



DRAFT

**MINUTES - SHOREWOOD BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
Special Village Board Meeting  
August 31, 2020**

1. Call to Order

Tr. Stokebrand called the meeting of the Village Board to order at 6:32 p.m. via teleconference. During the roll call vote below President Rozek teleconferenced into the meeting.

2. Roll Call

Village Manager Ewald called the Roll. Present over teleconference: Trustees Davida Amenta, Tammy Bockhorst Jessica Carpenter, Arthur Ircink, Kathy Stokebrand, Wesley Warren and President Rozek.

Others Present: Village Manager Rebecca Ewald, Assistant Village Manager Tyler Burkart, Finance Director Treasurer Mark Emanuelson, Public Works Director Leeann Butschlick, Assistant Public Works Director Joel Kolste, Planning and Development Director Bart Griepentrog, and Police Chief Nimmer.

3. Special Order of Business

- a. Consider changes to the Long Range Financial Plan project schedule and creating a construction coordinator position. (6:36 p.m.)

President Rozek relayed that Tr. Amenta will be leading this discussion as the Chair of the Budget & Finance Committee.

Tr. Amenta opened discussion. Question was asked on the cost for an asphalt overlay on Oakland Avenue and DPW Director Butschlick noted that the cost for asphalt paving for the entire length of Oakland Avenue could be from \$600,000 to \$700,000 based on recent Milwaukee costs.

General discussion continued on the merits of the two scheduling options. Director Butschlick indicated that with any pavement replacement would likely include water main replacements.

The timing of projects was also reviewed, with a focus on the length of time that asphalt overlay would last and what the condition of the roadway would be during that period. Director Butschlick also clarified that just the south section of Oakland Avenue asphalt overlay would cost from \$200,000 to \$225,000 based on recent Milwaukee costs.

Finance Director Emanuelson responded to questions on the various fiscal impacts to consider related to the use of TID 5 funding, the impact on TID closure, and the variability of those timelines based on the pending assessment legal challenge.

Village Manager Ewald began discussion of the Construction Coordinator position with slide presentation overview. Questions were asked related to the cost of the proposed position and why the village does not have an engineer on staff. Assistant Village Manager Burkart discussed the needs of contracted inspections services vs. a staff position. The staff position is not intended to do engineering work. Assistant DPW Director Kolste discussed benefits of having a staff position vs. continually “training” contracted staff on “the Shorewood

way” of customer engagement and expectations. Staff position would also provide increased levels of customer service beyond the contracted inspections services. The staff position does not impact the Village engineering scope.

Assistant Village Manager Burkart reviewed that this position was recommended by the consulting group as part of the DPW organizational analysis. This position could also generate potential net cost savings. Position would also improve the customer service capabilities of the department related to construction projects.

Village Manager Ewald also restated that this request is based on staff recommendation in 2019, consultant recommendation in 2020, and would allow DPW to more effectively deploy staff resources.

President Rozek moved to deny the hiring of the construction coordinator position in the packet. Motion failed for lack of a second.

Tr. Warren moved and Tr. Ircink seconded to approve the construction coordinator staff position and job description to the Department of Public Works for 2021 and to budget for this staff position consistent with alternative one (\$70,000 capital projects/\$30,000 DPW general fund operations) from the fiscal notes. Motion failed 4-3 with President Rozek, Tr. Amenta, Tr. Carpenter, and Tr. Stokebrand voting nay.

Tr. Carpenter noted that it was hard to put this position into context without the draft budget in front of the Board so they could see the full impact. Tr. Amenta agreed. Tr. Bockhorst relayed her support for approving the position. Tr. Ircink agreed with Tr. Bockhorst. Tr. Stokebrand relayed her concerns with the benefit costs associated with the position.

Tr. Carpenter moved to approve the additional construction coordinator staff position and job description to the Department of Public Works for 2021 and discussion during the budgeting process. Village Manager Ewald clarified that her intent was to include budgeting for this position within the scope of how the draft budget was to be presented. Tr. Amenta confirmed that the intent of the motion was to allow the Board to decide on creating and funding the position during discussion of the DPW budget. Tr. Amenta seconded. Village Manager Ewald reread the motion as clarified that Tr. Carpenter moved to approve discussing the additional construction coordinator staff position and job description in the Department of Public Works in the 2021 budget for the staff position. Motion carried 7-0.

Tr. Warren moved and Tr. Ircink seconded to direct staff to pursue Option B – pavement replacement with spot curb repair of North Oakland in 2022 with high impact paving of South Oakland in 2021; pavement replacement of South Oakland in 2026 and RFP for pavement replacement design, decreasing design review time.

President Rozek moved and Tr. Amenta seconded to amend the motion to have both north and south Oakland use TID funding for full reconstruction. Motion failed 6-1 with Trustees Amenta, Bockhorst, Carpenter, Ircink, Stokebrand and Warren voting nay.

The Board then voted on the original motion: to direct staff to pursue Option B – pavement replacement with spot curb repair of North Oakland in 2022 with high impact paving of South Oakland in 2021; pavement replacement of South Oakland in 2026 and RFP for pavement replacement design, decreasing design review time. Motion carried 6-1 with President Rozek voting nay.

The Board deferred any action related to issuance of an RFQ for construction inspection services, as the construction coordinator position would be included in the draft budget and further discussed as a part of the 2021 budget process.

Tr. Ircink moved and Tr. Bockhorst seconded that North Oakland Avenue road work should be funded under the currently approved TID 5 project plan as roadway improvements outside of the district boundaries that are needed to serve the district. Motion carried 7-0.

The Board agreed to recess at 8:06 p.m. prior to starting discussion on parking regulations.

- b. Provide direction on modification of Night Parking regulations for purposes of preparing the draft budget. (8:13 p.m.)

The Board reconvened at 8:13 p.m. Director Griepentrog provided a review of recommendations for parking provided by the Transportation and Parking Analysis. Tr. Stokebrand chaired the meeting, as President Rozek was now attending the meeting via telephone and not teleconference.

Tr. Carpenter inquired if staff considered a six-month permit versus a monthly permit, with a reduction in cost if a six-month permit was purchased. Director Griepentrog relayed staff believed a monthly permit should be maintained, but consideration of a quarterly permit was suggested. It was noted that with a permit residency would be reviewed once every 12 months. Director Emanuelson noted that a six-month permit is an affordability issue for permit holders to come up with six months of permits fees at one time.

Tr. Bockhorst inquired why the Village has overnight parking restrictions in the first place. She also inquired about the cost of a Whitefish Bay and Milwaukee overnight parking permit. Director Griepentrog relayed that generally overnight parking permits are not allowed in Whitefish Bay and the few that are issued are \$30/month. Milwaukee's permit is \$55/annually.

Tr. Ircink wanted to know the financial implications for doing away with overnight parking restrictions. He questioned if there are alternative options to offset the lost revenue, and what is the revenue we are losing with the 40/30 model. Director Emanuelson responded, a \$500,000 impact to do away with overnight parking, options to recover some of the costs could be parking meters or wheel tax. The Board previously reviewed parking meter revenue and it was estimated to be \$250,000 - \$300,000 per year based upon the number installed and rates associated. The revenue loss would be approximately \$30,000 for reducing the permit fee.

Tr. Stokebrand noted that she would like to have the difference be closer to zero, than a deficit of \$30,000. Director Emanuelson noted the challenge of anecdotal scenarios of how staff reasonably believes the market will respond. Once those numbers are better understood, the Board could revisit the subject of fees within 6 months, 1 year or 2 years.

Tr. Warren was curious as to whether public works will be able to clear the streets of snow if alternate side parking is not implemented. DPW stated that they shared the same concern, but was unable to quantify it at this point. Tr. Warren noted that the parking survey asked what people would be willing to pay based upon price points. However, he also wanted to know what people are paying for non-Village lots in Shorewood. The parking study did not include this information. The Village does not have information on private lots; however, one developer noted that what the study is proposing is cheaper than monthly parking permit fees in a newer development, so the tenants would likely switch to Village permits for parking.

The concept of extending daytime regulations by 2 hours was discussed to free up parking space for businesses within the commercial district. Staff noted that it could be rolled out concurrent with the proposed changes or would this change down the line. If it was a concern, the Board could consider it; however, it was changed relatively recently. It was previously posted for a longer duration, but was changed to encourage parking on Oakland and Capitol, rather than the residential streets. This topic would also be reviewed during the first year of implementation.

It was confirmed that the Village has alternate-side parking requirements within its night parking ordinance; however, the Village stopped enforcing it. The ordinance calls for alternate-side parking Village-wide, unless there is only parking on one side of the street.

Tr. Amenta noted if we going to allow people to park on the street overnight that alternate-side parking should be implemented at the same time. Tr. Amenta does not understand why residency and permit limits are

connected. She did not believe too many non-residents would be interested in purchasing permits here; however, there are dense areas of town. The consultants recommended limits to the permits to two per household. She is in favor of lowering the cost 40/30, but believes if there is not a control over the number of permits allowed per household that the Board will find themselves in trouble very quickly. She wants to warn people that parking is something that people are very concerned about and stated that she would not vote for it unless there are household limits. Director Griepentrog doesn't know an easy way to confirm where everyone resides. Tr. Amenta is not willing to risk it, by not requiring it for some blocks where it will be a really big issue.

Tr. Warren relayed that if we were to institute a household limit that he believes there would not be rampant fraudulent activity based upon this requirement.

Jeff Jara wanted to thank Directors Griepentrog and Emanuelson for their cooperation in sharing data. He noted that his analysis concluded that total revenue from permits in 2019 of about \$300,000 came from approximately 1,000 individuals. He was curious how those individuals were being impacted. Based on his research and understanding, he believes six assumptions are being embraced:

- 1) Shorewood has to charge fees for on-street overnight parking because Milwaukee does and if they did not residents of Milwaukee would park in Shorewood. He noted that this may be true for some sections, but it would not happen everywhere in the Village. He stated that he doesn't understand why the Village has overnight parking regulations and suggested that more selective regulations could be adopted.
- 2) There are some issues with supply and demand. He noted that there doesn't appear to be supply/demand in all areas of the Village. He stated that if you allowed off-street permit parkers to park on the street that about 300 cars would be added to neighborhood streets. There was recently a test of unregulated parking during the stay at home order and there were not any issues. He noted that he saw no parked up streets and suggested that if there are issues, then the Village should regulate the hot spots.
- 3) Residents wanted to maintain access to parking on their blocks for convenience. He stated that the reality is that most people who can park off street will continue to do so and that those who need to park on the block will be able to find parking on that block or nearby. He acknowledged that it could change daily.
- 4) Overnight parking restrictions serves to deter crime. He stated that an irrational fear of a criminal element does not make it true. He believes this concept has been a fallacy within village politics for a long time. He noted that there is no historical data to support this claim in the Village.
- 5) Residents want to limit parking for aesthetic consideration. He noted that aesthetic value is subjective. The exceptions to the policy undermine the assumptions because on-street parking is currently allowed for approximately 1/3 of the calendar year on weekends and holidays and through temporary permissions.
- 6) Parking revenue supports the Village government. With respect to this concept, he noted that the reality is that off street parking revenues offset the real costs of the program. The other revenue is used to pay into other administrative or government expenses. He stated that the entire parking ordinance creates a government apparatus with expenses that would not exist if the parking permit would not exist. He stated that this was an inefficient use of current Village resources. He also noted the Village owns private pieces of land that have been turned into municipal parking whose revenue is less valuable than if these properties were developed and tax revenue received.

Lastly, he stated that there is a social economic impact since the vast majority of permit holders are tenants and earn less than homeowner counterparts. He summarized that the parking program is detrimental to this segment of Shorewood and set up to address problems that do not really exist. He requested that the Board consider delaying their September 8<sup>th</sup> vote for further evaluation of the program's need, as he did not believe that residents should be charged for overnight parking.

Caroline Kreitlow noted that has been working with Jeff Jara on reviewing the parking regulations. She is the

owner/occupant of a duplex that is landlocked and has a 3-car garage off the alley that is fully occupied. She indicated that their lives are growing with children aging into cars and partners, and that they spend approximately \$1,000 a year on parking citations, in addition to \$10,000 a year in property taxes. Both units are 3-bedroom units needing parking for 4 vehicles. They do not have parking for an oversized work vehicle. There is no driveway, but there is an area next to the garage they could put a slab, but there is a power pole blocking it, so there is no room to expand for parking. She is not comfortable with her partner walking to and from a Village lot. She has heard the concerns of streets being too busy with parking, but believes the virus provided a good test. She noted that every single night people are already parking on the streets by calling in their vehicles without additional regulations and the streets get cleaned. She mentioned that parking permits should be viable in the option for revenue; however, as a business owner parking meters would be a different conversation. She is open to purchasing a permit. She asked that if more time was needed to figure out the best solution that parking restrictions be lifted in the meantime.

Mike Maher noted that Milwaukee was the first city to have night parking. He stated that all you have to do is drive through the east side of Milwaukee to see what unrestricted parking looks like to park on the street during winter. From 2005 – 2008 the Village did an analysis block by block on night parking permission. He noted that people want night parking, but questioned if it's unlimited, where are these people going to park. The 3500 block was the highest usage of parking. If all the people in the area park on the street, the neighborhood will fill up and the residents will be frustrated because they will not be able to park close to their house. There should be a limit per residence. He doesn't believe we can proceed unless there is a plan to remove snow. During the pandemic there was not a university of 25,000 in operation during the stay at home order. Parking is one way to control how overcrowded the neighborhoods are, particularly close to the university. A storage unit is about \$110/month. The parking permit fee must incentivize property owners to use their own parking first. He would support a set number for residence and keeping the fee high enough to utilize other parking.

Tr. Stokebrand is concerned about not doing alternative side parking right now. Chief Nimmer noted the main issue with alternate side parking is that the ordinance is confusing and requires clarification. The question is what is considered the night. That being said, he supports alternate side parking and the ordinance simply needs to be clarified. Director Griepentrog confirmed that the ordinance could be clarified. Village Manager Ewald supported the clarification of the ordinance and enforcement of the alternate-side parking ordinance.

Tr. Amenta noted support for changing the ordinance to support overnight parking with limits per residence and clarifying the language of alternate-side parking. She stated that she was inclined to go lower rather than higher with the fee, as renters in general have a lower income than homeowners, assuming landlords don't increase rates to make up for it.

Tr. Bockhorst was in favor of opening up on street parking, and noted that if a tiered approach was necessary to allow those who need it most receive it first. Currently the Village perpetuates a program that restricts entry into our community. We heard the need for equity and affordable housing. It can cost \$1,000 a year to park.

President Rozek concurred with Tr. Bockhorst and noted that on street overnight parking regulations need to be eliminated in Shorewood. She believes that residents of the Village do not want other people here, meaning people who do not live here. The more people on the street the safer a neighborhood is because there are more eyes on the street. She 100% supports on street parking in the Village of Shorewood. Alternate-side parking is possible and it's a viable option to pursue. On-street permit fees need to be more than the village lots. She also agreed with eliminating the rental of private lots and the administrative responsibility. She does not agree with limiting the number of permits per residence. It doesn't matter if you are a resident or not. Anyone who needs to buy a permit in Shorewood should be able to purchase a permit in Shorewood. She stated that the Village currently only permits 50% of permits on streets. If things go well, we could start by permitting 60%. She would not touch the zone of RCA because they are their own square. The university is a different animal.

Tr. Ircink voiced the need to revise the language for overnight parking, without residency requirements, and suggested the 40/30 fees. He also noted that he was interested in exploring the concept of open parking.

Tr. Carpenter was in favor of the 40/30 fee split, would like RCA area kept the same, would like to do some work to control the number of permits per residence, and would like to update the language for alternate-side parking. She questioned if the village required landlords to provide parking permits and suggested the concept of requiring landlords to purchase the permit without penalizing the tenant.

Tr. Warren supports overnight parking at the lowest cost possible and no residence or household restrictions because we have a lot of different types of households. He questioned if the decision could be delayed in order to consider an even lower cost. He would like to know what the impact is on the budget and doesn't want it to have unintended impacts. He supports alternate-side parking and wonders what the signage impact would be and expense associated. He appreciates the conversation they are having on equity and the impacts.

Tr. Stokebrand inquired what the cost would be to implement the costs associated with alternate-side parking and signage. She supported the on street overnight parking permit with changes to alternate-side parking, no household limits and was in favor of the staff recommendation on fees of 50/40.

Tr. Bockhorst noted that the Board needed to give direction to staff tonight.

Director Griepentrog reviewed what he heard from the discussion and offered to incorporate the changes into the documents for the Village Board's consideration on September 8. He noted that he heard consensus on offering the overnight permit without residency requirements or household limitations, clarifications to alternate-side permits and a fee structure of \$40 for the on-street overnight permit and \$30 for the off-street overnight permit.

Tr. Amenta believed that there are a lot of people that don't pay attention to what the Board does and there will be unanticipated changes in behavior. She also noted that the fiscal analysis is built on assumptions. As much as she wants to open up parking, if the Village is not limiting by household she stated that she can't vote for it.

Tr. Bockhorst would like to know how much revenue comes from fees/fines. She would like to see the permits lowered again.

Tr. Carpenter noted that she comes from an urban area that had parking challenges and would like to have some controls and residency requirements.

Tr. Ircink stated that he was in favor of the permit without residency requirements and clarifications to alternate side parking. He would like the fee to be as low as possible, if any.

Tr. Warren noted that he was comfortable with Director' Griepentrog's summary of consensus, which included no residency requirements or household limits, alternate-side parking updates and the lowest fee price.

Tr. Stokebrand noted that changing parking regulations were like moving a mountain. She stated that it was important to start somewhere and noted that the Board would have the option to revisit it.

#### 4. Adjournment.

Tr. Bockhorst moved and Tr. Ircink seconded to adjourn at 9:44 p.m. Motion carried 7 - 0.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca Ewald

