

**City of Salem
Traffic and Parking Commission
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, April 19, 2018**

A meeting of the Salem Traffic and Parking Commission was held on Thursday, April 5, 2018 at 6:30pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Commission Chair Tanya Stepasiuk, Commission Vice-Chair Eric Papetti, Commissioner Lt. Robert Preczewski, and Commissioner Robin Seidel. Assistant Director Nicholas Downing was also present. Commissioner Jamie Metsch and Director Matt Smith were absent.

CALL OF MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 6:36pm. Assistant Director Downing noted audio of the meeting was being recorded to assist with notes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Joyce Kenney, 285 Lafayette, commented that the parking issue near her street has continued. Lt. Preczewski has sent officers out multiple times and they have issued multiple tickets. Staff is continuing to work with the MBTA about better signage for that area.

Assistant Director Downing provided a brief update on an issue on Orne Square. This small one-way street off of Broad Street. The one-way sign was recently removed by the phone company during utility work, and when residents requested it be replaced, we found the one-way designation was not present in the City ordinances. The street has been a one-way for more than 30 years. Lt. Preczewski replaced the sign and submitted an ordinance recommendation to the Council as waiting to do bring this issue before the Commission could have potentially compromised public safety. The residents on the street have also had issues with Uber and Lyft drivers traveling the wrong way on the street recently. The sign has been replaced and the recommendation is going through the process to be made official in the City ordinances.

Chair Stepasiuk asked for an update on the recent City Hall Annex. The Department moved out of the old space at the end of last week and into the new space at the beginning of this week. The Department is on the 2nd floor between Engineering and Planning and Community Development. There are 3 public meetings on the 1st floor and each of the 2nd and 3rd floors have multiple conference rooms for internal meetings.

NEW / OLD BUSINESS

- Use of Skateboards on Streets and Sidewalks

Approved at Traffic and Parking Commission Meeting on May 3, 2018.

Assistant Director Downing provided some background on this issue. The Commission previously discussed this item in May 2017, but the matter was tabled at the time to take on some more time sensitive issues. Skateboarding in City sidewalks and streets was banned in the late 1970s/early 1980s after there was a fatality when a skateboarder was struck and killed. The City ordinance bans “to play at skateboarding” on all City streets and sidewalks. While this language could be open to interpretation, the City and the Police interpret it as meaning that any use of a skateboard on City streets and sidewalks is banned. In the years since the ordinance was passed. The general attitude towards skateboarding has changed, but it’s also important to draw the distinction between using a skateboard for transportation and using a skateboard to perform tricks. The language we have drafted tries to find that compromise and allow skateboards to be used for transportation but does not allow putting things in the street to perform tricks or anything like that. Staff feels this is worth revisiting to allow skateboards to be used as a mode of transportation and this language is a good balance compared to what we have now.

Chair Steaspiuk asked Commission Preczewski how often he or the Police Department sees skateboarders or issues tickets. Lt. Preczewski said he sees them sometimes but generally does not focus on enforcement except in instances where residents have called with complaints or concerns. Shortly after the ban there was more active enforcement, but less so in recent years.

Lt. Preczewski asked where this recommendation originated. Assistant Director Downing answered that the Mayor had initially drafted the language the Commission considered last May and it had been recommended to her by the proponents of the new skate park.

Vice Chair Papetti asked if this language has been revised from what we had a year ago. Assistant Director Downing answered that this language we think is more clear in terms of what type of skateboarding is allowed.

Chair Stepasiuk asked if this definition is a common definition of skateboard. Assistant Director Downing answered that he could not find a definition in state law anywhere about skateboarding. Chair Stepasiuk continued that she found section 1A odd and wasn’t sure if it would be enforceable. Lt. Preczewski added that after having talked to the Chief, he wondered if the Commission could study longer or does it need to be enacted tonight? Some additions about skateboarders following all laws the same as a bicyclist would make sense. Concern from the Police is public safety for children. Assistant Director Downing answered that this is not an emergency and action does not need to be taken tonight. If the Chief wanted to draft an opinion to share with the Commission or attend the next meeting where we discuss this, we would welcome that.

Approved at Traffic and Parking Commission Meeting on May 3, 2018.

Chair Stepasiuk suggested the Commission wait and not make a recommendation tonight to allow staff to address some of the questions being brought up.

Chair Stepasiuk asked Lt. Preczewski for a sense of who rides skateboards. Lt. Preczewski answered that it generally seems to be people in their late teens or early 20s.

Vice-Chair Papetti expressed some concern with a skateboard specific ordinance. Instead, replace the ban with an ordinance stating skateboards shall follow all state laws and city ordinances pertaining to bicycles, which means helmets for people under 16, obeying all traffic laws, and yielding to pedestrians. Placing objects in the street is already banned, so we don't need to specifically call that out. Few people will go out and read the ordinance before they skateboard, so we should keep it as simple as possible. We should mimic what we have for bikes and only add things if there are truly aspects unique to skateboards.

There was general consensus that the preferred path would be a simpler ordinance that stated skateboards shall follow all the same state laws and city ordinances as bicyclists, and that staff would draft this language and share it with Lt. Preczewski for comment and suggestion before bringing it back to the Commission at a future meeting.

- Brown Street at Washington Square

Assistant Director Downing provided background information on the intersection striping at Brown Street and Washington Square. The last time the Commission discussed this, it was recommended that the striping pattern be changed to have all traffic turning on to Washington Square travel south of the Roger Conant Statute and all traffic turning on to Brown Street travel north of the Roger Conant Statue. This pattern has been in place for a few months and we have heard positive feedback from nearby residents and business, especially the Witch Museum. It was also intended that this change not be the final change to this intersection as reflected in this Commission's recommendation that the striping not be done using thermal plastic paint so the Commission could revisit for any potential changes down the line. Based on what we have seen and heard, the Department is suggesting that we change the one turning lane from Brown Street on to Washington Square to 2 lanes – one for left turns and one for right turns, but both still south of the statue. We have seen some back-ups at this intersection that we think this change would help alleviate. Whatever we do in this next phase, we are not recommending we sue thermal plastic paint, because we think there are potentially bigger intersection changes further down the line, but this is a more modest suggestion. Items not included on this image we may want to consider as well are better markings for Washington Square North for traffic traveling north. The road is wide enough for a travel lane and a turning lane for Brown Street. Some have suggested we add "Don't Block the Box" signage and striping as well.

Chair Stepasiuk asked about what happened last year with the Commission making its recommendation and what will happen with the recommendation we make tonight. Assistant Director Downing answered that there are 2 issues at play here and it is important to separate them. First, this was an item that was not on the Commission agenda when it was discussed the last time because it was brought to the Commission by another department. The Commission still made a recommendation, and in hindsight, we realized we should not have done so. The Department received a letter from the Council about making sure we followed all aspects of the Open Meeting Law and the Sunshine ordinance, and we have since then always followed that and this is why we have had multiple instances of not discussing an issue because we did not have it on our agenda.

Second, there is a difference of opinion about whether the recommendation the Commission made was an ordinance change, which relates to what is and is not Brown Street at this intersection. Based on information the Department has from MassGIS and how this intersection was signed previous to any changes, it is the Department's opinion that the roadway to the north and the south of the Roger Conant Statue is Brown Street. That means the recommendation we made previously was not an ordinance change to make a two-way street a one-way street, it was a recommendation to change a traffic pattern on an existing street that did not require an ordinance change.

Chair Stepasiuk commented that she believes the Commission is within its rights to make a recommendation here, but was curious if this has been discussed with any Councillors that have been interested in the issue. Assistant Director Downing responded that he and Director Smith have met with Councillors recently on different topics, but that this item was discussed with Councillors that had been interested in the topic. Specifically, Assistant Director Downing met with Councillor Sargent earlier today, and relayed the information about this recommendation to him and noted the same type of paint would be used as this is not the be-all end-all work for this intersection. Councillor Sargent did suggest another alternative that would reestablish two-way traffic north of the Roger Conant Statue and a right-turn-only lane south of the statue.

Vice Chair Papetti asked for a clarification in terms of what the Commission is being asked to make a recommendation about. Is the Commission being asked for an ordinance recommendation change because the Council feels it needs to be formalized via ordinance? Or a recommendation for the Traffic and Parking Department to make some more tweaks to this pattern? Assistant Director Downing responded that the Department does not believe it needs an ordinance recommendation because we have maintained the overall pattern and the roadway north and south of the statue is Brown Street. However, we do suggest this recommendation be for a trial period as we continue to monitor this intersection, and this is why this item is not on the agenda under the ordinance recommendation section.

Approved at Traffic and Parking Commission Meeting on May 3, 2018.

Chair Stepasiuk asked about what action the Council has taken on this thus far in terms of affirming what we recommended? Assistant Director Downing responded that the Council took the Commission's recommendation and passed an order for a trial period to put the order into place. Vice Chair Papetti asked about the legal meaning for an order for a trial period of the Commission and Department view that it is not needed. Lt. Preczewski commented that right now, the street and intersection are somewhat in limbo, and a ticket could potentially be challenged. Chair Stepasiuk thought the Solicitor had made an opinion about the status of the street. Assistant Director Downing commented that the Solicitor has not provided an opinion yet, but the reason we are suggested the Commission make a recommendation for an order is because there has been some contention around this issue already, and seeking an order acknowledges this is an iterative process and we want to find the best solution for the intersection before the final option is selected.

Lt. Preczewski suggested that an ordinance could be drafted that divides up Brown Street into two-way and one-way sections. He supports the pattern we have now and is supportive of the proposed change. Seeking the order solidifies the pattern so as to make it enforceable.

Vice Chair Papetti commented that the presence of the statue complicates this whole intersection. Ordinances don't specify each individual direction of each lane on a street. Lt. Preczewski agreed, but added that his main concern is how the change can be put into ordinance to allow enforcement.

Vice Chair Papetti commented that he feels there are 2 issues. First, the legal issue about whether we need an ordinance recommendation or not which needs to be settled to get everyone on the same page. Submitting to Council for an order without agreement on whether an order is needed does not seem to make sense.

Chair Stepasiuk commented that submitting an order request shows the Council we are continuing to work on this and if there is a legal question, the Commission has been shown to be taking the appropriate steps. Vice Chair Papetti added that staff work with the City Solicitor to determine the legal status of the street and whether or not we need ordinance change recommendations or not.

Assistant Director Downing commented that the Department would seek a legal opinion from the City Solicitor about the status of the streets here and that opinion would then influence what type of action the Commission takes, whether it be an order or ordinance recommendation or neither.

Vice-Chair Papetti commented that he thinks this still needs further work for the overall final design of the intersection, especially in terms of bicycle accommodations and the issues created by the bus parking near this intersection, but supports the idea of this modification.

Approved at Traffic and Parking Commission Meeting on May 3, 2018.

On a motion duly made by Chair Stepasiuk and seconded by Commissioner Seidel, the Commission voted unanimously to recommend modifying the existing traffic pattern at the intersection of Brown Street and Washington Square to include both right-turn and left-turn lanes from Brown Street on to Washington Square for a trial period through November 15, not using thermal plastic paint, to be submitted to Council as appropriate per consultation with the City Solicitor.

- Two-Way Margin Street Pilot

Assistant Director Downing gave the Commission an update on this proposal. While the Commission has discussed it multiple times, it has never made a formal recommendation to proceed with the implementation of the pilot. Staff is seeking the formal recommendation from the Commission to proceed with a two-way pilot on Margin Street. Two-way traffic would be allowed between Mill Street and Gedney Street, but traffic would remain one-way between Norman Street and Gedney Street. This proposal has been discussed in detail before the Commission multiple times,

Lt. Preczewski asked about the right turn from Mill Street on to Margin Street that would be allowed as part of the pilot and if the pilot would require some construction. Assistant Director Downing answered that yes, the pilot would require some construction to the corner at Mill and Margin to allow right turns for larger trucks and public safety vehicles.

Chair Stepasiuk asked if the Department has received any negative feedback from residents or the neighborhood. Assistant Director Downing responded that there has not been a negative reaction, but some skepticism about the street geometry and if there is sufficient room for two-way traffic. We feel confident that we have sufficient room for the pilot to proceed, and can do so with maintaining the existing parking.

Vice Chair Papetti asked about some of the existing parking that would now be more in the intersection on Margin Street. The current alignment of the intersection makes parking within that intersection more feasible, but with a more traditional T intersection, you wouldn't allow that parking. Assistant Director Downing commented that we do have parking in T intersections elsewhere, and that is not to say we should allow it, but that it does happen. Given that the pilot will be temporary, we could allow it to remain. It appears that as many as 3 spaces would have to be changed. The pilot would not include a full redesign of this intersection, so we could maintain the parking for now.

Assistant Director Downing asked Lt. Preczewski to share his opinion, in terms of the safety issues of maintaining the parking. Lt. Preczewski said it could cause a problem, but suggested staff should determine exactly how many spaces would be impacted. Chair Stepasiuk commented that she did not have strong feelings about the parking, but wants to make sure we don't negatively impact the various

Approved at Traffic and Parking Commission Meeting on May 3, 2018.

businesses there. Lt. Preczewski commented that the parking south of the proposed crosswalk would be too close to a crosswalk per the newer MUTCD rules, and removing it could also make it easier for public safety vehicles to make the turn. Removing one or 2 spaces would be a good idea. Lt. Preczewski asked for more detailed technical drawings from VHB to address these more specific issues. Assistant Director Downing added that even if the Commission makes a recommendation tonight, there are still multiple design steps before an order would be submitted to make sure the Council has the information they need to vote on the order.

On a motion duly made by Vice-Chair Papetti and seconded by Commissioner Seidel the Commission voted unanimously to recommend an order for a two-way pilot for Margin Street between Mill Street and Gedney Street to be submitted to the City Council.

- Bicycles on the Essex Street Pedestrian Mall

Assistant Director Downing gave a brief update on this idea, but staff is not seeking a specific recommendation at this meeting. This item is, in part, a continuation of the larger discussion the Commission kicked off at the last meeting about the Essex Street Pedestrian Mall. Currently, you cannot use bicycles on the mall, even though there are bike racks at some locations along the mall. Through our current bike master planning process, and generally within the City, we are trying to improve bike access and making our City more bike friendly. The mall becomes somewhat of a block for cyclists, but the design is discouraging toward bicycles and you are currently not allowed to travel along the mall on a bike right now. That said, some cyclists use it anyway. We wanted to get a sense from the Commission if you feel like repealing this ban is worthwhile, and if so, how we would want to go about doing it. The current design of the mall is not one that encourages cycling, so if the Commission wanted to allow bicycles, we may need to consider design changes down the line as well.

Chair Stepasiuk asked Lt. Preczewski if the Police Department regularly enforces this restriction. Lt. Preczewski responded that for many years, the City had problems with teens congregating on the mall with bicycles, and did enforce the restriction. Lt. Preczewski spoke with the Chief and they agreed that a Council order for a trial period through the summer season could be a path forward to assess how it could work, with the trial lasting up to a certain number of days, so it could be cancelled if needed more easily.

Commissioner Seidel expressed some conflicts about allowing bicycles as there are other streets that could serve as better cut-throughs for cyclists. Assistant Director Downing responded that if the mall were opened to bikes in some capacity, it would have to include signage and education for pedestrians and cyclists. Commissioner Seidel asked staff to look at if other pedestrian malls allow cyclists or not. Assistant Director Downing responded that he would, and also highlighted the other

Approved at Traffic and Parking Commission Meeting on May 3, 2018.

pedestrian only infrastructure within the City as well, so this would not remove the only pedestrian only area from the City.

Vice-Chair Papetti commented that the main benefit of allowing bikes on the mall isn't to act as a cut through, but rather to benefit the businesses by allowing cyclists to more easily patronize their stores. He added that he had done some research, and in 2009 the state passed a large overhaul of bicycle laws, and part of that change stated that a person may ride a bicycle on any public way in the Commonwealth except for limited access highways or express highways. It also requires bicyclists on sidewalks to yield to pedestrians. This might be the opportunity to go to Council to then define the sidewalk on Essex Street in some capacity. He suggested that staff seek the opinion of the City Solicitor about this section of the street to determine how it could be more accurately described and regulated in the ordinances.

Chair Stepasiuk agreed that staff should seek clarity from the City Solicitor regarding this section of Essex Street. Assistant Director Downing agreed, and added that the items Vice-Chair Papetti mentioned may provide language for the Commission to mirror in its consideration of allowing skateboarding.

Vice-Chair Papetti asked Lt. Preczewski if City police could write a citation for a violation of state law. Lt. Preczewski responded that if the law is on the books and has a fine allowing municipal police to do so, then yes they could issue that citation.

Assistant Director Downing thanked the Commission for their input, and will seek the City Solicitor's opinion about if bikes were to be allowed, how it would need to be written.

- Parking Benefit District

Assistant Director Downing gave the Commission background on Parking Benefit Districts (PBDs). PBDs became law as part of the 2016 Municipal Modernization Act. Previously, there was a difference of opinion among city solicitors and attorneys as to whether municipalities could use parking revenue for a wider set of uses beyond maintaining parking infrastructure. The PBD statute created a new subsection of MGL that allows municipalities to do so to designate a geographic area of the municipality as a PBD, and then revenue generated within that district can be used for a much wider array of investments, such as street lighting, improved pedestrian crossings, security at parking garages, overall maintenance of the district. Some cities and towns have begun to explore establishing PBDs. Salem is unique in terms of how it generates revenue. Whereas most municipalities generate 60-70% of parking revenue through fines and tickets, Salem is the opposite and generates 75-80% of its parking revenue through meters, lots and garages, with the remainder coming from fines and tickets. This puts the City in a great position to look at the potential of a PBD. With the exception of the Willows, non-fine parking revenue is all generated within and immediately around downtown. We have started to explore how a downtown PBD could support major projects like the Museum Place Garage

renovations, but also smaller improvements such as sidewalks and street lighting. We have heard complaints and concerns about the safety near the Museum Place Garage, especially at night, and a PBD could potentially fund security at that facility. Also, as we have seen utilization generally and regularly move up to 75% and above, and routinely in the high 80s and 90s, we may need to look at pricing to address that demand, and pairing pricing increases with a PBD make sense, as a PBD could be funded by any incremental increase in revenue, maintaining the level of support for the general fund that parking revenue has provided. A PBD would not receive revenue from fines, and that revenue would still go to the general fund as well.

Chair Stepasiuk asked how it is different than an enterprise fund. Assistant Director Downing responded that it is easier to set up a PBD than an enterprise fund, and a PBD is designed so that it could be managed by existing city departments. Chair Stepasiuk commented that other departments in the City might view it as a cash grab if this revenue is specifically set aside, and the City could portion out this same amount of money for these purposes without the fund if it wanted to already, and it might give the City less flexibility. Assistant Director Downing responded that tying it to pricing changes is important because we do not want to be seen as raiding the general fund, and the way we have considered this up to this point is designed specifically to maintain existing revenue going into the general fund. It could be set up to be a percentage of overall parking revenue, so that the general fund would get more revenue if the City generated higher parking revenue than expected. But it is also important for residents and visitors to see the connection between paying for parking and the benefits they receive. Pasadena has a plaque on every meter that says what parking revenue goes to support within their PBD.

Vice-Chair Papetti asked how a PBD becomes into being as to whether it is more an internal accounting piece or more specific action needs to be taken and various entities would have to be notified. Assistant Director Downing responded that like many state laws, the PBD statute is one a municipality needs to accept, which requires Council action to accept the provisions of this section of MGL and designating the district with certain geographic boundaries. Then, there is also an internal accounting side and is up to the City to determine what amount of revenue would go to support the fund.

Vice-Chair Papetti commented that he is unsure about how it would be implemented here and has some concerns. First, if we raised extra revenue through the PBD, the City Council could reduce the budget for other items by that same amount, either explicitly or implicitly. Also, with the vast majority of parking revenue being generated within a small area of the City, it could have the potential to exacerbate inequities among city neighborhoods. Assistant Director Downing responded that there are infrastructure investment needs within the downtown area right now that even in the absence of a PBD will exacerbate difference levels of investment in the neighborhoods. Downtown has infrastructure unlike the rest of the City that supports the whole City and needs to be maintained such as the Museum Place Garage and improving accessibility downtown. Chair Stepasiuk commented that

raising the rates but putting it into a PBD gives the City less flexibility. Assistant Director Downing responded that regardless of setting up a PBD, the City Council could always change the funding structure and move revenue out of a PBD fund for other purposes, like with any other fund the City creates.

Vice Chair Papetti asked if we should consider a PBD-esque idea on a smaller scale, such as the Museum Place Garage paying its own way. That maintains flexibility for other investments and would not exacerbate the difference in investment between downtown and the rest of the City. Assistant Director Downing responded that for that reason, we don't think a PBD makes sense in the absence of pricing changes. We don't want to take 25% of existing revenue and put it toward a PBD, we want to look at a certain amount of new revenue going to fund a PBD. There is the possibility the Council could reallocate other revenue away from downtown, and we can't stop that, except to make the case as to why this revenue should be spent in the ways we have discussed.

Chair Stepasiuk asked if we had a PBD, these upgrades would have to be made in conjunction with other City departments, so how does it work on conjunction with those other things? Assistant Director Downing responded that the law is open in terms of who would manage the fund, but we feel it would make the most sense for the Traffic and Parking Department to manage that fund. But we would still on an annual basis be going to the Council to present how much revenue was generated and asking for the amount we felt appropriate to be designated for the PBD fund. Ultimately it is still a Council allocation that has to happen every year, and will remain a Council decision every year. In terms of how it is spent and what it is spent on, part of the annual presentation to the Council would be a multi-year plan looking at the types of project we would be looking at like debt-service for larger projects, maintenance projects, accessibility projects, etc. And that would be presented to the Council annual as we are asking for the allocation we think appropriate for the PBD.

Vice-Chair Papetti commented that right now we could go to Council right now and make a funding request based on parking revenue without a PBD, and that a PBD seems more about how that ask is sold. Assistant Director Downing agreed, and added that it could be done right now, but the PBD gives us a tool that makes the ask easier and more clearly shows the nexus between how the revenue is generated and how it is spent.

Commissioner Seidel asked if staff has looked at potential revenue generation within the boundary we have been looking at. Assistant Director Downing answered yes, and the math is somewhat complicated because it would be based on how much a price increase was put into place and where exactly prices were changed, but with modest increases such as raising the hourly rate at the Museum Place Garage from \$0.85/hour to \$1.00 and other similarly modest increases, we could generate about \$600,000 annually. Commissioner Seidel added that she supports the idea of a parking asset like the garage funding its own maintenance and repairs. Assistant Director Downing responded that yes, we could go down that path but we would

Approved at Traffic and Parking Commission Meeting on May 3, 2018.

have to see much more dramatic increases in parking rates to have that work financially. Lt. Preczewski asked how much it costs to parking in the garage right now. Assistant Director Downing responded that parking for 8 hours in the Museum Place Garage costs \$6.00. One benefit of a larger district is it eases the burden on any one asset to pay for its own upgrades.

Vice Chair Papetti suggested we could do a PBD in other ways, and one way could be tied to resident parking zones, and all resident parking revenue goes into a fund for a given zone, which would incentivize more adoption of resident parking. Focusing on downtown revenue could cause some problems.

Chair Stepasiuk commented that downtown parking should benefit the whole City. Assistant Director Downing responded that right now, downtown parking revenue does support investment elsewhere in the City, and our idea for a PBD would maintain that support while also increasing revenue for the densest area of the City that has unique infrastructure needs. Vice-Chair Papetti commented that he thinks the City needs better overall capital planning that should influence where we invest and make sure the investments we make are the best ones, not all focused on one area of the City. Assistant Director Downing responded that the City could create multiple PBDs, with a downtown PBD paired with residential zone PBDs on a much smaller scale, and they could all be run in relatively the same way. It gets more complicated and cumbersome to manage.

Lt. Preczewski commented that he does not think we should discuss how money is spent and that should be left to the Council and Mayor. Assistant Director Downing responded that ultimately, the authority still stays with the Council to either create a PBD or if we do create one, at what level to fund it. The Traffic and Parking Department can't take any of these steps on its own.

Chair Stepasiuk asked if Director Smith would be at the next meeting as it would be important to hear his view. Chair Stepasiuk also asked if other cities have considered PBDs. Assistant Director Downing responded that Arlington is establishing a PBD, and Salem almost has one. The Salem Willows Fund receives parking revenue generated at the parking meters at the Salem Willows to support the Salem Willows Park. It does not cover the entire cost of the maintenance for the park, but it is revenue generated in a specific part of the City that stays within that part of the City.

Chair Stepasiuk asked about the parking lot at Crombie Street going to a kiosk form meters, and asked for an update on that at the next meeting.

- New Handicap Parking Space

Lt. Preczewski asked the Commission about an issue that was brought before him today by a City Councillor to add a handicap parking space for a resident. The item was not on the agenda, so the Commission did not discuss it. Under current City

Approved at Traffic and Parking Commission Meeting on May 3, 2018.

ordinances, the Lt. could advance this issue to the Council without Commission recommendation as he did with the Orne Square issue which was a public safety matter. As this issue is not a matter of public safety, the Lt. indicated he would wait for the Commission to take it up at the next meeting.

MEETING MINUTES APPROVAL

The Commission did not have sufficient members present who attended the last meeting to vote on the minutes, and will take up approval for the minutes from April 5 at our next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion duly made by Commissioner Seidel and seconded by Vice-Chair Papetti, the Traffic and Parking Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:16pm.