
OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET ANALYST REPORT

Date Issued: September 11, 2008

IBA Report Number: 08-97

City Council Docket Date: September 15, 2008

Item Numbers: 200 & 201

City-Wide Parking Restrictions for Oversized, Non-Motorized, and Recreational Vehicles

OVERVIEW

On Monday, September 15, 2008 the City Council will consider two alternative proposals to restrict the parking of oversized, non-motorized, and recreational vehicles on public streets, alleys, and in parks between the hours of 10:00 P.M and 6:00 A.M. The ordinance would also prohibit parking of such vehicles within 50 feet of any intersection at any time. Violations would be an infraction with a fine of \$100. City residents and their guests would be eligible to receive permits to park recreational vehicles for up to 72 hours, as long as the recreational vehicle is parked in the same block as the address of the residence. The cost of the permit for one, two, or three consecutive nights would be \$3.50.

Two alternative proposals have been presented to the City Council for consideration, the first proposes to implement the ordinance for a pilot area encompassing west of Interstate 5, north of Downtown and south of Del Mar, and a portion of the City east of Interstate 5 across from Mission Bay. The Second proposal would implement the ordinance city-wide. The implementation of the ordinance falls into three distinct areas that have fiscal and policy ramifications:

- Implementation
- Permitting
- Enforcement

FISCAL/POLICY DISCUSSION

Implementation

Staff has estimated implementation costs for the pilot area at \$22,000 and \$41,500 for city-wide. Depending on which alternative is approved, implementation costs include the installation of signs on every roadway entering the pilot area or city-wide. Additional costs are associated with public information and education programs. It is important to note that a funding source for the implementation costs has not been identified. However, staff has indicated in their April 4, 2008 Memorandum that they anticipate that these one-time implementation expenses will be recovered through permit and citation fees. More on cost recoverability of this program is discussed later in this report.

Permitting

Under both Proposals, City residents and their guests would be eligible to receive permits to park recreational vehicles for up to 72 hours, as long as the recreational vehicle is parked in the same block as the address of the residence. No more than 24 permits shall be issued relating to any one address in any one calendar year period (maximum of 72 days). Staff has proposed that the fee for obtaining a permit would be \$3.50. The estimated permit processing costs for the pilot area is \$173,654 and \$228,645 for city-wide. However, it is unclear what initial expenditures will be necessary to implement the program. Staff is estimating that the total amount of fees that will be collected for permits is \$175,000 for the pilot area (50,000 expected permits issued) and \$262,000 for city-wide (75,000 expected permits issued). The revenue collected from permit fees will be used to help offset the cost of the program. The IBA recommends that the fee amount be reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that the permitting segment of the program is cost neutral to the City.

Enforcement

For this program to be most effective, a sound enforcement plan is essential. The Mayor's staff has proposed one option to enforce the program. The following section reviews the proposal presented by the Mayor's staff. However, due to the high cost of staff's proposal in an uncertain economic climate, the IBA offers two other enforcement proposals that could be less costly for City Council consideration. The two proposals presented by our office will require additional fiscal and operational review by the Mayor's staff.

Option I (Mayor's Proposal)

For both the pilot area and city-wide the Mayor's staff is proposing to add additional personnel to handle the enforcement of the program. Teams of two Parking Enforcement Officers (POEs) would patrol the City seven days a week. ***These teams would issue cites for all parking violations, not just oversized vehicle infractions. It is important to note that by approving one of these options, the City's parking enforcement program would expand to 24 hours, seven days a week, in some of the***

City's communities. The policy ramifications of this change are not discussed in the April 4, 2008 Memorandum. This is a major concern for the IBA. The implementation of either of the Mayor's proposals would require a change in POEs workdays and hours. This would require the City to Meet and Confer with the POE's labor union. If the Meet and Confer process was not successful, the responsibility of the enforcement of the program would fall to police officers who are already challenged with existing workloads. The following tables indicate the staffing and expenditures necessary to implement the Mayor's enforcement proposals:

Pilot Area	
FTE	Expenditure
4.00 Parking Enforcement Officers II (\$75,503 Salary)	\$302,012
1.00 Parking enforcement Supervisor	\$80,062
Non-Personnel Expenses	\$80,200
Total:	\$462,274

City-wide	
FTE	Expenditure
16.00 Parking Enforcement Officers II (\$75,503 Salary)	\$1,208,048
2.00 Parking enforcement Supervisor (\$80,062 Salary)	\$160,124
Non-Personnel Expenses	\$312,000
Total:	\$1,680,172

Staff has indicated that the expenses related to the enforcement of the program would be offset by permit processing and parking citation fees. However, more analysis is necessary to verify this. Approval of either of the Mayor's enforcement proposals would likely result in significant cost increases to the City. If the city-wide option was approved, the Police Department's budget for POEs would increase by 27%.

Option II (Alternate Proposal)

Another enforcement option would be to approve the ordinance but use existing staff to enforce. Enforcement could be done by a combination of police officers and POEs. This proposal would still require negotiation through the Meet and Confer process to change POEs working hours. If the Meet and Confer process was not successful, the responsibility of the enforcement of the program would fall to police officers. The positives of this proposal include the possibility of a slight increase in revenue to the City due to the ability to issue oversized vehicle citations without incurring the costs associated with having to hire additional POEs. The negatives of this proposal could

potentially be a weak enforcement of the ordinance. If the hours of POEs were not changed, enforcement of the ordinance would be the responsibility of police officers that could take away from other critical responsibilities. In addition, oversized vehicle infractions would be a lower priority when compared to emergency calls. The reassigning of POEs from the day shift to the night to cover increased enforcement hours would result in a service level cut for daytime parking enforcement.

Option III (Alternate Proposal)

Another proposal is the enforcement of the ordinance through a complaint driven process. Complaints could be submitted using the same website used to purchase oversized vehicle permits. Existing staff could be utilized to respond to complaints until a determination could be made if additional staff would be required. The need for additional staff would be based on the level of complaints received by the City. The positives of this proposal are the ability to base the number of additional staff required for enforcement on the level of complaints submitted and a more focused response. This proposal would still require negotiation through the Meet and Confer process to change POEs working hours. If the Meet and Confer process was not successful, the responsibility of the enforcement of the program would fall to police officers who are already challenged with existing workloads.

Cost Recovery of Program

In the April 4, 2008 Memorandum to the City Council, staff states that they anticipate that the program will be cost neutral. Revenue collected from permit processing fees and parking citation fees are expected to offset the expenditure costs associated with implementing and enforcing the program. As noted earlier, we have not yet verified this presumption. Staff has indicated that they have taken a very conservative approach to estimating the revenue from citations. The citation revenue assumes that each team will issue an average of 40 cites per shift. *As stated above, the estimated revenue assumes that the teams will issue cites for all parking violations discovered, not just oversized vehicle infractions and the increase in parking enforcement hours.*

If the ordinance is approved, the City should see an increase in revenue due to oversized vehicle infractions and an increase in service hours if additional staff is hired. However, it is important to note that the fees collected from parking citations in the last two fiscal years has indicated a slow down. The following table shows the budgeted revenue compared to the actual revenue collected for fiscal years 2007 and 2008:

Fiscal Year	Budgeted Revenue*	Actual Revenue**
2007	\$18,553,901	\$18,057,615
2008	\$19,417,599	\$16,558,210

*Includes only parking citation revenue accounts

**Unaudited figures

The decrease in revenue is believed to be attributed to vacancies in the department and increased compliance from the public with parking laws resulting in fewer citations being

issued. If parking revenues continue to decrease, the City's General Fund could be significantly impacted and the full cost recovery for the additional staff hired under the Mayor's enforcement proposal is questionable.

CONCLUSION

The two proposals presented to the City Council on Monday, September 15 will start to address problems associated with the parking of Oversized, Non-Motorized, and Recreational Vehicles in the City if properly implemented. If the City Council chooses to move forward with approving one of the Mayor's proposals the IBA recommends the following:

1. Request staff to return to the City Council within thirty days with the necessary expenditure amount, funding source, and timeline to implement the program. The proposed funding source should not come from the City's reserves.
2. Request staff to return to the City Council at a later date with a fiscal and operational review of the alternative enforcement proposals presented by the IBA. In addition, more information should be provided on the policy and service impacts of expanding the City's parking enforcement program to 24 hours.

[SIGNED]

Jeffrey Sturak
Fiscal & Policy Analyst

[SIGNED]

APPROVED: Andrea Tevlin
Independent Budget Analyst