



Corvallis Parking Program Audit White Paper #6: Enforcement

October 2020 (v4)

Prepared for:

City of
Corvallis Oregon

Prepared by:

RICK WILLIAMS CONSULTING
Parking & Transportation

Contents

Contents	i
1.0 Executive Summary	1
2.0 Introduction	2
3.0 General Best Practices	3
3.1. Managing Compliance	3
3.2. Program Elements	3
3.2.1. Enforcement Personnel	3
3.2.2 Performance Metrics - Financial	5
3.2.3 Performance Metrics - Enforcement	7
3.2.4 Technology	11
4.0 Existing Conditions	12
4.1. Overview	12
4.2. Organization	12
4.2.1 Enforcement Division	12
4.2.2 Patrol Duties	13
4.3 Performance Management	14
4.3.1 Revenue/Expenses	14
5.0 Recommendations	15
5.1 Enforcement Personnel	15
5.5.1 Conduct Parking Enforcement Organizational Review	15
5.5.2 Incorporate Ambassadorial Services	15
5.2 Performance Metrics - Financial	15
5.2.1 Ensure the Enforcement Program is Financially Self-Sustaining	15
5.2.2 Establish an Evaluation Process for Citation Fees	15
5.3 Performance Metrics - Enforcement	16
5.3.1 Define Enforcement Performance Metrics	16
5.3.2 Routinely Track Enforcement Performance Metrics	16
5.4 Technology	16
5.4.1 Implement Technology Improvements	16
6.0 Summary	17

1.0 Executive Summary

Parking enforcement is a key component of any community parking program to ensure the system is able to function as intended. This paper provides an overview of industry best practices, existing conditions, and tailored recommendations for Corvallis' enforcement program. Key recommendations are listed below with a fuller narrative of the recommendations provided in **Section 5.0**.

Enforcement Personnel

- Consider transitioning the enforcement function to Public Works. This would consolidate all parking operations under a Parking Manager within Public Works.
- Repurpose the enforcement position to one that blends traditional enforcement with community ambassadorial services.

Performance Metrics - Financial

- Ensure the enforcement program is financially self-sustaining.
- Establish an evaluative process for adjusting citation fees that is routine, self-sustaining, and replicable.

Performance Metrics - Enforcement

- Establish performance success metrics for the enforcement program.
- Routinely track performance metrics in a manner that informs decision-making regarding rates and fees and deployment of labor.

Technology

- Pursue implementation of enforcement related technology improvements recommended in **White Paper #5 – Technology**.

2.0 Introduction

The City of Corvallis is interested in gaining a better understanding of its current parking operations program and how it compares with accepted industry standards. To accomplish this, the City is pursuing an audit format of six key elements of its program.

This is the sixth of the seven audits and focuses on the City's parking enforcement program. Effective enforcement is a critical component of any parking management program. This report describes general industry best practices in parking enforcement, the current operations of Corvallis' Parking Enforcement unit, the role enforcement plays in supporting the City's on-street programs, and key performance indicators which can be used to assess enforcement effectiveness.

Following this review, the final section offers strategy recommendations for monitoring and measuring the performance of the parking system and factors to improve the on-street and off-street systems. The recommendations are based on industry best practices and management fundamentals used in similar settings. The recommendations are also presented from the framework of what is most appropriate and effective for the Corvallis system.

3.0 General Best Practices

3.1. MANAGING COMPLIANCE

The foundation of sound parking management is enforcement. Without enforcement, systems such as time limits and pricing that are designed to encourage turnover and deter employees from occupying on-street visitor parking are likely to be ineffective. The primary goal of parking enforcement is to enforce the City's parking regulations so that drivers come to understand that parking legally is the better alternative. This means citing a sufficient percentage of violators. A common misconception is that parking enforcement should strive to capture all violators. In fact, excessive enforcement is usually harmful as it can discourage people from visiting a community and patronizing local businesses.

Consistent and objective enforcement should be established with the goal of achieving key metrics of performance established for the on-street parking system. Ideally, enforcement produces a "culture of compliance" in which users park legally, supporting an efficient parking system.

Enforcement should not be heavy handed or exceedingly lenient. Rather, consistent and objective enforcement should be established with the goal of achieving key performance metrics established for the on-street parking system. These metrics include managing duration of stay, turnover, and rate of violation. Ideally, enforcement produces a "culture of compliance" in which residents and visitors park legally, supporting an efficient parking system.

3.2. PROGRAM ELEMENTS

The following section provides an overview of key elements of best practices parking enforcement.

3.2.1. Enforcement Personnel

Role of the Parking Enforcement Officer (PEO)

Traditional Role

The traditional role of a parking enforcement officer (PEO) is to objectively enforce violations of the parking code as it applies to the rules of use for specific on-street stall types (e.g., time limited and special use stalls) and appropriate use of a stall or curbspace. In most cities, parking enforcement is overseen by a designated parking division within the city (Eugene and Portland, OR) or as a unit within the police department (Corvallis and Everett, WA). Some cities contract out parking enforcement to a third party vendor (Albany, OR, Bend, OR, and Redmond, WA).



Example: Enforcement Handheld Technology

In recent years, the trend in municipal parking enforcement has been to place the program within a designated parking division within a city, separate from police services. This trend has been influenced by the strategic belief that municipal parking programs, and the enforcement that comes with them, are driven by both the need for safe and secure movement of traffic *and* economic development factors supporting community vitality. To this end, it is more common to see parking operations and enforcement placed in Public Works, Transportation, or Economic and Community Development Departments, as opposed to within Police Departments.

Regardless of where enforcement is placed, components of a PEO's workday include enforcement of time zones (whether in metered zones or areas with signed time limits) and in activities that are not "patrol" based. Such non-patrol based activities can include:

- **Dispatch:** Receipt, logging, and forwarding of complaints, including blocked driveways, abandoned/prohibited vehicles, and time-limit infractions.
- **Prohibited and Abandoned Vehicle Claims:** Citing of oversized vehicles (such as motorhomes), which are prohibited from extended parking on residential streets, and abandoned vehicle complaints.
- **Delineation (Meter Bagging):** Posting of temporary signage so others will not park in spaces that have been reserved temporarily for a fee.
- **Meter Collections:** Routine and on-call meter collections (to prevent or repair non-functioning meters due to coinage).

Emerging Role - Parking Ambassador Programs

Some cities have adopted a parking ambassador approach to parking enforcement. The parking ambassador approach is based on delivering enhanced customer service by maximizing patron interaction while also performing all parking enforcement functions.

Traditional enforcement programs often focus on citation productivity whereas the ambassador model's aim is to provide information, aid, and general hospitality services. The primary goals of an ambassador program are to help make a business district a better, safer, and more enjoyable place to live, work, and visit, to educate parking users about how to use parking resources, to assist users in finding parking locations, and to increase the convenience and ambiance of an area or district. Training new enforcement officers is based on two key objectives: teaching them the fundamentals of their technical job responsibilities and, just as importantly, teaching the soft skills needed for customer service and conflict resolution.¹

In Williamsburg, VA, PEO's are trained to know the variety of businesses in the downtown and, during peak lunch and dinner hours most days, to assist with not just parking, but in providing directions and maps,



Example: Parking Ambassador Program in Chattanooga, TN

¹ Colleen M. Niese, *Defending the Enforcement Officer*: Alexandria: International Parking Institute, 2013.

recommending sites to see, and offering pamphlets with information to enhance a customer's visit. Similar programs are in place in Raleigh, NC, Chattanooga, TN, and Hartford, CT. In several cases, ambassadors are also uniformed differently than traditional PEO's.²

Any meaningful shift from the traditional enforcement model to the ambassador approach requires a comprehensive training program, rewritten job descriptions, and a shift in the skills sought when hiring.

3.2.2 Performance Metrics - Financial

Self-Sustaining Program

Many cities budget enforcement as a separate revenue/expense fund, ensuring that decisions regarding revenue from citations are made in the context of the actual cost of covering enforcement expenses. In other words, parkers who obey the rules should not be burdened, through hourly parking rates, with the cost of subsidizing those who violate the rules.

Laguna Beach, CA, Portland, OR, Tacoma, WA, and Corvallis are such cities. This ensures that *parking* revenue/expense performance is evaluated separately from *enforcement*. Both operating centers should be responsible for their own financial coverage. Though it is not unusual for cities to blend enforcement revenue and expenses in their parking funds, it can eventually lead to decisions related to on- and off-street hourly parking rates that are influenced by the cost to both operate *and* enforce the system. To a degree, this could inflate the hourly rates charged for parking in downtown above the true market rate for parking. While the cost of the enforcement program should be included in the downtown parking fund, it should be managed separately and revenue from citations should cover all the operating costs and future needs of enforcement.

As discussed in **White Paper #2: Rates and Fees**, Corvallis does separate enforcement revenue and expenditures within its Parking Fund, and there is a clear delineation between revenue generated through enforcement and costs to deliver the program. Corvallis further delineates the costs to support the program through the municipal court system.

Table 1 provides a summary of FY 2018-19 annual revenue from citations and program costs. As the table indicates, annual enforcement revenue (\$437,000) represents 61% of all "parking related" revenue³ in the fund and exceeds its direct annual program expenses (\$321,000), which represent 34% of all fund expenditures⁴. However, including costs to administer and support the program through the municipal court system (\$208,000) the overall enforcement program accounts for 56% of all fund expenditures. Overall, the enforcement program costs approximately \$92,000 more per year to operate than citation revenues collected.

² See for instance: <https://www.downtownraleigh.org/about/downtown-ambassadors>

³ FY 2018-19 gross revenue totaled \$713,700. This total included licenses, fees & permits meter revenue, and citation revenue.

⁴ FY 2018-19 gross expenditures totaled \$950,000. This total included staff time for Community Development, Public Works, Public Work special projects, parking enforcement, and municipal court expenses.

Table 1: Enforcement Revenue/Expense Summary (FY 2018/19)

Program	Annual Revenue (2018-19)	Annual Program Expense (2018-19)	Net Revenue to Parking Fund
Enforcement	\$437,000	\$321,000	<\$92,000>
Finance (municipal court)		\$208,000	
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>\$437,000</i>	<i>\$529,000</i>	<i><\$92,000></i>
% of Total Gross Parking Revenue	61%	56%	

As a unique cost center, enforcement is not currently financially self-sustaining. Consistent with industry best practices, Corvallis' enforcement program is set up to easily track and monitor financial performance. Moving forward, an evaluation of fines and fees (within this unique operating center) can assist in bringing the program to self-sufficiency within the parking fund.⁵

Rates and Fees

As stated above, industry best practices recommend that the costs of managing enforcement should not be combined with those of managing the on-street or off-street parking systems. Revenue from citations should cover all operating costs and future needs of the enforcement system.

Fees established for parking violations should be based on four criteria and evaluated (at minimum) every two years:⁶

1. **Minimum break-even cost.** The cost of maintaining existing operations, including administration, personnel, back office, court system expenses, and equipment.
2. **Future system needs.** The reasonable cost of future needs, including system growth and replacement and technology improvements.
3. **Compliance performance.** Targeted goals for rates of compliance (see below).
4. **Comparable cities.** Routine tracking of an established list of cities that represent reasonable "comparables" for parking enforcement citation fees. This provides comparative data of similar markets as other metrics are considered.

Corvallis staff has indicated that it has been many years since citation fees were evaluated, particularly against a set of best practice criteria like those summarized above. Similarly, current fees do not cover overall program costs to at least a break-even level. **Table 2** provides a summary of "comparable" cities reviewed in **White Paper #2: Rates and Fees**.⁷

⁵ Several recommendations in this regard are detailed in White Paper #2: Rates and Fees.

⁶ Rick Willson, *Parking Management for Smart Growth*. Washington: Island Press, 2015 (especially pages 191 – 196). See also, Todd Litman, *Parking Management Best Practices*. Chicago: American Planning Association, 2006.; and Rick Williams Consulting, *Survey of Rates in American Cities*: Unpublished. 2014.

⁷ The comparable cities used here were developed in conjunction with City staff during the development of White Paper #2. Note that Missoula, Eugene, Salem, and Davis represent cities with Universities abutting their downtowns. As a formal evaluative process is developed, the list of comparable cities can be refined to ensure that "market" assessments are realistic and reasonable for Corvallis.

Table 2: Comparison of Fines- Comparable Cities

City	Overtime Violation	Meter Violation
Missoula, MT	\$10.00 ⁸	\$10.00 ⁹
Corvallis, OR	\$10.00	\$10.00
Spokane, WA	\$10.00	\$15.00
Eugene, OR	\$16.00	\$16.00
Salem, OR	\$30.00	\$25.00
Hood River, OR	\$26.00	\$26.00
Davis, CA	\$50.00	\$50.00

As the table indicates, Corvallis' citation fees are at the very low end of the scale when contrasted with other cities, indicating some margin within which to adjust fees to eliminate what is now a program deficit.

3.2.3 Performance Metrics - Enforcement

Best practices standards suggest establishing a managed and replicable set of key performance metrics that are used to track enforcement performance. Once established, "success metrics" are routinely compiled and expressed in report formats that allow for comparative analyses between operating periods, whether monthly, quarterly, or annually. All compiled information should be combined into a single report (e.g., quarterly or annually) that allows review of such standards for enforcement as well as the broader on- and off-street systems.¹⁰

Best practices standards call for establishment of success metrics to support consistent, informed, and strategic parking enforcement.

The cities of Tacoma, WA¹¹ and Portland, OR¹² have established goals and measures for their enforcement programs, routinely tracking metrics in a manner that informs decision-making regarding enforcement rates and fees and deployment of labor. Each city is also capable of comparative analysis of baseline measures year-to-year. Baseline measures include the following, some of which are discussed further in sections below:

- Violation rate/capture rate
- Deployment of labor
- Summary of infractions: by total and by type (see graphic at right, next page)
- Revenue by type of citation
- Expense/revenue performance

⁸ Fines escalate in \$5.00 increments from the first violation (\$0) to the 5th violation (\$20); \$10 serves as the fine for the 3rd violation.

⁹ Fines escalate in \$5.00 increments from the first violation (\$0) to the 5th violation (\$20); \$10 serves as the fine for the 3rd violation.

¹⁰ White Papers #1 (Residential Permit Districts) and #3 (Format and Management – Downtown) also discuss the need for performance metrics to monitor residential, downtown, and enforcement parking operations; routinely publishing results (e.g., via the City's parking webpage).

¹¹ See: *City of Tacoma, Establishing and Integrated Parking Plan* (Parking Services Division/Rick Williams Consulting – August 2013)

¹² See: *City of Portland, Performance Based Parking Management Manual* (Kimley-Horn, February 2018)

Measuring performance in any area of parking management requires monitoring, data collection, data assembly, and reporting. At present, the following performance metrics are not in place in Corvallis, though recommendations for establishing and monitoring specific metrics related to the parking management program have been discussed in **White Papers #1 through #5**.

In many cases, data is available, it just needs to be consistently tracked, analyzed, and assembled. To this end, moving toward a best practice standard in establishing performance metrics is more a function of reordering work tasks within existing programming than a significant cost burden. In other cases, as discussed in **White Papers #3 and #4**, field data such as occupancy and utilization is not available or routinely collected. Achieving this level of performance monitoring will likely require additional funding resources, preferably through evaluation of citation rates and fees (see **Section 3.2.2**).

DESCRIPTION	PERCENT OF TOTAL ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS
No Meter Receipt	21%
Overtime Meter*	18%
Loading Zone	7%
Overtime Parking	4%
Area Permit Required	4%
Improper Display, Meter Receipt	4%
No Parking Anytime	3%
Prohibited Time	1%
Other Parking Infractions	15%
Other (Non-Parking)	23%
	100%

*This violation includes either vehicles in a meter space with an expired receipt or a vehicle which was timed by the PEO and found to have exceeded the time limit.

Source: City of Portland Performance Based Parking Management Manual (February 2018)

Violation Rate

Violation rate is the percentage of unique vehicles¹³ within a system that park in violation of regulations at some point during their parking session.

$$\text{Violation Rate} = \frac{\text{Unique Vehicles in Violation}}{\text{Unique Vehicles Observed}}$$

In most cities that follow best-practice standards, this rate is quantified from data derived from routine parking utilization studies where license plate data is collected, allowing for analysis of unique vehicles by block face, stall, and time stay designation. The violation rate is unrelated to whether the infraction resulted in a citation or other action by the enforcement officer; it is only a measure of actual vehicles parked in the downtown or a time-limited area that commit an infraction. As an example, if a system serves 1,000 vehicles in a day, and 80 vehicles are recorded violating the stated regulations (overtime, unpaid meter, etc.), the violation rate for this observation day would be 8%. Within the industry, the best practice standard for rates of violation target a range between 5% and 9% of unique vehicles parked during hours of enforcement.¹⁴

Violation rates are useful for determining deployment of labor (see below) and can be useful for determining the level of citation activity when also contrasted against parking occupancy levels. For instance, if peak parking occupancies are consistently less than 85%, it may be reasonable to allow a higher violation rate given that at low occupancies, violators are not adversely impacting visitor access to the parking system. Conversely, higher occupancies that create parking access constraints would suggest a lower violation rate standard (as well as other strategies related to posted time limits and/or pricing). This is important to ensure that spaces for the highest priority users of a parking supply are preserved.

¹³ The industry defines violation rate using “unique vehicles” to make the distinction that total vehicle observations (which can include repeat observations of the same vehicle) are not used in the calculation. Additionally, repeat violators would only be counted once when calculating the violation rate.

¹⁴ Rick Willson, *Parking Management for Smart Growth*. Washington: Island Press, 2015 (page 111).

Table 3 summarizes how several peer cities have used occupancy and violation rate data to inform strategy considerations for deploying enforcement personnel. Good examples are Everett and Tacoma, WA. Both cities had high peak hour occupancies and high violation rates that were well above the industry standard of 5% - 9%. Based on this data, both cities have moved to increase enforcement FTE within the downtown, targeting a 9% rate.¹⁵ In Newberg and Redmond, OR, both cities had very low occupancies and high violation rates. Both cities have elected to simply monitor occupancies over time as there does not appear to be an issue with visitors finding a place to park. In Albany, OR, low occupancies and a very low violation rate has led the city to consider both a more ambassadorial role for enforcement personnel as well as consideration of expanding the enforcement area and directing efforts to respond to issues in adjacent residential areas.

Table 3: Sample Cities: Violation Rates with Strategy Output

City	Unique Vehicles Recorded*	Peak Hour Occupancy	Violation Rate	Strategy Consideration
Albany, OR	2,613	43%	4.0%	Reduce enforcement hours downtown
Bend, OR	4,677	81%	9.6%	Moderate increase in enforcement
Everett, WA	6,354	82%	14.2%	Increase enforcement
Hood River, OR	3,270	86%	7.9%	Meets standard
Kent, WA	1,538	65%	18.4%	Phased increase moving to 9% target
Lake Oswego, OR	1,483	50%	13.5%	Phased increase moving to 9% target
McMinnville, OR	1,938	63%	12.8%	Phased increase moving to 9% target
Milwaukie, OR	1,064	58%	17.3%	Phased increase moving to 9% target
Newberg, OR	1,303	48%	23.0%	Monitor occupancy
NW Portland	10,701	86%	8.4%	Meets standard
Redmond, OR	860	41%	12.5%	Monitor occupancy
Tacoma, WA**	3,404	86%	13.1%	Increase enforcement

*Unique license plates recorded over the course of a typical enforcement day (usually 9:00 AM – 5:00 PM, with some variations).

**Meter district only

Capture Rate

Capture rate is the percentage of violators who are “captured” by enforcement, meaning the violation was discovered and some action was taken (either a warning or a citation). Excellent parking enforcement programs typically achieve a 15% “capture” rate, or about one in five violations¹⁶. Enforcement above a 15% capture rate can be harmful and discourage people from patronizing local businesses. The goal, however, is to be able to measure the effectiveness of PEO deployment and assure that issuance of citations is balancing with the overall goal for

$$\text{Capture Rate} = \frac{\text{Unique Vehicles Cited or Issued Warning}}{\text{Unique Vehicles in Violation}}$$

¹⁵ In both cases, these cities are looking at redeployment of existing FTE (from other non-downtown routes) as well as on-street pricing and increases in citation fees.

¹⁶ This capture rate recognizes that most violations are not observed by enforcement officers, as enforcement generally relies on “sampling” some percentage of the system. The violation rate, on the other hand, is generally based on periodic hourly data collection in order to quantify the total number of violators on a typical day.

violation rates of between 5% and 9%, which is neither heavy handed nor exceedingly lenient. A good example of this is described in the City of Portland's Parking Management Manual, which recommends a 15% capture rate as its standard for measuring efficient enforcement activity, correlated to the 5% - 9% violation rate standard.¹⁷ At the end of the day, use of violation and capture rates contributes to a system that is fair, objective, and intended to facilitate turnover and maximize user access.

Deployment of Labor

A key consideration in parking enforcement is determining the ideal number of officers to deploy. Unfortunately, there is no easily defined "best practice" standard. Many cities attempt to calibrate their deployment based on the total number of stalls enforced, drawing on averages among peer cities. However, geography, type of enforcement (e.g., on foot, in scooters), type of stalls enforced (on-street, off-street, or a combination), and technology all affect the number of stalls that each individual officer can efficiently patrol. Similarly, the relationship between the enforcement of regulated (time limited) stalls versus unregulated stalls also drives the deployment of labor uniquely by city.

Table 4 shows enforcement staffing for several cities in the West. As the table indicates, staffing levels vary greatly, ranging from as low as 146 stalls enforced per officer (Fresno, CA) to a high of 865 stalls per officer (Everett, WA).

Table 4: Spaces Patrolled per Enforcement Officer

City	Spaces Patrolled ¹⁸	Enforcement Officers (FTE)	Spaces per Officer
Corvallis, OR	1,535*	2.75	430 (on-street only) 558 (w/ off-street lots)
Albany, OR	578	1	578
Boise, ID	1,300*	3	433
Eugene, OR	1,749	8	219
Everett, WA	1,730	2 [‡]	865
Fresno, CA	2,200	15	146
Hood River, OR	448 [†]	2	224
Portland, OR	8,400	50	168
Santa Rosa, CA	815	4	204
Tacoma, WA	2,335	8	334

Note: * Includes the 1,182 metered, permitted and time-limited on-street stalls as well as the 353 unrestricted, time-limited and permitted off-street stalls † Includes all timed stalls in the downtown ‡ Downtown only

¹⁷ City of Portland, *Performance Based Parking Management Manual* (Kimley-Horn, February 2018)

¹⁸ For the most part, spaces patrolled in the cities represented here do not include stalls associated with residential areas, just those in defined commercial parking management areas or districts (like a downtown). To that end, the Corvallis stall total does not quantify stalls in residential areas that are routinely patrolled by PEO's. This was done to create as much of an "apples to apples" comparison as possible. As such, a portion of the Corvallis FTE total does provide service in residential permit districts, meaning the current 2.75 FTE estimate may be lower in the commercial areas. This number was not available from the data reviewed. Unlike Corvallis, most cities respond to issues in neighborhoods on a complaint basis.

Ultimately, the most effective guideline for calibrating enforcement levels is with occupancy data and use of violation and capture rate information. Routine review of such data allows for strategic and incremental adjustments in labor deployment at levels that are cost effective with efficient levels of user compliance.

3.2.4 Technology

A range of parking management technologies were covered extensively in **White Paper #5**. Those relating to enforcement included mobile and handheld license plate recognition systems as well as pay-by-plate and electronic permitting systems. Recommendations for Corvallis from that review include upgrading current enforcement tools to facilitate pay-by-plate options for users and a transition to electronic permitting. These technologies not only improve enforcement tools for PEO's but enhance the customer/user experience.

4.0 Existing Conditions

4.1. OVERVIEW

Effective enforcement is a critical component of any parking management program. This section describes the current operations of Corvallis' Parking Enforcement program, the role it plays in supporting the City's parking program, and other indicators which can be used to assess its effectiveness.

4.2. ORGANIZATION

4.2.1 Enforcement Division

Logistics

The City of Corvallis' Police Department contributes to the City's overall mission by enforcing Title 6 (Traffic) of the municipal code.

Enforcement Overview	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area covered: 14.23 square miles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adopted 2018/19 Budget: \$271,000¹⁹
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Primary Focus Areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ On-Street: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 538 Free stalls ▪ 644 metered stalls ▪ 255 10-Hour permit stalls ○ Off-Street <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2 Permit lots ▪ 2 Unrestricted lots ▪ 3 Time-limited lots ○ Residential Permit Districts (RPDs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3 RPDs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organization: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enforcement Staff: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2.75 FTE ○ Public Works, Finance and Community Development staff are not included in these personnel service charges.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional Areas of Responsibilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enforce temporary No Parking areas ○ Tow vehicles for parking violations ○ Respond to calls about abandoned vehicles ○ Monitor/cite employees parking in downtown free parking areas ○ Additional tasks assigned by the supervisors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2019 Citations/Warnings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 15,550 citations issued ○ 1,720 warnings issued ▪ Top violations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 6,428 Overtime Meter ○ 3,441 Residential Zones ○ 3,102 Parked Improperly/Prohibited

¹⁹ This is the adopted budget for 2018/19 for the Police Department for parking.

Citation Processing

In 2019, PEOs issued 15,550 citations and 1,720 warnings. The cumulative value of the citations was \$404,562. **Table 5** summarizes the breakdown of these citations, highlighting the top three operational infractions and the percentage of total enforcement actions taken during the year.

Table 5: Citation Summary

Citation Description	# of citations	Percent of Enforcement Taken
Overtime Meters	6,428	41%
Residential Zones	3,441	22%
Parked Improperly/where prohibited	3,102	20%

4.2.2 Patrol Duties

Parking Enforcement Officers (PEOs) are housed within the Police Department and are assigned rotating routes. Routes may be assigned for a week or they may change daily due to enforcement needs or assignments from a supervisor. The PEOs work in all the districts and are not dedicated to particular areas. They issue citations using a handheld device with printing capabilities. Supervisors may instruct PEOs to concentrate on certain areas or locations based on complaints, violation history, and time since an area was last patrolled. The following sections summarize the main responsibilities of the PEOs.

Meter Enforcement

Meter enforcement is performed on either scooters or on foot in the Downtown. PEOs can reticket vehicles in meter and time-limited stalls, if a vehicle is cited for non-payment and then is observed again after the time limit has been exceeded, it can again be cited for a time-limit violation. This is a policy followed by many major cities. For vehicles parked improperly, one citation is given per day.

For the parking stalls associated with the four pay stations, three Downtown and one at the library, PEOs have an app on their phones to access the pay station database. The database allows the PEO to see which parking stalls have been paid and which are expired. To track single-head meter violations, PEOs simply observe if a meter has expired and then, if warranted, issue a citation.

Enforcement of metered time limits is challenging, particularly when there is a mix of time limits on a single block. If a block has a mix of time limits (24-minutes, 1- hour, 2-hours, etc.), it is very difficult to check the shorter time-limited spaces properly because the required passes (e.g., every 24 minutes) serve very little value in enforcing the majority of spaces on the block.²⁰

Time Limit Enforcement in Unmetered Areas

PEOs will patrol a given block face, recording the plates of each vehicle by pen and paper. They will then time their subsequent passes so they can identify those vehicles that have violated the posted time limit by checking the hand-written list of plates. If warranted, the PEO will use their handheld device to issue a citation. The

²⁰ Using a base standard time limit in the downtown (as described in **White Paper #3**) would help to address this challenge.

citation is printed and either placed on the windshield or handed to the driver if they are present. The information is then 'in the system' electronically and can be accessed by the municipal court.

Residential Parking Permit Zones

Corvallis has three Residential Permit Districts (RPDs). These are patrolled regularly to check for violations rather than being complaint-driven, meaning officers are assigned a route rather than simply responding to resident complaints. A full discussion of Corvallis' Residential Permit Districts is provided in **White Paper #1 - Residential Parking Districts**.

Response to Complaints

As mentioned above, PEOs are expected to respond to complaints in addition to patrolling their assigned routes. As a result, routes assignments and daily tasks may change due to complaints and/or supervisor daily changes.

4.3 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

4.3.1 Revenue/Expenses

Based on the 2018/19 approved budget, **Table 6** provides a breakout of the enforcement revenue (citations) and the enforcement expenses (Police and Municipal Court). Citation revenue is treated as a non-dedicated revenue belonging to the Parking Fund. Since this revenue cannot be linked to one particular expense, both Police and Municipal Court expenses are shown below.

Table 6: Revenue/Expense Summary (FY Approved 2018/19)

Revenue	Ticket	\$437,000
Expenses	Police	-\$321,000
	Municipal Court	-\$208,000
NET PROGRAM INCOME		<\$92,000>

The combined Police and Municipal Court expenses of the adopted 2018/19 budget were \$92,000 more than the budgeted ticket revenue. The enforcement parking fund should strive to be financially self-sustainable.

5.0 Recommendations

5.1 ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL

5.5.1 Conduct Parking Enforcement Organizational Review

More and more cities are transitioning the enforcement function from traditional police services to Public Works, Transportation Services, or Community and Economic Development. This trend has been influenced by the strategic belief that municipal parking programs - and the enforcement that comes with them - are driven by both the need for safe and secure movement of traffic *and* economic development factors supporting area vitality. This would also allow for the consolidation of all parking functions under a single Parking Manager within Public Works. An organizational review would consider potential cost efficiencies, clarification of roles, and streamlining performance metrics and communications.

5.5.2 Incorporate Ambassadorial Services

Corvallis' downtown is destination-based, with vital street level activities and an intimate interface with Oregon State University. The need for downtown enforcement *and* information services to users can be blended into the current enforcement position. Coupled with best practice metrics for compliance and upgraded technologies, the current Parking Enforcement Officer can be broadened into a Community Service Ambassador.

A shift from the traditional enforcement model to the ambassador approach will require a comprehensive training program, rewritten job descriptions, and a shift in the skills sought throughout hiring.

5.2 PERFORMANCE METRICS - FINANCIAL

5.2.1 Ensure the Enforcement Program is Financially Self-Sustaining

A key success metric will be to ensure that the annual enforcement budget is balanced. Corvallis does separate enforcement revenue and expenditures within its Parking Fund, and there is a clear delineation between revenue generated through enforcement and costs to deliver the program. Corvallis further delineates the costs to support the program through the municipal court system. However, as a unique cost center, enforcement is not currently financially self-sustaining. Future planning should, at minimum, calibrate citation rates based on cost recovery for delivery of the program. See **Section 5.2.2** below.

5.2.2 Establish an Evaluation Process for Citation Fees

Fees established for parking violations should be based on four criteria and evaluated (at minimum) every two years:

- Minimum break-even cost
- Funding of future system needs
- Compliance performance (see **Section 5.3.1**)

- Comparable cities

5.3 PERFORMANCE METRICS - ENFORCEMENT

5.3.1 Define Enforcement Performance Metrics

The enforcement program should have established goals and measures that reflect best practice indices of success, efficiency, and compliance. Best practice success metrics include:

- Violation rate/capture rate
- Deployment of labor
- Infractions: by total and by type
- Revenue by type of citation
- Expense/revenue performance

5.3.2 Routinely Track Enforcement Performance Metrics

Information necessary to tracking and quantifying established performance metrics would be gathered within the context of a routine schedule of data collection as described in preceding White Papers. These efforts would be coordinated to support evaluation and program adjustments no less than every two years.²¹

5.4 TECHNOLOGY

5.4.1 Implement Technology Improvements

A range of parking management technologies were covered extensively in **White Paper #5**. Recommendations for Corvallis from that review include upgrading current enforcement tools to facilitate pay-by-plate options for users and a transition to electronic permitting.

²¹ See particularly White Paper #3 (Section 5.0)

6.0 Summary

This White Paper provides insight into enforcement from a best practices standpoint and an evaluation of Corvallis' current program within that framework. Findings note that the current program is not financially self-sustaining and lacks a decision-making format based on "success metrics" that can be routinely measured and replicated. The series of recommendations contained in this paper are intended to contribute to workable solutions within the enforcement program; the output being a financially sound and efficient operation.

Draft