

**City of Salem
Traffic and Parking Commission
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, September 17, 2020**

A meeting of the Salem Traffic and Parking Commission was held remotely on Thursday, September 17, 2020 at 6:30pm, pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §20, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitation on the number of people that may gather in one place.

Present: Commission Chair Tanya Shallop, Commission Vice-Chair Eric Papetti, Commissioner Robin Seidel, Commission Lt. David Tucker, Commissioner Todd Waller, Director of Traffic and Parking David Kucharsky, and Assistant Director Nick Downing.

CALL OF MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 6:33pm by Commission Chair Shallop. Chair Shallop explains how members of the public may participate during the remote meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Commission Chair Shallop opens the floor to public comment.

Jeff Bellin 396 Essex Street

Mr. Bellin informs the Commission that he used to chair the Salem Bicycling Advocacy Committee, and that he is very passionate about biking. Mr. Bellin explains that he lives near the intersection of Flint Street and Essex Street, and expresses concerns regarding the "no thru-traffic" barriers recently installed. Mr. Bellin states this particular intersection is very narrow despite being two-way, making it rather dangerous without further narrowing. Mr. Bellin indicates the barrier comes out on Essex Street, forcing bikers to veer toward potentially oncoming traffic. He notes he has pulled the barrier back himself but that it keeps being put back in the original area. Mr. Bellin also claims it is dangerous for bikes to go over speed bumps, and maintains the ones placed on Chestnut street present a hazard.

Chair Shallop says staff will follow up with Mr. Bellin offline to discuss the issue more. Mr. Bellin indicates he also called the Mayor about the issue, but that her office instructed him to attend this meeting.

Angela Williams 389 Essex Street

Ms. Williams explains she is speaking on behalf of the three condo unit owners in her building. Ms. Williams expresses that ideally, in the long run, Salem should move to zoned parking passes, but in the meantime requests that resident permit parking passes be extended for residents on Essex Street up to Flint Street. Ms. Williams indicates this would include nine (9) additional houses. Ms. Williams acknowledges that the public library and

park should have parking, and understands that that block should be excluded, but claims resident only parking should extend a bit further to create parity with nearby streets such as Federal and Chestnut.

Chair Shallop indicates that staff can communicate with her offline to bring the topic up on the agenda for a future meeting. Mr. Downing notes he has received one other similar request, and that he will inform Ms. Williams and the individual Ward councilors when it will be on the agenda.

Polly Wilbert 7 Cedar street

Ms. Wilbert states she would like to comment on the Shared Streets Pilot closure on Fairfield Street. Ms. Wilbert indicates she was not aware of any input sought from the neighborhood or advance notice of the pilot program. Ms. Wilbert informs the Commission that she read through recent Commission meeting minutes and noticed a discussion of economic and racial justice. In light of this, Ms. Wilbert states she finds irony in the selection of Fairfield Street, as traffic is now being diverted to the adjacent Cedar Street and Gardner Street. Of the latter streets in the area, Ms. Wilbert states that Fairfield Street is one of the more affluent and least diverse ones in the neighborhood. She indicates Fairfield Street is also wider and contains mostly single-family homes with driveways or parking. Ms. Wilbert expresses concern that if the goal was to provide a safer place to play, nearby children and households from more mixed neighborhoods were not informed. Rather, congestion on their own streets increased. Ms. Wilbert opines this program was poorly planned and poorly executed. Ms. Wilbert also echoes the concerns raised by Mr. Bellin regarding the barriers and adds that the barriers were moved during the week in such a way that traffic to Fairfield Street still appeared closed off. Ms. Wilbert contends traffic has been consistently backed up on her street after the program began, and notes there are many disadvantages and health concerns regarding idling traffic. Ms. Wilbert suggests Salem needs efficient flowing traffic routes, rather than programs like this that incentivize drivers to find short cuts and shift burdens to new areas. She asks the Commission to reconsider the Shared Streets program as it is not helpful.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING DIRECTOR UPDATE

Traffic and Parking Director David Kucharsky provides an update on the following recently completed and ongoing projects in Salem:

Shared Streets Pilot

Mr. Kucharsky notes the pilot has been running and that both quantitative and qualitative data are being collected. Mr. Kucharsky indicates there are counters at each location on weekends, as there were prior to the pilot beginning. Due to limited devices, some neighborhood proponents are assisting with counting as well. The pilot will go through the end of September with turning restrictions, after which the barriers and signs will be pulled (with the exception of the green Shared Streets sign). The speed humps will remain until colder months when snow might fall. Staff are working with the Mayor's office and a consultant to develop a survey that will go

out for anyone in Salem to comment on the pilot. Feedback will be gathered, and the information will be presented at a future meeting.

Vice Chair Papetti asks if the traffic counts on Barr Street in North Salem are automated or a person, and Mr. Kucharsky indicates there are both. Mr. Papetti says he thinks the pilot has had a positive impact, yet acknowledges some aspects need to be reexamined. Vice Chair Papetti also suggests extending the pilot down to Symonds Street, noting that on several nights much of rush hour traffic could be seen turning from North Street onto Symonds in order to eventually turn left onto Buffum Street.

Chair Shallop notes that Commissioner Todd Waller joined the meeting.

Matters Before OLLA Subcommittee

Mr. Kucharsky explains that he, Mr. Downing and Lt. Tucker met with OLLA to review recommendations submitted by the Commission over the years. The recommendations regarding Holyoke and Gedney received a favorable vote and will go for second passage on the 24th of the month. Mr. Kucharsky indicates meters will eventually be put out, and signage will be improved, and that some residential permit parking areas will be included.

Hawthorne Boulevard recommendations received a first passage and that matter was brought back for further discussion. Mr. Kucharsky and Mr. Downing indicate it should receive a second passage at the end of the month. Residents will be notified, signage will be installed, and the new service zone at the corner of Essex and Hawthorn will go in.

With respect to October parking, the Commission's recommendations went forward as well, although Mr. Kucharsky notes there is some back and forth regarding the issuing of visitor passes. October temporary passes will be mailed out to identified streets, and the hope is there will be consistency moving forward in future years.

Mr. Kucharsky states that OLLA discussed the year-round resident sticker parking program, and that they had questions they wanted the Commission to review. This topic will be discussed later in the agenda.

Sunday Paid Parking

Mr. Kucharsky explains that Sunday enforcement began this current week, and that signage has been updated to reflect the new hours of Sunday from 12PM to 6PM. An additional part time enforcement personnel has been hired.

Vice Chair Papetti asks if the ordinance which prohibits parking within 10 feet of a crosswalk is being enforced yet. Mr. Kucharsky indicates it has passed, and that staff are working on updating signage to help with enforcement.

MassDOT Shared Streets Program

Mr. Kucharsky notes two projects were awarded through the Shared Streets Program. The Willson Street Project, which runs from Highland Ave to Laurent Street, will introduce protected bike lanes and some school zone equipment. Mr. Kucharsky states radar feedback signs as well as Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) will be installed at crosswalks, along with other work. The work on Essex Street runs from Hawthorn Boulevard to the intersection with New Liberty, and will install a sidewalk extension, and work will begin in the following week.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

Neighborhood Traffic Calming Requests and Resident Sticker Parking: Pope Street & Proctor Street (NTC); Looney Avenue & Hillside Avenue (Resident)

Mr. Downing explains that both issues/topics are being combined in discussion as the issues are interrelated and the areas are in the same approximate neighborhood. Mr. Downing acknowledges, however, that they are separate requests, one for Neighborhood Traffic Calming measures, and one for resident sticker permitting.

Chair Shallop notes that the request regarding Looney Avenue and Hillside Avenue has previously come before the Commission. Mr. Kucharsky confirms, and states that a road diagnostic was conducted to determine how the area was previously designated, noting that much of the area was actually designated “No Parking”.

Mr. Downing presents and explains the street diagnostic of existing ordinances. Mr. Downing demonstrates general parking restrictions on the map, along with tow-zones and handicap accessible parking spaces. Mr. Kucharsky notes that while the diagnostic shows what ordinances are on the books, much of the area lacks signage reflecting the ordinances. Mr. Kucharsky indicates ward councilors have complained of cars parking on sidewalks, potentially due to the narrowness of the roadway. He adds that what is on the books is clearly not being communicated to the public or nearby residents.

Chair Shallop asks for clarification regarding Councilor Morsillo’s request, and whether it referred to speeding or if there was more going on. Mr. Kucharsky indicated the request was to address issues with speeding as well as vehicles on sidewalks creating issues for pedestrians. There might be an opportunity to use on street parking creatively to help reduce speeds.

Mr. Kucharsky explains staff has also looked at reversing Pope and Proctor Streets as part of the Boston Street Project, and that there have been several discussions with Ward Councilors in the area. There is a question of how any parking would overlap with those changes. Mr. Kucharsky indicates volume and speed data were collected on Pope and Proctor Streets at the end of July. On Pope Street between July 28 and July 31 there were roughly 1,600 vehicles per day, with an 85th percentile speed of 29mph, and a high of 48mph. Mr. Kucharsky notes the street has a statutory 25mph limit. During the same timeframe, Proctor street saw higher volumes of over 3,700 vehicles per day, an 85th

percentile speed of 29mph and a high of 52mph. Mr. Kucharsky adds that 30 vehicles were captured going the wrong direction on the street, one at a high speed at 7AM. Chair Shallop asks about the device placement, and Mr. Kucharsky demonstrates on the map where they were located. Lt. Tucker confirms.

Chair Shallop asks if Proctor Street and Pope Street are on the Traffic Calming agenda/list. Mr. Kucharsky indicates an application was submitted, which is why data was collected. Chair Shallop says it seems like there is some data, but that potentially more is required particularly with respect to any potential changes in traffic direction.

Vice Chair Papetti offers that the location seems like a good candidate for Traffic Calming Program. Mr. Papetti suggests that if funding is lacking, staff should go to City Council and ask for more. Referencing the high speeds, Mr. Papetti states that there are issues that clearly need to be addressed sooner rather than later. He adds that the public should be aware that a large change like reversing directions would not be implemented anytime soon, as a change like that requires time, but that in the meantime other things can be done.

Chair Shallop asks Lt. Tucker if there are many accidents or other concerns in this area. Lt. Tucker says there have been some, although nothing terribly significant that would warrant drastic or immediate action. Lt. Tucker explains the street is a bypass to cut through to and from Highland Avenue and has been for years. He adds that some of the biggest issues are down on Boston Street coming out of Pope Street. Most of the complaints on Proctor Street are about parking and late-night speeding, and complaints on Pope Street are mostly related to parking.

Chair Shallop opens the floor to public comment.

Pat Corton 19 Raymond Avenue

Mr. Corton asks the Commission how a speed bump can be placed in a public street. Chair Shallop asks how the question relates to the proposals being discussed, and Mr. Corton states his question relates to traffic in the City of Salem generally. Mr. Downing offers his email for any general comments.

Mr. Kucharsky states that if there are no objections, Pope and Proctor Streets will be officially moved onto the Traffic Calming Program list. Mr. Downing indicates staff will now go out and get more data and attempt to come up with creative solutions.

Chair Shallop suggests transitioning the discussion to the subject of Looney Avenue and Hillside Avenue. Mr. Kucharsky reminds the Commission that this request was previously presented at a prior meeting, and that the Commission wanted to have Lt. Tucker present for further discussion. Mr. Kucharsky also notes that Mr. Papetti provided photographic examples of some of the parking issues in the area.

Mr. Kucharsky explains the residents in the area were requesting resident permit parking on Looney and Hillside Avenues pursuant to parking changes at Salem Heights and the closure/construction by the skate park at Gallows Hill. At the previous meeting, the

Commission acknowledged that the Gallows Hill situation is temporary, and that once construction was completed, they might be able to better assess what could be done.

Chair Shallop indicates it may still be premature regarding the end of park construction but asks for Lt. Tucker's perspective on the request. Lt. Tucker states he would need to learn more about the policy changes at 12 Pope Street and see if there is any way to bring some of the parking back on site. Lt. Tucker agrees it may be premature to jump to resident permit parking while temporary conditions exist. He adds that many residents do not consider the downside to having resident permit parking in front of your home, such as limited parking when hosting a gathering, guest pass issues, etc. Lt. Tucker also suggests getting more information and feedback from additional residents in the area.

Chair Shallop asks if the homes are mostly single family with driveways, and Lt. Tucker confirms that is the case. Mr. Downing presents an overhead map and notes that most, if not all homes have driveways. Mr. Downing clarifies the initial concern was the general volume of cars on the streets, and potential issues related to turning radii.

Chair Shallop states the issue is too premature and would need to come back in a month or two.

Vice Chair Papetti states he lives close and has been through the area many times, recently taking photographs. Mr. Papetti contends he has never seen the streets more than 50 percent occupied with parking at any one time. Mr. Papetti also reminds members of the public that homeowners do not own the spot in front of their home on a public street. He adds that resident permit parking is meant for people who cannot find parking near their home, and that it is not meant to solve the problem of not liking cars parked in front of one's home. Vice Chair Papetti suggests this issue not come before the Commission again unless there is evidence that an issue exists that only resident parking would solve.

Lt. Tucker echoes Mr. Papetti's statements, noting that frustrations regarding poorly parked cars and the blocking of driveways are not things that resident parking can resolve. In those instances, the police can be called for immediate action.

Chair Shallop opens the floor to public comment but there is none.

Chair Shallop confirms that the request should only come before the Commission again once construction in Gallow's Hill is completed and more information is gathered.

Resident Sticker Parking on Naples Road

Mr. Downing shows the ordinance diagnostic of Naples Road and the surrounding area, noting that Naples Road is currently no parking on the northerly side, and prohibited from 6AM to 8PM on the southerly side. Mr. Kucharsky explains that the residents of Naples Road have petitioned through Ward 5 Councillor Turiel to have the street designated as a resident sticker parking street on the whole road from Lafayette to Hemenway. Mr. Kucharsky reads the following email from Councilor Turiel into the record:

“I do not have an opinion of my own here, but my hope is that the Commission will come up with a reasonable solution that will allow homeowners to be able to occasionally be on the street without fear of tickets, while still preventing Salem State University attendees from utilizing the area, and accounting for safety and emergency vehicle usage. Should resident permit parking be considered, the best solution I’d suggest is for this to be included in the zone with Fairview Road, in much of Ward 7, rather than the Ward 5 resident zone. This would serve to reduce possible student abuse of parking”

Mr. Kucharsky explains that staff discovered Fairview is supposed to be resident permit parking, but current signage states it is a no parking tow zone. Mr. Kucharsky states he plans to check with the Collector’s office to determine how many residents on Fairview, and the area generally actually have resident stickers. He indicates the issue might need to be looked at holistically, as when you implement something like resident parking in one area it can move an existing problem elsewhere.

Mr. Kucharsky indicates there have been calls regarding parking in violation of existing street signage, prompting ticketed enforcement based on the signage. He states that if this road were to become resident permit parking only, everyone who lives on the street and wants to park there would need to buy into the system.

Mr. Kucharsky also notes another issue nearby on Hemenway Road, where there exists signage indicating parking for Hemenway Condo Association, and there is no such parking in the ordinances. This would indicate they are preventing parking on a public street. Mr. Kucharsky suggests any changes be looked at holistically, including the streets around Naples Road (Fairview, Savoy, Hemenway).

Vice Chair Papetti recalls a previous discussion regarding this area and asks if a measure was passed by City Council. There is a brief discussion, with various staff and Commission members indicating they also recall a prior discussion. Vice Chair Papetti states he believes part of the issue involved neighbors selectively calling in parking enforcement on people they did not know, and that over the years many homes have built driveways to deal with parking issues. Mr. Papetti states if there is a way to accommodate some kind of parking to address a need, he would prefer that it be done in a legal manner rather than through a blanket prohibition that is selectively enforced.

Chair Shallop opens the floor to public comment:

Wendy Roworth 21 Savoy Road

Ms. Roworth states she is the current president of the Osgood Park Neighborhood Association, and that she is speaking on behalf of many neighbors against this request. Ms. Roworth maintains there are already many cars on the street and traffic in the neighborhood, which consists of three streets. She adds that emergency vehicles often struggle to turn onto Hemenway. Ms. Roworth indicates her understanding has always been that there is no parking on Hemenway, and that if cars are parked it makes turning

onto the street difficult. She opines that bringing more cars into the neighborhood with resident sticker parking would exacerbate existing difficulties with visibility and safety. Ms. Roworth suggests the majority of those in the neighborhood would not be in favor of the request.

Ryan Noonan 19 Naples Road

Mr. Noonan says he agrees with some of Ms. Roworth's comments but holds an opposite opinion regarding Naples Road. Mr. Noonan contends it is important to look at all three streets, as Hemenway and Savoy contain predominantly single-family homes, while Naples has some more two and three-family homes. Mr. Noonan states the difficulties that exist are for those on Naples Road who do not have driveways. Currently with the pandemic and many people working from home, residents are parking there out of necessity regardless of whether they are being ticketed or not. Mr. Noonan maintains that previously residents could go to the tax collector's office, explain where they lived, and the ticket would often be thrown out. He states that allowing resident permit parking on Naples Road would not create a change from current circumstances because only people who live there are parking on the street.

Brett Wingard 7 Savoy Road

Mr. Wingard states he is against resident sticker parking on Naples Road, and echoes concerns raised by Ms. Roworth. Mr. Wingard argues that the neighborhood should be considered Hemenway, Naples, and Savoy, and that it does not make sense to lump in Fairview in the discussion. Mr. Wingard contends the community has decided as a whole that the existing situation is appropriate, and that the resident who spoke to Councilor Turiel does not speak for the majority of the neighborhood. Mr. Wingard adds that both Naples and Savoy have signs indicating "No Thru-Traffic" when entering from Lafayette Street, and that instating resident permit parking would invite more traffic and not be in the spirit of what the City has been implementing regarding traffic calming. As a final point, Mr. Wingard states the neighborhood is a "throwback neighborhood" where children draw with chalk on the streets, play street hockey, and residents have annual parades. He contends inviting more traffic would run counter to that idea and asks that the Commission deny the request for the sake of the neighborhood.

Dan Perez 2 Naples Road

Mr. Perez indicates he is unaware of who made the request but contends there are many residences on Naples that are no longer single-family homes, noting that he lives in a three condo building and that there is one for sale down the street. Mr. Perez states that while some buildings have parking, there is barely enough for the residents and it is difficult for visitors, plumbers, babysitters, and others as parking is restricted. Mr. Perez acknowledges the neighborhood association's desire to limit access to the streets for non-residents but suggests that if implemented as proposed by Councilor Turiel, there would be no increase in traffic, just allowing parking in existing space to residents in front of their homes. He states he is only in favor of resident parking for Naples Road.

Jack Hoar 11 Naples Road

Mr. Hoar states he opposes the request for resident sticker parking, noting his main concern is safety. Mr. Hoar indicates Naples Road is narrow and a two-way street, which gets much narrower in winter when snow gets plowed. Mr. Hoar contends there is not a consensus or majority in favor of the proposal. Mr. Hoar states he is familiar with the neighborhood, and that most homes have driveways or available parking. He maintains that many of the homes with driveways use them for storage rather than parking.

Linda Lackey 11 Naples Road

Ms. Lackey states she has lived in the neighborhood since 1996 and that she is against the requested resident sticker parking. Ms. Lackey indicates that when people park in the street it can become problematic, particularly in winter with the snowbanks that get created. Ms. Lackey notes the street has many children and dogs, and that for safety reasons she is opposed to the request.

Matt Kirchman 9 Naples Road

Mr. Kirchman indicates he lives in the middle of the block, and that he is opposed to the request. Mr. Kirchman echoes the concerns of others and states he has been on the board of the neighborhood association for ten years. He notes the association meets every spring to discuss issues such as parking, and that there is widespread opposition to any kind of sticker program. Mr. Kirchman suggests there are existing misunderstandings of what the parking situation is on the street due to inconsistent signage, and that any new program implementation would require the Commission to first clean up the signage and ordinances to be consistent.

Debra VanEtten 17 Hemenway (end of Naples Rd)

Ms. VanEtten states she has lived in the neighborhood for two years, and that she was under the impression that increased traffic flow from Salem State was a safety issue. Ms. VanEtten indicates that she is at the end of Naples Road, and that she sees the amount of traffic coming down currently and suggests that resident sticker parking would not be advantageous in anyway. She states she is opposed to the request.

Chair Shallop asks if any of the Commissioners would like to comment.

Commissioner Seidel states the Commission is hesitant to put in resident sticker parking without full support from the neighborhood. Ms. Seidel acknowledges that there needs to be some clean up with respect to existing ordinances and signage. Once that issue is corrected, further changes can be considered if issues remain.

Chair Shallop expresses she is sympathetic to the various issues that exist and would not be opposed to revisiting the issue at a later date once the signage and ordinances are consistent.

Lt. Tucker states he would want to see close to 90 percent of neighbors in favor before implementing something like resident sticker parking. Lt. Tucker acknowledges there are some creative driveways with older curb cuts that would likely not be approved if

requested today but that he has not seen too many parking issues. He notes that some housing has adequate parking, while some does not.

Mr. Kucharsky states staff will review the ordinances and come up with a way to clean up the inconsistencies with signage. Mr. Kucharsky also asks that residents email him with additional suggestions that might work, such as tweaking the hours. He adds that technically cars can park at night starting at 8PM, until 6AM.

Vice Chair Papetti agrees that staff should make sure we can properly sign it first and clean up the ordinances. Mr. Papetti suggests there could be other creative solutions if there is still a need for parking. He reiterates his previous concerns regarding issues of selective enforcement and the potential for complaints becoming vehicles for neighborhood issues and disputes.

PEM Service Zone

Mr. Downing explains that the Peabody Essex Museum has requested a service zone be established near the corner of Essex Street and New Liberty Street, alongside 144 Essex Street. Mr. Downing notes that Commission Lt. Tucker took the request in from former Salem Police Chief Butler, who now works for the PEM.

Lt. Tucker says he met with former Chief Butler who is now Security Director at PEM, and that they are looking to implement a service zone to help retail customers with access to the shop and for pick-up/drop-off to assist visitors with mobility issues. Lt. Tucker states the spot would be for limited hours, and that there is currently no parking in the requested space. Lt. Tucker indicates that some City vehicles previously would park there to collect trash, and that the PEM would be happy to share the space with City vehicles. Lt. Tucker maintains the request is in line with the accommodations made for restaurants regarding pick-up and drop-off during the pandemic.

Mr. Downing asks Lt. Tucker if the request is based on needs due to the pandemic specifically, and whether this would be a temporary need/request. Lt. Tucker states the pandemic definitely played a big part in the request, and perhaps any decision could be revisited after the pandemic.

Chair Shallop asks if the request is for a temporary or permanent service zone. Lt. Tucker suggest that if it is successful, he does not see the convenience factor disappearing.

Mr. Downing mentions how City vehicles utilize the area, and asks if it would make sense to formalize their use by creating a more formal service zone, and within that zone designate a portion of it to be temporarily used for 15 minute pick-up and drop-offs as done elsewhere during the pandemic.

Vice Chair Papetti asks whether trolleys and other vehicles would have difficulty making the turn on the street if there was a service zone there, and Lt. Tucker maintains they can manage now even when two City vehicles are parked there.

Vice Chair Papetti also notes there are metered spots on Essex Street, and that it might make sense to discuss the potential of repurposing an existing spot if more appropriate, as he is not in favor of shoehorning additional parking downtown where it did not previously exist, particularly so close to a large parking garage and parking lot. Lt. Tucker states this would not be a metered or long-term parking space, and suggests the spots on Essex Street a block or less away might be too far for the PEM's requested need,

Chair Shallop indicates she is not against the idea of a service zone, but it sounds like the request is a mix of a service zone, intermeshed with a need for 15-minute parking due to pandemic related restrictions. Chair Shallop states, however, that she is open to the idea as she would prefer a car in the location in question as opposed to on the actual pedestrian mall.

Commissioner Seidel agrees with most of the comments expressed thus far. Commissioner Seidel states the street is not heavily trafficked outside of October, and that it might not be an issue to just pull over if needing to drop off a customer or pick up something from the retail shop. She notes that it is a low speed road and that people currently park there illegally periodically. She stresses that they should not but recognizes that it does occur. Commissioner Seidel acknowledges the potential benefit of a 15-minute parking spot that could be used by anyone, not strictly the PEM, and states that some other businesses might be in favor of something like that. Ms. Seidel states she is also fine with the service zone if the spot is already being used as such.

Commissioner Waller agrees there could be benefits with a 15 min service zone in that spot, noting there are not enough service zones in Salem. Mr. Waller also opines that a multi-use space could be beneficial too.

Chair Shallop opens the floor to public comment but there is none.

Chair Shallop states that it appears what the Commission is in favor of is different than the request as drafted. Mr. Downing agrees and indicates he can work with Mr. Kucharsky to edit the language to reflect a more general 15-minute service zone if desired.

Commissioner Seidel asks if nearby businesses are informed when the City adds a new service zone, and Mr. Kucharsky responds that in some cases they are, but not always.

Vice Chair Papetti asks for clarification on how a service zone here would be utilized by the PEM, and whether it would be for deliveries, as they currently have a loading dock and a spot for a small van adjacent to the building. Mr. Papetti questions how this additional space would be helpful for PEM deliveries. He states that he would be in favor if the request could be supported by a legitimate need, but that he is hesitant to add additional short-term parking just for pick-ups and drop-offs.

Lt. Tucker indicates his understanding is that the spirit of the request was less for deliveries, and more for retail customer pick-up of purchased goods during the pandemic.

Vice Chair Papetti suggests a temporary 15-minute parking spot similar to those granted to restaurants during the pandemic would be more appropriate, rather than going through an ordinance. He asks if something temporary can be implemented here for a month to see if it is utilized. Lt. Tucker states that can be done as a police order or through a trial ordinance. Mr. Downing states that all the restaurant related 15-minute temporary spots have been created by police order, and that for consistency the same process might be most appropriate.

Chair Shallop asks generally if this is something the area needs in terms of 15-minute parking, and whether this should already be an existing space. Commissioner Seidel suggests it could be useful for businesses on the pedestrian mall, particularly CVS.

Lt. Tucker clarifies that the PEM requested the space but was open to the idea of sharing it. The request would be for parking to be allowed between 10AM and 5PM Thursday through Sunday for retail shop purposes. Mr. Downing says that language in the request should be cleaned up regardless, and that staff can work on it and return to the discussion.

Chair Shallop asks if the ability for the police to create a 15-minute parking spot for drop-offs and pick-ups is limited to spaces that already exist, or if they can create one temporarily. Lt. Tucker states the language is mostly related to restricting parking but notes that a spot could likely be created. Chair Shallop indicates she would prefer to consider it in the context of the temporary 15-minute parking spots granted to restaurants, and that perhaps at a future date the possibility of a service zone in the area could be reexamined.

Commissioner Waller and Vice Chair Papetti discuss the differences between a 15 minute spot and a service zone, and Mr. Waller confirms that a service zone would be for commercial vehicles servicing businesses within 100 feet, and that he would be in favor of something that takes even one truck off the pedestrian mall.

Commissioner Seidel asks if in the case of a dual use space the hours of one use would prohibit any alternative use. Mr. Kucharsky states that the service zone on Essex Street is limited to the hours of 7AM to 5PM, and that it is open to overnight parking outside those hours. He indicates that could be examined as a possibility here if it makes sense.

Chair Shallop opens the floor to public comment again.

Tammy Harrington from Salem Trolley, 8 Central Street

Ms. Harrington indicates that trucks currently use the spot in question regardless of whether it currently exists or not. Ms. Harrington states she has no opinion either way, but that she wanted to make sure the Commission was aware that the spot is already in use for beer delivery, food trucks, and other deliveries.

Chair Shallop indicates she would not be opposed to formalizing such use, even if on a temporary basis. Commissioner Seidel suggests piloting the spot to see if it is beneficial. Lt. Tucker confirms while it is currently restricted as no parking, it is being used for

deliveries. Lt. Tucker states that it would not be a good location for long-term parking, but that it could be beneficial for deliveries and notes there are many benefits to service zones.

Chair Shallop states she is comfortable formalizing the spot if it is being used as such currently. Commissioner Waller agrees, and suggests a trial period. Ms. Shallop suggests a three-month trial of a multi-use loading zone and 15 minute drop-off space.

Motion and Vote: *On a motion duly made by Commissioner Seidel and seconded by Commissioner Waller, the Traffic and Parking Commission moves to approve a multi-use loading and 15 minute drop-off spot near the corner of Essex Street and New Liberty Street, alongside 144 Essex Street as a three month trial. **The vote five (5) in favor and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.***

Request for Traffic Ordinance Recommendation

Resident Sticker Parking Program

Mr. Kucharsky explains that staff met with OLLA at its September 9th meeting to discuss the Traffic and Parking Commission's recommendations regarding the City's resident sticker parking program. OLLA had no major issues with the amendment as submitted but asked that some minor changes be considered before the matter was moved out of committee.

Mr. Downing presents the ordinance amendment language, and Mr. Kucharsky indicates some of the Councilors expressed concern with the language stating that the Commission "shall adopt policies for designating and modifying resident sticker parking zones," as they see the Commission as having a more advisory role, rather than a body that sets policy. Mr. Kucharsky states there was some back and forth regarding the proposed language, and that some Councilor's suggested the language reflect that the Commission would review policies and make recommendations to Council.

Chair Shallop suggests it might be too late in the night to deal with this issue. Chair Shallop expresses frustration with the inaction of City Council and their reluctance to allow the Commission to develop policy efficiently.

Vice Chair Papetti thanks Mr. Downing and Mr. Kucharsky for going to City Council to discuss this issue, but echoes Chair Shallop's frustrations. Mr. Papetti states he does not believe any incremental steps will get the Commission and Council to be on the same page. He states they should continue pushing for actual regulatory authority in order to be able to accomplish things.

Chair Shallop suggests Mr. Downing and Mr. Kucharsky provide a bulleted list of the main issues and concerns City Councilors had, in order to prepare to discuss the matter in the future for bullet points of main issues to prepare to talk about them at a future meeting. Commissioner Seidel and Commissioner Waller agree that it would be best to discuss at a future meeting.

Mr. Downing discusses additional points regarding language relating to students and eligibility, and Council feedback on limiting the number of stickers per household.

Mr. Kucharsky indicates the October agenda will be large, so perhaps it would be best to bring the issue back for discussion in November or December.

OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY LEGALLY COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION

Mr. Downing mentions an issue regarding Flint Street. He explains that pursuant to the Shared Streets program on Chestnut Street, people have been noting the lack of consistency with respect to Flint Street changing from two-way to one-way. Requests have been submitted to see if any change needs to happen in the area.

Mr. Downing also explains that Councilor Madore raised an issue regarding concurrent signal timing at the intersection of Essex Street and North Street. Intersection of Essex and North Street. Mr. Kucharsky states Councilor Madore provided suggestions for the Commission to consider at a future date.

UPCOMING MEETINGS SCHEDULE

The next meeting is scheduled for October 15, 2020.

MEETING MINUTES APPROVAL

The Commission reviews the minutes for the August 20, 2020 meeting.

Motion and Vote: *On a motion duly made by Commissioner Seidel and seconded by Commissioner Waller, the Traffic and Parking Commission moves to approve the meeting minutes from August 20, 2020 as amended. **The vote is five (5) in favor and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.***

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion duly made by Vice Chair Papetti and seconded by Commissioner Seidel, the Traffic and Parking Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:56 PM.