



UPTOWN COMMUNITY PARKING DISTRICT, INC.
Meeting Minutes
Monday, May 12, 2014 at 5:00 p.m.
Joyce Beers Community Center
Uptown District Shopping Center – 3900 Vermont Street
San Diego, CA 92103

Board attendees: Tim Gahagan, Roy Dahl, Ann Garwood, Cecelia Moreno, Michael Brennan, Lara Koljonen, Doug Scott, Char-Lou Benedict, Jared Svendsen, Megan Gamwell, Michael Jacobs

Staff: Elizabeth Hannon, Ben Verdugo

Others in attendance: Bob Martynec, Joe Jimenez, Nancy Moors, Walt Chambers, Meredith Dibden-Brown, Hans Wangbichler, David Cooker, Jonathan Carey, Adriana Martinez, Ben Baltic, Sonya Stauffer

1. Establishment of Quorum, Call to Order, and Introductions

- T. Gahagan called the meeting to order at 5:05p.m. A quorum was established and the group introduced themselves.

2. Smart Meter Update (Potential Action Item)

- T. Gahagan

3. President's Report

- T. Gahagan said that staff and the City and SANDAG have all been in talks regarding mitigating parking loss impacts due to the bike route in Uptown. Among the measures help mitigate parking losses are demand focused which include turnover studies, and GIS mapping metered and unmetered parking.

4. Non-Agenda Public Comment

- A. Garwood made an announcement regarding the road diet that has been installed in Bankers Hill on Fourth and Fifth avenues from Laurel to downtown. She said that she was at a residence on Fourth between Juniper and Kalmia and noticed that there was a bicyclist in the westernmost lane and not in the newly striped bike lane.

5. Smart Meter Update (Potential Action Item)

- T. Gahagan reported that the City is considering purchasing single-space smart meter technology and recapped that the UCPD made a statement at April's board meeting that the group wanted to see meters purchased simultaneously with sensor

- technology. He added that original RFP was a little vague with regards to how many sensors were to be included for a pilot project but the City has maintained their assertion that the number of sensors was always 200.
- At the direction of the Executive Committee, staff was asked to provide background regarding smart meters and sensors for the board meeting. E. Hannon presented a summary to the group for review which briefly discussed the RFP cancellation, the news of the City piggybacking on to Sacramento's purchase and that council committee will be hearing the purchase plan on May 22nd.
 - Because of the differences of opinions between staff and the City with regards to the piloting phase of the RFP, April's meeting motion taken by the UCPD was determined to have less relevance. In addition the pay-by-phone technology would not be included on the piggyback purchase of Sacramento.
 - E. Hannon said that there are still questions that need to be answered regarding sensor technology and because this is a newer technology, there are benefits to piloting a smaller sample size.
 - A single space meter will cost approximately \$603 and this will be split between the City and the UCPD at the current meter revenue share of 55 and 45 percent respectively. Sensors are priced at around \$250 but this price will potentially vary depending on the vendor.
 - The benefits of having smart meter technology without sensors is that we can tell for the most part what meters are available vs what spaces are available, meaning that we would be able to tell if the meter paid for or not. This does not take into account handicapped drivers or people who park at expired meters. The new meter technology will also allow for the City to make pricing and time changes through a back office system instead of manually programming each meter. Also, data management and collection will be much more efficient and precise, as audits are currently being performed quarterly with no real time data.
 - Case studies were provided in the packets on smart meter technology and sensors. Also, staff didn't have enough information regarding the removal of meters due to bicycle lanes, but will work closely with the City and SANDAG to provide oversight along the way.
 - E. Hannon provided suggestions for next steps for the board to think about which included:
 - Support the piggy-back purchase of smart meters.
 - Support the piggy-back and insist that pilot takes place in Uptown for sensor technology.
 - Take a neutral stance on the piggy-back purchase.
 - Support the piggy-back and begin RFP for sensors.
 - Do not support the piggy-back and recommend that the City conduct a new RFP process.
 - Table support or non-support and provide specific questions regarding technology, costs and benefits that need to be answered before the next UCPD Board Meeting

- T. Gahagan said with regards to tabling the discussion, the UCPD is still waiting to hear from Downtown Parking Management Group and Mid-City Parking District on their positions.
- T. Gahagan introduced Jonathan Carey, with Parking Program Manager with the City who is overseeing the piggybacking purchase of smart meters.
- J. Carey announced to the group that he is asking for UCPD support when he presents to Budget and Finance Committee on May 22nd and to answer any questions that the board has. He continued that although the cancellation of the RFP was unfortunate, the option to piggyback will still allow for smart meters which were a major component of the RFP. Also, because of the amount of time that has passed since the cancellation, more options are becoming available regarding sensor technology that could have been missed due to a contract binding the City to older technology. Another benefit is that smart meters will allow for real-time data which could guide where to place sensors in the street in the future.
- C. Moreno asked J. Carey what he knows about what other cities are experiencing with similar technologies and if he has learned anything from them. J. Carey said that many cities use IPS including La Mesa and San Diego, but regarding the sensors he does not have much info since sensor technology is fairly new. This also was a good reason not to purchase sensors for all single spaces, since a pilot would be better served to determine where turnover needs will be.
- T. Gahagan asked how long La Mesa has had smart meters in the ground, and J. Carey deferred to David Cooker with IPS. D. Cooker said that he didn't know the exact dates but thought it was around a year. He also added that 135,000 IPS smart meters are in cities around the world and would be happy to provide references.
- T. Gahagan referenced a statement J. Carey made regarding that a benefit of the RFP cancellation was that the City wouldn't be bound to older sensor technology since it is evolving. He asked D. Cooker if this would be the case six months in the future with newer sensors. D. Cooker said the in-ground sensors are the most accurate sensors at this time versus the pole mounted sensors which are still very new. Santa Monica for instance has 6000 in-ground sensors and the accuracy is over 99 percent. IPS is also looking at sensors that would be located in the housing but they are still not proven technology yet. The pole mounted sensors are susceptible to vandalism which is why the housing option unfolded.
- R. Dahl asked about D. Cooker about his confidence in the development of IPS software and how it could provide data to both the City of San Diego and parking apps like Park Hillcrest. D. Cooker said that they have terabytes of parking data and they have offered to GIS locate all parking meters and map out all the poles. D. Cooker said that they currently work with ParkMe and integrate their back office with ParkMe's app. This provides the user with real time data as well as costs. T. Gahagan asked if ParkHillcrest will be able to utilize the data and D. Cooker said that this can be accomplished with a monthly fee.
- C. Moreno was concerned with the amount of time pilot studies take and Hillcrest would be a natural choice for a pilot because of the app.
- H. Wangbichler asked about the cost differential between the original RFP and the Sacramento piggyback, and J. Carey said that there is a 6% savings differential by

- going with Sacramento. He also continued that the price will be a little more than \$603 a meter because of advance technology components being built into the meters to accommodate compass cards and other additions.
- A. Garwood asked if the user will get refunded for unused time on the City pre-paid and compass cards and J. Carey said that although he didn't know about the compass card yet as they will be working with IPS to integrate with the meters, the City cards will still be functional with the new meters. A. Garwood said that she would only want to support the meters if the compass cards also reimbursed for unused time.
 - D. Scott wanted more clarification on potential vandalism of the pole mounted sensors and if the preferred placement would be subterranean. J. Carey said that a piloting phase would be ideal to possibly test both mounts which would give the City a better idea on durability of the product. He continued that the single head meters were the biggest component of the original RFP and suggested to the group to support the smart meters, get them installed throughout the City and then add the other components as they become available like the compass card, piloting sensors, and pay by phone capabilities. If the RFP process had to be restarted, it could substantially delay the process further as the original RFP took a year to write and another year to go through the vendor process. J. Carey added that he had a docket briefing with the Mayor and personally told him that City Treasurer, Economic Development, Police Department and community parking districts will continue to pursue procurement solutions this year for multi-space meters and real-time parking data to address the 2013 solicitation.
 - T. Gahagan added that the multi-space and real-time data elements of the original RFP were not included onto the piggyback with Sacramento. He asked D. Cooker if IPS would be comfortable with the notion if the meters were purchased today, that emerging technology would be able to be added on as it becomes available. D. Cooker said yes and IPS has been integrating new technology with existing meters for customers across the United States.
 - R. Dahl asked about the model that will be purchased for the City and D. Cooker said that it is their latest model which has been made available over the last year. T. Gahagan asked what generation the meters on Fourth Avenue in Hillcrest were and D. Cooker said the said second generation and the new meters will be the fourth generation, named Mark 5. R. Dahl asked what the difference was with the new generation models and D. Cooker replied that energy efficiency has been increased, there is a larger screen for the user, and the button configuration is different.
 - T. Gahagan asked if anybody had questions or comments for J. Carey who was leaving and C. Moreno said that she was concerned that the UCPD funds would be used for meters that could possibly be yanked out of the ground for a bike path and wanted to know if installed meters were pulled out, that they need to remain somewhere in a parking space in Hillcrest and not moved outside of the district. M. Dibden-Brown said that the City is working with SANDAG and the UCPD to try to identify either phasing the meters along the bike path in later, relocating meters that are removed to other locations within Uptown, or if they are taken out and there is nowhere to use them, provide the district with a credit for money spent for those meters. C. Moreno said that she needed that in writing.

- A. Garwood said in Bankers Hill, there are areas where meters are not generating any money and the BHNPC is currently investigating lowering meter revenue. She asked if it would be wise, at over \$600 per meter to install at these areas that are not generating revenue. She also asked if it would be considered to turn over these metered spaces to free parking instead. J. Carey said that J. Jimenez and the UCPD would be able to make the determination that an underutilized area could possibly be changed to free parking. A. Garwood also asked what the City is doing with the old meters and J. Carey said that they will be recycled with the help of IPS and the money from recycling will go back to the City and the districts. J. Carey added that the City did a very thorough search of other cities' RFP's to see if they could piggy back on the other components but San Diego is the only City that has done a three-part solicitation and it was encouraging that the largest component will possibly be able to continue. T. Gahagan said that La. Mesa did a two-part solicitation, but J. Carey couldn't elaborate on their RFP process as he was unfamiliar.
- R. Dahl asked about pay-by-phone capability and asked if it would be an add-on and J. Carey said in the original RFP, it was listed as an optional item and this is something they will pursue once the smart meters are installed. A. Garwood asked what the cost would be, but J. Carey didn't know up front.
- R. Dahl asked what the impact of pay-by-phone has on battery life and D. Cooker said that it all depends on real-time data pushing which can also be disabled. He added that IPS integrates with the big three mobile phone providers and that with any phone the more apps and features that are running will cause a drain on battery life.
- W. Chambers said that he has been following San Francisco's attempt to charge demand-based pricing which hasn't been successful. He said that this might be because they don't have the ability to increase and decrease their prices very much. He asked what authority the UCPD has to charge demand based pricing. T. Gahagan said that the final report has yet to be released and M. Dibden Brown added that the City's municipal code allows a range of meter rates from \$0.25 per hour up to \$2.50 per hour, and the standard currently is \$1.25 per hour. Time limited zones are also variable and where there are underutilized meters, the City has implemented a combination of lower rates and longer meter hours to increase utilization. The process is that the UCPD would look at the revenue data to determine if rates should be changed and make recommendations to City staff. In downtown, they lowered rates incrementally by \$0.25 at a time and then checked after three months which is the recommended option instead of dropping rates dramatically, and raising rates again which would be unpopular with the public. The advantage of changing rates with smart meters is that they can be remotely programmed and that the new rates will be displayed on the screen. The current meters would have to be manually changed, meter-by-meter, and stickers would have to be printed for each meter displaying the price.
- T. Gahagan asked if anybody would like to make a motion.
- A. Garwood said that if the City would be able to put a sticker on each meter advertising City parking cards, similar to the Visa/Mastercard stickers. M. Dibden-Brown said that it wouldn't make sense because the purchasers of the parking cards already know to use the meters. A. Garwood said that the City needs to do a better

job of advertising to the public that the City parking cards allow for refunds for unused time, and that a little blue and white sticker on each meter advertising use of the parking card that will allow for a refund would be a good idea. T. Gahagan said that this would be a good idea for staff to add to their list to look into.

- E. Hannon asked the board to at least come to a consensus on what position to take and C. Moreno asked to look at the initial options again which T. Gahagan read:
 - Support the piggy-back purchase of smart meters.
 - Support the piggy-back and insist that pilot takes place in Uptown for sensor technology.
 - Take a neutral stance on the piggy-back purchase.
 - Support the piggy-back and begin RFP for sensors.
 - Do not support the piggy-back and recommend that the City conduct a new RFP process.
 - Table support or non-support and provide specific questions regarding technology, costs and benefits that need to be answered before the next UCPD Board Meeting
- **Motion:** “Motion to support the piggyback and ask that the City conduct the pilot of the sensor technology and the cell phone technology in Uptown.” (R Dahl, J. Svendsen)
- C. Moreno asked that the motion be amended to include a timeframe for a pilot, and A. Garwood added that the timeframe should be by the end of 2014. Because there was not a definitive date of installation, M. Brennan added that the timeframe should be within six months of installation.
- **Amended Motion:** “Motion to support the piggyback and ask that the City conduct the pilot of the sensor technology and the cell phone technology in Uptown within six months of installation.” (R Dahl, J. Svendsen) Motion passes 11-1-1, 1 abstention (T. Gahagan) 1 nay (A. Garwood)

6. Approval of Consent Agenda A-C (Action Item)

- T. Gahagan noted that A. Garwood requested that the meeting minutes be taken off consent agenda until they are put out with ample time for them to be reviewed by the Secretary before the meeting.
- B. Approval of Financials – April 30, 2014
- C. Bankers Hill Board Elections –
 - The Bankers Hill would like to recognize the Bankers Hill Community Group as the organization to host UCPD Board of Directors elections. The Board approval of this item allows staff to submit to the City for approval.
- Motion: “Motion to accept both items of the consent agenda.” (D. Scott, C. Moreno) Motion passes, 9-0-2, 2 abstentions(T. Gahagan, C. Benedict)

7. Approval of Minutes

- A. Garwood read the minutes and sent changes back to staff. Staff provided the updated minutes in the board packets at the meeting.

- **Motion:** “Motion to approve April minutes.” (D. Scott, C. Moreno) Motion passes 10-0-1, 1 abstention (T. Gahagan)

8. Mission Statement (Action Item)

- E. Hannon stated that this is the group’s fourth work session on the mission statement and read the following proposed mission statement compiled from suggestions of the board based of the survey that was handed out at the beginning of the meeting. The survey was based off of suggestions from the group over prior work sessions. *The Uptown Partnership, d.b.a. as the Uptown Community Parking District mission is to provide fiscal responsibility and reinvesting a portion of parking meter funds to increase availability, supply and effectiveness of parking for residents and businesses while considering traffic circulation, transit effectiveness, biking, and pedestrian mobility in the neighborhoods of Bankers Hill, Hillcrest, Mission Hills and International Restaurant Row/5 Points with creative collaborations to support economic revitalization.*
- A. Garwood asked if it is the parking board’s obligation to help neighborhoods with economic revitalization. M. Gamwell said that by alleviating parking issues, we are in turn supporting economic revitalization.
- T. Gahagan didn’t like the wording regarding *d.b.a.* and it was agreed by the majority that it should be removed.
- C. Moreno asked to change *a portion* to *our portion* and A. Garwood said it should read *its portion* as it is grammatically correct. T. Gahagan asked the group if they would like to see the change to *its portion* and the majority said yes.
- T. Gahagan asked the group if the last part of the mission statement regarding economic revitalization is referenced in CP 100-18 and are we supporting economic revitalization or economic vitalization. T. Gahagan said that revitalization to him implies blighted environment and asked for a show of hands who liked that last part of the mission statement and the majority liked it as written. R. Dahl proposed that economic vitality should replace economic revitalization and the majority disagreed. E Hannon proposed *a vibrant local economy* and the majority agreed with the change.
- A. Garwood felt that the mission statement was too long and anything the group could do to try to shorten it would be preferred as it was clumsy to her. She suggested that the individual neighborhoods be removed from it. E. Hannon took the names out and the group preferred the change.
- E. Hannon read the amended proposed mission statement: *The Uptown Community Parking District’s mission is to provide fiscal responsibility in reinvesting its portion of parking meter funds to increase availability, supply and effectiveness of parking for residents and businesses while considering traffic circulation, transit effectiveness, biking, and pedestrian mobility in its neighborhoods with creative collaborations to support a vibrant local economy.*
- **Motion:** “Motion to approve mission statement.” (D. Scott, C. Moreno) Motion passes 8-1-2, 2 abstentions (T. Gahagan, C. Benedict) 1 nay (A. Garwood)

9. FY15 Budget/Annual Plan (Action Item)

- E. Hannon presented the annual plan draft to the group that will be submitted to the City which detailed all projects summarized for the upcoming fiscal year.
- D. Scott asked about meter purchase/installation and suggested that to the general reader, it will look like the each neighborhood will be paying a different amount per unit as Bankers Hill budgeted much higher than the other neighborhoods. He asked that an asterisk with a note stating that the amounts were determined by each neighborhood during the drafting of the budgets prior to knowledge of per-unit cost of meters and do not represent per-unit costs but are rather budget estimates. E. Hannon said that she will add it into the draft annual plan
- A. Garwood asked if Bankers Hill has money for residential parking permits and E. Hannon replied that Bankers Hill budgeted \$50,000 for residential parking solutions. A. Garwood asked if Hillcrest needs to move forward with residential permitting due to the bike path, will \$20,000 be enough and E. Hannon said that \$20,000 would be more than enough.
- **Motion:** “Motion to approve draft annual plan with suggested change.” (R. Dahl, D. Scott) Motion passes 10-0-1, 1 abstention (T. Gahagan)

10. Chief Operating Officer Report

- DMV lease is fully executed and an article was in the Uptown News on Friday, May 9th. The lot will be available to the public by Friday, May 16th and an official unveiling will happen soon.
- Bike share locations are still being debated and the Uptown Planners have pushed back against the locations at the last meeting. C. Benedict thought it was odd that bike share locations proposed in Bankers Hill are not along the new City bike lanes. A. Garwood added that they are only 3-speed and present a challenge for riders to go from downtown to Uptown.

11. Operations Manager Report

- B. Verdugo said that he has continually been adding to survey 2.0 and J. Jimenez will start on it once 1.0 is finished. Once the budgeting process is finalized, Jimenez will complete survey 1.0 so B. Verdugo can get some more gains starting in Bankers Hill.
- Marketing efforts are underway for ParkHillcrest app as well as the trolley.

9. Committee Updates

- **Hillcrest Report - None**
- **Bankers Hill Report**
 - D. Scott said the BHNPC is working on the wayfinding sign locations and curb survey and the group is in favor of the road diet that was just recently installed on Fifth and Sixth Avenues.
- **Mission Hills Report - None**
- **5 Points/IRR Report - None**

Adjournment – 6:30 p.m.

UPTOWN COMMUNITY PARKING DISTRICT, INC.
MEETING MINUTES CONT.
May 12, 2014

Next Meeting Date, Time and Location:

Uptown Community Parking District's next meeting is Monday, June 10, 2014 at 5:00 p.m. at the Joyce Beers Community Center in the Uptown District of Hillcrest.

Transcribed and drafted by Ben Verdugo