happening.

Mr. Brown added that once you have pay-by-phone in your city that will happen organically with the business owners.

Ms. Fox stated that residents in the Historic District feel that studies are done, but nothing ever happens as a result. If the City is going to try this on the east side, there would be no harm in asking a few business owners if they would like to try it for their lots.

Ms. Alutto suggested going to HDBA to see if there is interest.

Mr. Brown stated that they did speak to HDBA and there was excitement about it.

Ms. Alutto stated that maybe it would encourage them more if the City would help walk them through how to get that started.

Mr. Brown stated that the pay-by-phone vendor has an incentive to help them get started because they would receive fees.

Bridge Street District Vision Plan

Ms. Rauch stated there are three different pieces that staff has reviewed: the Bridge Street District Vision Plan, the Bridge Street District Code and Guidelines work plan, and the Historic Dublin Code and Guidelines.

At the June work session, Ms. Fox inquired about how the Vision Statement and Principles was being integrated into the Code and Design Guidelines.

The Vision Statement states:

The Bridge Street Corridor is Dublin's centerpiece. Dublin's historical and cultural heart is strengthened and balanced by highly walkable districts and neighborhoods on both sides of the Scioto River. Exceptional green spaces preserve the outstanding natural features in the corridor and seamlessly connect each unique district along the corridor. Mixed-use districts bring together complementary arrangements of living, working, and recreation in memorable settings created by distinctive, human-scaled architecture and streets that invite walking and gathering. Greatly expanded choices in housing, employment, activities, and transportation attract new generations of residents, businesses and visitors. The Bridge Street Corridor radiates a diversity and vitality that mark it as a special place not only within Dublin, but within the region, nation and world.

Ms. Fox stated that when the Bridge Street Code came to Planning and Zoning, there was very little information focused on what the character of the district looked like, but much heavier on the "bricks and mortar" pieces. She believes that to really understand the character of what the community plan wanted the Bridge Street District to look like was not really addressed in the Code. If it isn't stated, then it is difficult for any planning and zoning group to really verify if the vision is being followed.

Mr. Papsidero stated that the Bridge Street District Vision Plan will be incorporated in the Code as part of the Code update that is underway.

Ms. Fox inquired what specific wording was to be used.

Mr. Papsidero stated that the specific wording will not be determined until the stakeholder committee is formed.

Ms. Fox asked about the August 29 version of adopted principles that she had in her possession, Mr. Papsidero stated that the language came from the original 2010 plan and is also reiterated in the PowerPoint provided for tonight's presentation. It has been incorporated into the Code as part of the update coming forward in October.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes asked when staff expected this to be voted on.

Mr. Papsidero stated that vote would likely not occur until April or May of 2019. This material will first be provided to the stakeholder committee that Council asked staff to create.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that there were some items from the Council Goal Setting retreat that were to be incorporated into the amendment, such as boundary adjustments and review processes. When are those happening?

Mr. Papsidero stated that a timeline will be shared on those items later in the presentation.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that a strong vision statement will really be helpful in determining appropriate uses.

Mr. Papsidero stated that the 2010 Plan has detail regarding site specific policy recommendations. Staff put those in the Guidelines and updated them to demonstrate what has occurred since 2010.

Ms. Fox asked where the vision statement will be located in the Bridge Street Code update.

Mr. Papsidero responded that it will be integrated into the introduction of the Code and shared a slide of the language staff intends to use.

Ms. Fox asked if it will only be referenced or will it be explained.

Mr. Papsidero stated that they will be replicating it word for word. There will be more explanation in the Scope and Intent section, which is the foundation of the Code. He explained how the information will be integrated in the first three chapters of the guidelines, stating:

- the first chapter of the guidelines will be a User Guide, which explains how you use the guidelines, how it applies relative to the Code and will have clear references to the 2010 Plan;
- the second chapter is the Vision chapter and will go into a lot of detail in terms of replicating again the statement and the principles as well as a series of supported policies in the Plan that will be in the guidelines; and
- the third chapter on Neighborhood Standards is where there will be more geographically specific guidelines.

Bridge Street District Code and Guidelines Work Plan

Mr. Papsidero stated in regard to the Bridge Street Code Work Plan that the first amendment piece is the administrative procedures and submittal requirements. This is currently before the Planning and Zoning Commission. The second piece updates the code and creates new design guidelines. He shared the timeframe for the first amendment. This amendment should be brought to Council in October or November.

Staff has been working to complete the draft of the larger Code update and circulated it in October for feedback. The document would then be provided to the stakeholder committee at the beginning of November so they could review it for a few weeks before they begin to meet. Staff proposes a schedule of four working meetings over two months for this committee to complete its review of the draft code and guidelines. These meetings are expected to begin in November/December. He illustrated the large amount of material that will be provided to the committee. Staff's suggestion regarding the composition of the stakeholder committee is:

- two City Council members;
- two Planning and Zoning Commission members;
- one District resident
- a developer/real estate industry*
- one architect*
- one engineer*, and
- a landscape architect*.

*Mr. Papsidero stated that these should be professionals who have used the Code and applied it.

In response to Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes' question regarding time commitment, Mr. Papsidero stated that they estimate four meetings.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that not every section of the Code needs revision.

Mr. Papsidero stated that they are extracting a great deal of the Code and tweaking what remains. The bulk of the work will be in the guidelines.

Ms. Fox stated that her suggestion on the composition of the committee is to have an architect and developer who have never worked with the Code. The City is trying to bring new people to Dublin to develop, but they keep hearing, "this is too complicated, or too hard." There is value to have both those who have worked with it and those who haven't.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes suggested that it would be good to know if the Code continues to discourage some due to its complexity.

Mr. McDaniel agreed.

Mr. Papsidero stated that not many people will volunteer to read this amount of material.

Mayor Peterson suggested having the Administrative Committee look at adding names to this stakeholder committee.

Mr. McDaniel agreed that would be helpful.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, Chair, Administrative Committee agreed.

Mayor Peterson added it will also be important to have people who work well together involved in the committee.

Mr. McDaniel stated that he has some ideas regarding people who have expressed interest in doing work in the area but haven't to date.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes suggested having a meeting with the staff to discuss this further.

Mr. Papsidero stated that the City has contracted with the two firms who did the original market study work, Zimmerman Volk and W-ZHA to update the studies. Preliminary information should be available from their work in early November. Staff is reviewing a proposal from Smart Growth America to conduct an independent analysis of development to date, streetscape improvements, and open spaces. This contract has not yet been signed and the work has not yet been scheduled. Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that the contract should address the firm using Dublin data on a speaking tour.

Ms. Fox stated she understood this was focused more on bringing revenues in versus a focus on streetscape.

Mr. Papsidero stated that the direction to staff was to have an objective third party come in and evaluate what has been built to date and determine if it is consistent with the Code.

Mr. Reiner stated that he has heard criticism and negativity which prompted the request for an independent analysis.

Ms. De Rosa asked about the purpose of obtaining this information.

Mr. Reiner stated that it will allow Council to assess "where we are" and "what can be improved."

Mr. McDaniel stated that this would look at the expectations for the Code, what is "Dublin-ized" versus the Code, and how do we come to agreement on this. He wants to have the expectations clearly defined and this study is supposed to do that.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated she was confused about why we would do a market study. The developers will do their own market studies and would know what is marketable in that area. She doesn't understand why the City would spend money to do the same.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the information could lead back to the ongoing dialogue on economic

development.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that they are still waiting on data about the number of jobs and the type of jobs in terms of salaries in the District. She understood that Crawford Hoying was assembling that information, but Council has not seen it yet.

Mr. McDaniel stated he will obtain that information for Council.

Mr. Papsidero stated that it was staff's understanding that Council wanted those studies updated and as part of that, forecasting what additional development could occur.

Ms. De Rosa stated that it was her understanding that we should first see where we are – the current status.

Mayor Peterson stated that the contract for the updated studies was already signed and the work is nearly half done.

Mr. Papsidero stated that the contract with Smart Growth America is the contract that is not signed. In response to Mayor Peterson's question, Mr. Papsidero stated that everything built to date includes everything built in the Bridge Street District since the Code was adopted.

Ms. Fox stated that she believes that Bridge Park is successful and it is wonderful. She also believes there is opportunity for improvement in everything, so it is important to identify what is working and what isn't working, green spaces, etc.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that, as we are talking about touring various areas, she believes it would make sense to end the tour with Bridge Park and talk about:

- What did we hit?
- What did we miss?
- What do we like?
- What don't we like?

She suggested that having this discussion would give them an analysis of the development to date. She stated that it isn't necessary to have Smart Growth America representatives tell the City about their own community.

Mr. Reiner stated the City is very fortunate to have one supplier building Bridge Street District. Regarding Smart Growth America, it would be good to have an outside party assessment to inform Council about what we are doing right and what we are not doing right. Any other applicant trying to move through the process for Bridge Street would have given up. He reiterated that he is glad Crawford Hoying is the only developer on that project.

Ms. De Rosa asked when the tour is scheduled.

Mr. Papsidero responded that staff is working with the Clerk's office on scheduling, but a date is not identified at this time.

Ms. Alutto stated she would prefer to do the tour first and have a follow-up discussion before any contracts are signed.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the original plan for the tour was to visit New Albany to view development.

Ms. De Rosa stated she had understood there was more to tour, such as the Short North.

Mr. Papsidero stated he recalled Council wanting to see New Albany residential and Westerville office development.

Ms. De Rosa stated that Franklinton and the Short North have lots of development activity and could be toured as well.

Mr. McDaniel stated that staff would provide a list of suggestions and circulate it among Council. There was consensus among Council that Bridge Park would be the last location on the tour.

Mayor Peterson asked if staff needed any other guidance on anything else in the presentation before moving on with the next topic.

Mr. Papsidero stated that Council has expressed interest in updating the Bridge Street District Traffic Study, and Engineering is requesting funding in the 2019 CIP to complete that update. Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes asked about the cost of this update, but that information was not readily available.

Historic District Code and Guidelines

Ms. Rauch stated that there were three tasks from the June work session, which were:

- Historic District boundaries;
- Historic District regulations; and
- Historic District Design Guidelines.

In terms of the boundary discussion, Ms. Rauch stated that staff reviewed the potential modifications to the boundary of the Historic District. She provided a map to illustrate the proposed changes, which are:

- Removal of the northern area – Z1, Z2, the Plaza, and Library /Garage – and giving it a Bridge Street District designation.
Ms. Rauch stated that when Z1 and Z2 were reviewed by Council as part of the basic plan, the required reviewing body designation was given to the ARB, so there will be a little clean up required with that. It would no longer be under ARB. Mr. Papsidero stated some of those items would go through ART.
- Addition of a West Bridge Street area; and
- Relocation of the eastern boundary.

Mr. McDaniel asked for clarification on Council's direction regarding the reviewing bodies for these areas.

Mr. Papsidero stated that the way the Code is written is if 20% of a façade or frontage is affected with a change that falls under the purview of ART as a minor project.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that with the Code re-write, Council is removing the ART from being a reviewing body and being an advising body.

Mr. Papsidero stated that ART is being removed as a recommending body, meaning they will not be providing recommendations to anyone, but retaining the minor project. They are reducing the number of eligible project that could go to ART.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that there are a number of properties throughout the City that are reviewed by ARB that aren't in the Historic District -- they are designated by address. She suggested designating these properties by address and having them reviewed by ARB but out of the Historic District.

Mr. Papsidero stated the properties she is referring to are historic structures and that is why they are designated in that way.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes clarified that they wouldn't have to be historic structures to be designated to ARB.

Ms. Rauch sought clarification on which reviewing body would be designated.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes suggested these properties be reviewed by ARB and added to the list of properties that are reviewed by ARB but outside the Historic District. She asked that staff provide a memo to Council about whether or not that is possible.

Ms. Fox stated that not adjusting the boundaries around these buildings would leave the reviewing body as ARB simply because they are within the Historic District.

Ms. Rauch stated that was true and there could be regulations about how these properties are

dealt with differently.

Ms. Fox stated that, going forward, there would be the protection of ARB looking at this area under their purview.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes clarified that the intent is to remove these properties from the Historic District so that other properties in the District cannot use them as examples of permissive developments throughout the Historic District. She wants to know if they can be placed on the list of ARB reviewed properties outside the District and then see what can be done from there.

Mr. Reiner asked for clarification of the intent. When the area around Oscar's is re-developed in the future, for example, that does not prevent them from building condos along the river, correct? Or is the suggestion that there are such limitations in place so that would not be allowed?

Ms. Rauch stated that the Historic Core permits a variety of uses including multi-family --, it is really about the context and the height.

Mr. Reiner agreed that he would like the Historic District to continue looking historic, but if someone wanted to propose a historic façade with something different behind it, that would be allowed.

Ms. Rauch stated that the regulations and guidelines could be written to allow that.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes gave the example of town center one and town center two.

Mr. Reiner stated he doesn't want to be exclusionary.

Ms. Rauch stated that the second bullet point relates to expanding the west boundary of the Historic District to include Shawan Falls/Corbins Mill Drive.

Ms. Fox stated that she thought that the boundary was proposed to be moved to Frantz Road. She is concerned about the difference in appearance with the Kroger and the strip mall in place. Is there a way to make it feel more cohesive as you enter the City and have all of this complement each other? She wants to avoid a diverse look.

Ms. Rauch stated that could be done with the larger Code update in terms of the scale and character of this area of the District in that zoning designation.

Ms. De Rosa asked if would simply be included in the Historic District.

Mr. Papsidero stated that the Dublin Plaza ownership has some strong objections to being subject to a historical advisory board. The same outcome can be reached through the Code because they would be reducing the height along West Bridge Street.

Ms. Fox stated that ARB needs to be involved in the Dublin Plaza, but it is important that all four corners of Shawan Falls and Corbins Mill are developed with the same perspective.

Ms. De Rosa asked why ARB would be the reviewing body versus Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Papsidero stated that it could be, however the suggestion from Council at the last work session was to have it all under ARB.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that the Historic Transition zoning was to extend all the way to Frantz Road. She didn't believe that had anything to do with the reviewing body.

Mayor Peterson asked for more information about the resistance from the owners of Dublin Plaza to being under the historical advisory board jurisdiction.

Mr. Papsidero explained that there is a different level of review with ARB versus Planning and Zoning Commission.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that the area should be a Historical Transition zoning under the purview of Planning and Zoning Commission and extend to Frantz Road.

Ms. De Rosa agreed.

Ms. Fox stated that there are other historic transitions, so are we changing the way historic

transition is reviewed for all the areas or for just this one?

Mr. Papsidero stated that this can be easily addressed to match Council's intent.

Ms. Rauch moved to the third bullet point -- for clean-up purposes, staff is recommending moving the eastern boundary of the Historic District. The boundary doesn't fully align with Riverside Crossing Park. Therefore, Planning recommends the eastern boundary of the Architectural Review District move from the east side of the Scioto River to the western side, with the exception of the Scioto River Bridge, which would remain under ARB's purview.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes asked how many buildable lots exist in this area.

Ms. Rauch stated there are none -- sometimes cases would go to ARB, sometimes to Planning and Zoning Commission. Staff is suggesting that the parkland specifically and the bridge would remain under ARB purview.

The consensus of Council was agreement with this recommendation.

Ms. Rauch stated they are moving away from the form-based Code and moving toward the form and scale in the guidelines. She asked if Council agreed with this direction.

The consensus among Council members was agreement.

Ms. Rauch moved on to the final item on the agenda, the guidelines. Earlier this summer there were a series of stakeholder committee meetings to talk through the direction given by Council. There were great discussions and great feedback came out of these meetings. The consultant did an analysis to make sure that the guidelines did indeed include guidelines. The next steps will be to hold a public meeting and obtain some feedback -- largely related to new construction. Then a document will be drafted with the goal of completing the public review process before the end of the year.

Ms. Fox sought clarifications on what is meant by a minor modification.

Mr. Papsidero stated that minor modifications are specific to minor projects and ART.

Ms. Fox stated she would like to review the minor modification language.

Mr. Papsidero commented regarding the role of ART in the Bridge Street District. ART still plays a role in approving minor projects, but for a very narrow category. He asked Council members if they concurred with ART having limited legal authority to approve projects.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that things that come up during construction where the elevation or dimensions were off by a small margin are okay for ART, but the problem occurs when a 20% of a 200,000 square foot building ends up being a very big portion of the building. The actual numbers triggering the reviewing body may be preferable than a percentage in these cases.

Mr. Papsidero stated most of what is in that category are storefronts and patios. He gave an example of the new restaurant that before ART and the waiver was under PZC purview. After the issue was resolved, it did not go back to PZC. Because of the size, it remained with ART.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes suggested that perhaps it would have to come back to PZC only if it were in conflict with the Code.

Mr. Papsidero stated that waivers are never before ART, those always go to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Fox stated this entire process is very complex. Her desire is that the process be clear and not complicated so that PZC can make things the best they can be.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

Deputy Clerk of Council