

From: [Julie Hall](#)
To: [citycouncil](#)
Subject: Downtown Parking
Date: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 10:11:07 AM

Dear Salem City Council Members,

I'm writing in response to the recent announcement that free street parking in downtown Salem will end starting July 10. While I understand the city's goals in implementing this change, I am concerned about how these new parking fees will affect members of our community who live with disabilities.

Many people with disabilities, especially those with mobility challenges or medical complexities, rely on accessible parking spots close to downtown destinations. These individuals often face added barriers in their daily lives, and additional parking costs could further limit their ability to participate in our community.

I urge the city to adopt a policy that allows drivers with valid disability parking placards or plates to continue using designated accessible parking spots downtown without being subject to the new parking fees. This would be a meaningful step in ensuring equity and access for some of Salem's most vulnerable residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I appreciate your work to make Salem a more inclusive and livable city for all.

Sincerely,

Julie Hall

From: [Randall Ray](#)
To: [citycouncil](#)
Subject: parking meters
Date: Monday, May 26, 2025 2:38:23 PM

DEAR ALL,
THIS IS AN EFFORT IN FUTILE INVESTMENT.WE'VE SEEN THIS FAILURE BEFORE
BUY NO METERS AND SELL PARKING STICKERS TO BE DISPLAYED INSIDE THE
CAR SIMILAR TO HANDICAP PARKING SIGN. NO STICKER; YOU GET A TICKET.
METERS WILL BE VANDALIZED BY HOMELESS AND STUPID PEOPLE.
WAKE UP; MOVE TO I T FUTURE.

RANDALL RAY

From: [Randall Ray](#)
To: [citycouncil](#)
Subject: parking meters
Date: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 11:30:40 AM

YOU JUST CAN'T FIX STUPID.

Parking meters we discontinued because they didn't pay for the install upkeep or the labor of payroll and administration costs

DO YOU THINK PRICES AND LABOR ARE LESS NOW THAN 50 YEARS AGO?
YOU JUST CAN'T FIX STUPID??

RR.

From: [Evan Manvel](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: public testimony for May 27 council meeting
Date: Monday, May 26, 2025 10:04:15 AM
Attachments: [ManvelParkingTestimony2025May27.pdf](#)

Hi!

Testimony attached for tomorrow's City Council meeting. Let me know if you have any questions!

Best,

Evan

Evan Manvel
(206) 369-9049
Salem, OR
he/him/his

26 May 2025

RE: Agenda Item 7.1c - Parking Meters and Costs in Downtown

Ordinance Bill No. 8-25 amending Salem Revised Code Chapter 102 related to time limits in the Downtown Parking District for metered on-street parking and proof of payment.

Dear Mayor Hoy and City Councilors,

I am writing in support of Agenda Item 7.1.c, with two recommended changes.

Over the past five years, I spent much of my professional life helping cities reform parking management, and led the publication of Oregon's *Parking Management Jump Start Guide*. (I'm happy to get councilors printed copy of the 132-page guide, or you can find it [online](#).)

General Support

I am glad to see Salem is on the cusp of installing parking meters downtown, after a 48-year hiatus.

In 1932, business owners in Oklahoma City were desperate to help people reach their businesses, and held a competition to design a parking meter. Meters helped ensure employees and all-day parkers parked slightly farther away, and drop-in customers could park near a business door. By encouraging turnover at the highest-in-demand spots, businesses thrived.

Thanks to various public and private investments and decisions, Salem's downtown is becoming more and more lively. After the peak of the pandemic, we're seeing more people live in and visit our city's core, which is the place visitors are most likely to see and associate with the city. A thriving downtown helps ensure a thriving city, long-term. Our businesses provide great products, and I believe customers will not be burdened by paying \$1.50 an hour for more convenient parking, or walking from a free nearby parking space.

The metering of downtown spaces - while providing over 800 free parking spaces in garages - is simply good economics and smart management of a limited resource.

As Whitney Woodworth wrote in the *Salem Statesman-Journal* (Dec 24, 2024)

The current model fails to generate enough money for operating costs for the parking program and parkade maintenance and has been subsidized by American Rescue Plan Act [ARPA] funds and the General Fund for the past three fiscal years.

[Ordinance Bill No. 8-25](#) is a good step and should be supported, with two amendments.

Suggested Amendment #1 - Remove Financial Caps

On Page 5, Section 102.045 overly limits the City. It states:

(a) Increased annual assessments to finance the operation of the Downtown Parking District, SRC 7.110(a), are **capped at the lesser** *[emphasis added]* of the percentage increase in the Bureau of Labor Statistics general consumer price index for the Portland, Oregon, metropolitan area for the preceding year or 2.0 percent.

This clause, as written, ensures the city will fall behind inflation. As we all know, our city expenses are growing faster than inflation. **This clause builds in structural financial shortfalls.**

I don't know why this clause is even needed. **I recommend deleting this clause**, and addressing the assessment in the annual fee schedule or other appropriate document.

Barring that, the city could simply replace “the lesser” with “the greater” - thereby capping assessments but providing a small amount of flexibility.

Suggested Amendment #2 - Address Habitual Violations

I would recommend a fee structure to address habitual violations.

Having higher fees for repeat violations creates a norm of nudging first-time violators to comply with a relatively small fee, while not letting those who have significant resources simply ignore the law and pay fees when caught. This is a difficult balance. Ashland, Grants Pass, Medford and Salem all have had systems where the fees for multiple violations are significantly higher than one's first violation.

I would recommend the approach from Bend. Bend's Parking Manager Tobias Marx has reported good results from their fee schedule.

While violations 1-4 are all at the base rate, the Bend [approach](#) addresses habitual violators:

The fee for repeated parking violations within any calendar year increase as follows:

- 200% Offenses 5-9/year
- 300% Offenses 10-14/year
- 400% Offenses 15+/year

Page 8 of Salem's draft ordinance, Section 102.135 Violations, reads:

(D) SRC 102.045 "Prohibited Parking in Downtown Parking District": \$50.00. ~~\$100.00. If a person has violated this section two times within any one-year period, the fine shall be \$175.00, and if a person has violated this section more than two times, within any one-year period, then the fine shall be \$250.00.~~

...

(G) SRC 102.067 "Failure to Display license plate or Vehicle Identification Number in a space metered by a pay station Proof of Payment": \$30.00

To address serial violations, one could add to Section D:

If a person has violated this section five to nine times within any one-year period, the fine shall be \$100. If a person has violated this section more than nine times within any one-year period, the fine shall be \$200.

And for Section F:

If a person has violated this section five to nine times within any one-year period, the fine shall be \$60. If a person has violated this section more than nine times within any one-year period, the fine shall be \$120.

This approach would provide a balance between smaller nudges for the occasional violator, and larger ones for the habitual violator.

Thank you for your consideration, and service to the city. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Regards,

Evan Manvel
Ward 2
Leffelle St, South Salem