

PARKING AUTHORITY MINUTES

June 25, 2003

ATTENDANCE: Urban Mulvehill, Chairman; Burt Shatz,
Steven Bentkover, Troy Jellerette

STAFF: Ed Schmidt, Assistant to the Mayor;
Kathryn Hebert, DPW;
Martin Overton,
DPW Assistant Director

OTHERS: Robert J. Cavello, AIA, Westview Group, LLC

CALL TO ORDER

2.) May 28, 2003

****MR. MULVEHILL MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES AS DISTRIBUTED.
MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3.) Authorize the Chairman of the Parking Authority, Urban S. Mulvehill, to execute an Amendment to the Agreement with NetTech Solutions to continue the Parking Bureau Management Operations on a month to month basis until such time a new agreement is executed not to exceed 48% of collected parking ticket revenue (current approved contract).

****MR. BENTKOVER MOVED TO AUTHORIZE MR. MULVEHILL TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT TO THE AGREEMENT WITH NETTECH SOLUTIONS TO CONTINUE THE PARKING BUREAU MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS ON A MONTH TO MONTH BASIS UNTIL SUCH TIME A NEW AGREEMENT IS EXECUTED NOT TO EXCEED 48% OF COLLECTED PARKING TICKET REVENUE ON CURRENT APPROVED CONTRACT.
MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Schmidt said that if the application is adopted, the document must then be prepared to be signed in the office.

4.) Adopt the Recommended Operating Procedures for the Parking Bureau.

Mr. Schmidt asked the board to refer to the packet titled, "Operational Recommendations & Procedures to the Norwalk Parking Authority concerning the Parking Bureau." He said that page 4 basically was basically defining particular terms and that page 6-10 is the real meat of the packet. He stated that the definition for a "void ticket" is provided. He said that Tina is the parking violation supervisor. Mr. Bentkover asked there has to be a correction of the ticket if one has been voided out. Mr. Schmidt said no. Mr. Bentkover stated that one must show a corrected ticket for a void to be valid.

Mr. Mulvehill questioned what would happen if someone were to misread a sign. He said that there would be no basis to issue a ticket following that. Mr. Mulvehill instructed the board to refer to page 11. In regards to specific procedure, Mr. Schmidt stated that the issuing officer must submit a void request form that states the reason for the request. He said that if the reason is stated is an error in data or a malfunction of equipment, it must be verified that the next ticket number contains similar information to verify that a ticket was issued to a violator to insure that the officers are not canceling tickets at will. Mr. Schmidt said that once a ticket is issued, the officer is not authorized to cancel, void, or dismiss.

Mr. Shatz told the board to refer to page 5 of the packet titled, "Outside Agency Tickets." He explained that these are tickets that are issued by the Police Department, Fire Department, and the Parks and Recreation Department. Mr. Bentkover stated that there should be an explanation attached to a voided ticket if there has been a mistake. Mr. Mulvehill said that this reinforces the idea that there will be a subsequent ticket and that there may need to be more drafting before the situation is acted upon. He said that he does not think 10 days is enough time for a person to respond to a ticket. He said that he does not see the need for such a strict time limit. Ms. Hebert asked Mr. Mulvehill what he had in mind. Mr. Mulvehill said that they should not be disqualified on such a short time limit.

Mr. Jellerette said that people have the opportunity to write a written appeal within the 10 days, and that he does not think people should need to think about the ticket for an entire year. Mr. Hebert said that in ten days they can put a hold on and stop the process. Mr. Mulvehill questioned what would happen if individuals would become vigilant.

Mr. Schmidt said that appeals 1 and 2 are done by staff. He said that they need "black and white" rules for administrative review. Ms. Hebert said that there is much more flexibility now. Mr. Mulvehill said that if you the owner of a car and you get a ticket, with no knowledge of when it is issued, you should not be expected to pay it within 10 days. He said that this is unreasonable. Ms. Herbert stressed that the appeal rate for a ticket is only 10%. Mr. Mulvehill suggested that the level 1 and 2 people put in a reasonable time period. Ms. Hebert said that this would then go to a level 3 appeal. Mr. Mulvehill questioned why it would have to go to a level 3 appeal. Ms. Hebert said that she did not want the clerks to be making judgment calls. Mr. Mulvehill said that it would be wrong to tell people that they cannot come down to the office just because their 10 days are up. Mr. Jellerette said that people usually respond to the tickets right away anyway. Ms. Hebert said that it is not as though people are not allowed to appeal. Mr. Schmidt said

that there is a way to work this out. He said that in a level 3 hearing it says 10 days. He said that they can possibly add that the supervisor may waive the 10-day appeal requirement if there is cause shown to do so. Mr. Mulvehill stated that he still thinks 10 day is too short. Mr. Schmidt said that if the rules are going to be changed, the tickets have to be changed as well.

Mr. Bentkover said that tickets start at \$250 in New York. Mr. Mulvehill said that they should at least give people a period of time while the ticket is escalating.. Mr. Schmidt said that they can actually appeal after the 10 days. He asked the board to refer to page 6 of the packet. He said that tickets that qualify for a level one review are: officer requests, violator is deceased, error in data, bankruptcy, handicapped parker, stolen plate, defective meter and improper signage. He said that a dismissed ticket review will be handled administratively. He said that in the level 2 review, tickets that qualify for a level 2 administrative review are appeals made by violators that claim to have a valid permit and were issued a ticket for not having a valid permit, and violators that claim they were driving alternate vehicles, though they had a valid permit for their primary car that was not in use. He said that a level 2 appeal will be limited to five permit infractions issued to a permit holder within a six-month period. Mr. Mulvehill stated that he disagrees with this also. Ms. Hebert said that with the new contract people will also be able to pay for permits on line.

Mr. Bentkover asked if people are notified in advance when the permit expires. Ms. Hebert said no because the date of expiration is given on the permit anyway. Mr. Bentkover said that paying people to void tickets seem like a nightmare.

Mr. Schmidt stated that the current process says that a ticket can be dismissed if someone has a permit. Mr. Bentkover asked how there could possibly be an unlimited grace period. Mr. Jellerette stated that he did not think there needed to be a five-day grace period. Mr. Schmidt said that the level two review is clearly what they want the people who work the front desk to do. He said that they need an audit to be completed by NetTech to know why the tickets are being issued to people with valid permits. Mr. Mulvehill stated that he did not want the citizens of Norwalk to be inconvenienced in any way. Mr. Schmidt said that all of the issues cannot be solved tonight. He said that the administrative appeal could allow a dismissal of a ticket if someone does have a permit. He also stated that if the board does not act tonight, the current practice will be issued. Mr. Bentkover said that this does not have to be adopted on a permanent basis. He said that if you put a building block in place and say it is subject to scrutiny, NetTech still has a way of operating. Mr. Mulvehill stated that this is the first time these rules have been institutionalized. He said that if they upset one person about a ticket it underlies the legitimacy of what they are doing.

Mr. Schmidt said that in regards to "Meters and Signage" on page 10, a monthly report will be generated to track the status of defective meters and missing signage claims. He said the report will list the number of tickets dismissed or voided due to defective meters and signage by location. He stated that this report will assist in identifying and rectifying reoccurring problems. Mr. Schmidt further stated that the "Quarterly Reports" will

include, but will not be limited to the number of tickets issued, number of tickets dismissed/voided by category, ticket revenue, number of permits issued, and permit revenue.

****MR. BENTKOVER MOVED TO ACCEPT THE RULES AS SUBMITTED BY NETTECH.**

****MOTION PASSED 3-1.**

5.) Authorize the Chairman of the Parking Authority, Urban S. Mulvehill, to execute an agreement with CT Limousine, Inc. to provide airport transportation services at the South Norwalk Railroad Station for a lease sum of \$24,000 (\$2000 per month) for FY 2003-04.

Mr. Mulvehill said that it would be premature for him to execute an agreement. Ms. Herbert said that this needed to get moving. Mr. Mulvehill said that in the area that the airport buses are supposed to go, there is not enough room on the curb. He said that the public does not seem to know where exactly to go as a result of this. He said that they have to find the space provided to them acceptable. Mr. Shatz asked who is supposed to be developing this project. Mr. Jellerette said DTW.

Mr. Schmidt stated that the wording in the application needed to be changed. He said that the phrase, "on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Parking Authority" needed to be added after "transportation services."

****MR. BENTKOVER MOVED AUTHORIZED THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PARKING AUTHORITY, URBAN S. MULVEHILL, TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT WITH CT LIMOUSINE, INC TO PROVIDE AIRPORT TRANSPORTATION SERVICES ON TERMS AND CONDITIONS SATISFACTORY TO THE PARKING AUTHORITY AT THE SOUTH NORWALK RAILROAD STATION FOR A LEASE SUM OF \$24, 000 (\$2,000 PER MONTH) FOR FY 2003-04.**

****MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

6.) Authorized the Chairman of the Parking Authority, Urban S. Mulvehill, to execute and agreement with the Westview Group, LLC, to provide Project Management and Owner's Representative Services in connection wit the Maritime Garage Project, for a sum not to exceed \$47, 500 plus reimburseables.

Mr. Overton stated that during the development process the city is requires the developers to have a public service management on board. He said that there was a time limit set on the developer agreement expiring in July. He said that this proposal does not change

though they want to add a closeout of the project. He stated that the is strongly endorsing to carry out the project.

Mr. Schmidt stated that they were paying the Spinniker Group and then they were paying Mr. Overton. He said that he agrees with Mr. Overton that it does not make sense to be solely employed with Spinniker. Mr. Shatz said that 25% seems a bit high and questioned whether there were a lot of administrative services provided. Mr. Overton said yes. Mr. Schmidt said that they need Mr. Overton's services for the parking structure. Mr. Overton said that he does not want the city resources to be used in the development of the public and private project. Mr. Shatz said that this was a lump sum. Mr. Overton stated that it was a sum not to exceed the amount. Mr. Shatz asked how many months are anticipated for the project. Mr. Overton said two months after the completion date of the end of November. He said that he has calculated the schedule in terms of one fee. Mr. Bentkover asked if the money on the original budget has been approved. Mr. Schmidt said no. Mr. Bentkover said that he worked in businesses where there is a specific price and he said that this is it. He said that all these different developers are supposed to be coming in. He stated that the board is talking about money that is over and above what has been allocated.

Mr. Schmidt said that he had talked with Jack Miller this afternoon. He said that the guaranteed price is the construction budget, that is not to be confused with the project cost. Mr. Bentkover asked if the \$60,000 they paid was to Spinniker. Mr. Overton replied yes. Mr. Schmidt said that this does not come out of the maximum guaranteed price. He stated that they save money by having Rob monitor the project. He said that it is in everyone's interest to make sure that everything in the contract has been done. He said that the city does different contracts for different deals. He stated that this is a relatively minor deal. Mr. Mulvehill stated that they have done an excellent job. Mr. Cavello said Thank You.

Mr. Bentkover stated that the \$37,500 seems to have come from nowhere. Mr. Mulvehill stated that it had always been there. Mr. Overton stated that the city has been paying since before the project started. Mr. Jellerette questioned whether they are in good shape from a project point-of-view. Mr. Overton said yes. Mr. Schmidt said that they are saving money. Mr. Jellerette said that he sees Mr. Bentkover's point that it seems as though this money came from nowhere.

Mr. Mulvehill suggested to change the wording in item #6. He suggested to add, "through period of two months following completion of projects" after the word, "reimbursables."

7.) Authorize the Purchasing Agent on behalf of the Parking Authority to issue a purchase order to RCC Consultants to provide technological recommendations for the installation an implementation of network capabilities at the Maritime Garage, for a sum not to exceed \$7,250.

Mr. Schmidt stated that RCC was hired by the city to put the network together. He said that the RP would go out in July and that the funding is in existence. He said that the

company was hired to do local area network for the police station. He stated that Brian McMann High School will be having a swipe card system that will provide a record of who comes in and out of the building at all times. He said that will also be having security cameras and motion detectors. Mr. Schmidt said that the security people or the principal will be able to view the footage. He said that he had previously gone to the police station. He said that they have tons of security. He said that the biggest impediment for the Maritime Garage is the lack of safety there. He stated that the original plan was to have two cameras placed on top of the two ticket booths. He said that the fun part is to have the television monitors put in the walls that would show what is going on in Norwalk. He said that it would be rolling video of events in the Maritime Center and Norwalk. He said that now is the time to get all of this underway. He stated that the real reason to do the contract is for security. He said that if the motion detector were to go off, the alarm would go to combined dispatch, making the police able to see what is on that camera. Mr. Cavello stated that it is also a deterrent to faulty alarms. Mr. Bentkover said that this money is not in the original budget. Mr. Schmidt said that it is still within the available budget. Mr. Bentkover said that they will need someone to go out and do advertising for this project.

Mr. Bentkover said that there are three tasks to be reviewed. He asked what exactly they are contracting for. Mr. Schmidt said that they are only doing task one and that they just need authorization for the \$7,000. He said that he has a hunch that task two and three will not be needed. Mr. Bentkover stated that a consultant was hired for the project though there was no plan or idea of how much it will cost. He said that they need to know what the cost is going to be. Mr. Schmidt said that rather than having someone just sit in the Maritime Garage, they can just feed into the police station. He stated that the worst thing would be to build a garage with a speaker and panic button only to have no one respond to it if there is an emergency. He said that they must follow through and not just give the illusion of safe environment. Mr. Bentkover said that they are increasing construction costs. Mr. Mulvehill stated that the panic buttons had always been in the budget. Mr. Overton said that they had not been. Mr. Bentkover stated that there must be some sort of integrated plan. Mr. Overton said that the point is to have the integrated plan for the \$7,000. Mr. Schmidt stated that there has been a resistance to parking garages because of the perceived lack of safety and that they are likely to see a significant amount of usage if there is good lighting and security. He said that they are just using the \$7,000 to work all of this out. Mr. Schmidt said that a vendor will be consulted to manage the Maritime Garage.

Ms. Hebert said that the security cameras and tapes are very helpful. Mr. Bentkover said that he is not objecting to the security. He stated that he just believes that the board should be two steps ahead and should know what the impact is on the operating budget. He also stated that they need to know what the feasibility is on the costs going in.

8.) Discussion-Maritime Garage Construction Project.

Mr. Overton stated that everyone should be familiar with the format. He said that the global picture of the garage is that they are halfway through. He said that the change orders to date are 2% on the public side. He told the committee to refer to page on of the packet. He said that the foundation of the project has been completed this week

Mr. Overton stated that everything was going quiet nicely. Mr. Cavello told the board to refer to the section of the packet titled, "Updates. He said that the electrical power is a major issue. He said that engineering was not caught up at the time of the bid. Mr. Shatz asked whether they had lost days because of the rain. Mr. Overton said that they lost two or three complete days. Mr. Schmidt asked if they have iron workers. Mr. Cavello said yes. He said that the guys toughed it out even despite the rainy conditions. He said that they would be reviewing pricing tomorrow. He stated that diversified technologists have since hired a new electrical engineer and that they are having a second electronic engineer give them an exact price. Mr. Overton said that he is pleased with how the site is being managed. He said that there are only a few more items to go to bid. Mr. Bentkover asked about the "buoy" on item number four. Mr. Cavello said that someone has to bring it down. He said that he met with the people from the Maritime Center on Monday to discuss the design. He stated that the design was to their liking. He said that the aquarium is obtaining pricing for computer upgrades, furniture upgrades, etc. Mr. Cavello stated that it was important that the Maritime Center approved of the design in order for them to move forward.

Mr. Bentkover questioned the ticket operation for the garage and asked whether that is being considered. Mr. Cavello said that it has been purchased and that this particular system can be adjusted for all sorts of uses. He said that they had also designed the parking garage office near the gate. Mr. Schmidt questioned whether the office has glass windows. Mr. Cavello replied yes and said that you can see who is in the garage at all times.

Mr. Shatz asked if they are using the bomanite process. Mr. Cavello said yes, stating that it costs about \$12 a foot. Mr. Shatz asked why they would be using he bomanite. Mr. Cavello said that it was because of tripping. He said that general directional signs will also be placed in the area. He asked if the wayfinding signs come out of the \$250,000. Mr. Schmidt said that the did not know if it should come out of the \$250,000. He said that the design seems to be in excess of the \$250,000. He stated that if there was any surplus, he would say to go spend it on the signage.

9.) Discussion- Operation Parking Facilities

-Status RFP-Management/Operation Parking Facilities

Ms. Hebert said the RFPs are due back July 8, 2003.

As there was no further business to be discussed, the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Joseph
Telesco Secretarial Services

