

Item 23-1251: Resolution #11-R-23 Overnight Parking

Common Council

Wed, May 15, 2024, 7:00PM

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 18:04

We have no public hearings on our agenda this evening and no special resolutions so that means we come to the time to establish the order of the day. Would anyone like to request a separate vote on any items? Alder Hartzheim.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 18:20

Thank you chair. On the utilities committee in number 24-0586 the Badger Meter for leak monitoring system.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 18:29

Under Utilities. Thank you. Alder Siebers.

Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 18:36

Thank you, Your Honor. Municipal services overnight parking 23-1251.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 18:45

Thank you. Alder Schultz.

Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 18:53

Thank you, Chair. I'd like to refer back for municipal services 23-1251 the resolution to overnight parking.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 19:01

So the resolution for overnight parking. Alder Schultz is requesting that that be referred back.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 19:12

And Alder Fenton has objected. It also looks like Alder Croatt is trying to get my attention. Are you able to hear us?

Aldersperson Chris Croatt (District 14) 19:23

Yes, I can hear you. I was just going to ask Alder Schultz to give a reason for the refer back.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 19:28

Alder Schultz, would you like to give a reason for the refer back?

Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 19:31

Certainly. I think—I watched the committee meeting video several times over, and I think of all the individuals on Council right now that could move an issue with the community forward, I think Alder Siebers is the one and he proposed an amendment to try and address this overnight parking issue which is a consistent issue for years. It was referred to staff. Staff came back with what I thought was a pretty reasonable solution, and there was a lot of discussion at committee. I don't—I don't take that lightly, and there was a lot of exchange, but it did—it was held at committee for four months. And I think there were some things that were lost or maybe not discussed at committee. So I'd like to see some more discussion.

Alderson Alex Schultz (District 9) 20:22

I didn't hear any discussion about the impact, pro or con, for short term rental housing, what an overnight parking solution could mean for the upwards of 200 short term rental units in this community. It could be a positive benefit for them. I didn't hear any conversations about what it means for college students who spend their summers in Appleton and have a need to figure out where they're going to park. So it just felt like there were some topic points that weren't covered. There was a lot of conversation about potential costs, but the truth is the issue exists. Overnight parking happens—

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 21:03

So you feel—I'm just going to interrupt you. You feel that the discussion was incomplete.

Alderson Alex Schultz (District 9) 21:08

I feel like there could be a little bit further discussion, and I feel like we're just going to kick the can if we don't figure it out. Everyone on that committee said—

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 21:15

Okay. I guess, we're going to have to vote on this, but I just—we just need a brief explanation. We can't have a debate about that right now. Thank you.

Alderson Alex Schultz (District 9) 21:23

I was asked the question why, so I'm just trying to answer that question.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 21:26

Okay. So now we would have a vote on whether or not to refer the item back, Attorney Behrens, is that correct?

Attorney Christopher Behrens 21:32

Correct. So based on the rule, and the number in attendance tonight, it's going to require two thirds vote, which is eight. An aye vote would sustain the objection, keeping it here. A nay vote would refer the item back.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 21:49

All right. Any questions on how we're going to vote here? All right, hearing none, we'll go ahead and vote. Oh, okay. So we'll hand—actually I'm just going to ask to read the roll because I'm not used to deciphering voices. So if we could just take a roll call vote, I would appreciate that.

[A roll call vote was taken, but not all voices were picked up by the microphone.]

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 23:17

Alright, so the refer back fails. And what was the number on that? Right elev—how many are there? 1 2 3

Clerk Kami Lynch 23:26

Nine.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 23:28

Nine?

Clerk Kami Lynch 23:28

Nine Ayes two nays.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 23:29

Nine eyes and two nays. So the refer back would fail. The item will remain here and separated. Are there any other items that would—people would like separated for discussion?

[Cut]

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 27:12

And our other item from municipal services is going to be 23-1251. The resolution 11-R-23 for overnight parking. We have a motion. Do we have a second? We have a motion and a second to approve.

Aldersperson Denise Fenton (District 6) 27:34

Point of order, Chair.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 27:36

Alder Fenton.

Aldersperson Denise Fenton (District 6) 27:37

The resolution came from committee with a recommendation for denial. So my motion for there was to—

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 27:48

Approve the denial. Yes. So if everyone understands, the motion is to approve the denial that came from committee. All right. We do have some people in the queue. Alder Siebers.

Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 28:02

Thank you, Chair. I separated this item out not because I wanted to have one more opportunity to debate my question, yet I feel there's one important thing that I want to convey to the Council. When we submit a resolution sometimes the outcome is not what we had hoped for, and the mistake we often make is that after the defeat of the resolution, we walk away from the issue a resolution tries to address. However, the important thing we must not do is walk away from the lessons we hopefully have learned from the discussion we have had. And with those lessons, we must move forward to the next opportunity given to us, once again attempting to address our issue we deem important to resolve.

Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 28:56

The vast majority of those who participated in discussions on this resolution agreed that there is a problem, and how to address it is the question we can't agree on. But we know the problem is not going to go away, and at some point in time we'll need to discuss it again. Hopefully when that time comes, we will remember the lessons learned. I just want to thank everybody for the discussion that we have had. I think we've—I don't know if we've thoroughly discussed it, but we sure have discussed it a lot, and I think we need to move forward.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 29:38

Thank you. Next is Alder Schultz.

Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 29:45

Thank you, Chair. I have a question for Attorney Behrens and then a comment after. Attorney Behrens, could you just clarify what happens if we take the vote and if the motion is approved to deny, when is our next opportunity to discuss this? What would that look like?

Attorney Christopher Behrens 30:01

Based on the Council's rule, you have the one-year rule—the Council year. So you'd have to wait a full Council year to take up a substantially related item. What is substantially related comes down to the call of the chair if a resolution would be introduced prior to a year to make that determination. Of course, if the Council doesn't agree with the chair's ruling, there's always the opportunity to object, but once action is taken it's one Council year. So you'd be looking at next April when a new Council seated that it could be taken up again.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 30:37

Does that answer your question?

Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 30:38

That was the question, and then my comment is understanding that—yeah, again, I think everyone on committee agreed that there's an issue that needs to be worked on, figured out what the solution is. No one said it's not an issue. Currently we do have overnight parking on streets. Most of it is illegal. Some of it is legal when people call it in or register through the website, and you can do that seven days out of a month. Some people do that; some don't.

Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 31:08

With that system, people can call in cars on both sides of the street, and it could be that if a rental property has seven guests and seven cars, they could be on both sides of the street. That doesn't bode well for a street sweeper has to come through that neighborhood. I feel like staff did a lot of work to try and come to a solution, and I guess I I'm just—I'm a little frustrated that we all identify a problem. We all recognize it as a problem. But we just in the end threw up our hands because we couldn't come to a consensus or figure out what the solution is. Why are we not fixing the problem?

Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 31:46

It's the job of this body to fix problems. But we're gonna sit here tonight, and we're gonna vote because we can't figure out what the solution is. We can't continue to work with staff to figure out the solution. We're just going to kick it down for a year.

Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 31:58

That doesn't—I don't feel like I'm doing my job if that's what I'm going to do. I would rather fix the problem. That's why we're here. We—and we all recognize that it's a problem. It's been a problem. This guy's been on the Council for many years. He's seen this for many years. He knows it's a problem. That's why he brought it forward. It's something that needs to get fixed or addressed. Now we can just do what we do now. We don't have to—there's no enforcement as it stands, or I should say, no—there's little enforcement. Certainly people do get tickets, but very infrequent. There's probably very little enforcement of acting or enticing our citizens to register their vehicles overnight, particularly if they're just visiting. I had an incident two years ago where a family on my block had seven people—seven cars come in for a Thanksgiving visit. Thursday—or Friday morning after Thanksgiving, there were seven tickets on their cars. I am sure no one said "Hey, we better call our cars in tonight," because they were there for one night to celebrate Thanksgiving.

Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 33:00

I think these things happen. And it's going to continue to happen. And we should find a resolution. And particularly if we have cars parking on both sides of the street, legally or not, if we institute a system where people begin to understand that it's an even odd, maybe we'll alleviate some of the congestion or issues with our street sweeping system. So I'm frustrated that we all recognize it's a problem, and we're not going to come

to a—or figure out what the solution is. So I'm going to vote to not support the recommendation from committee. Thank you.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 33:38

Alder Fenton.

Aldersperson Denise Fenton (District 6) 33:41

Thank you, chair. Alder Siebers said a lot of what I had planned to say. And I again thank Alder Siebers for bringing this forward because we all recognize that this is a problem particularly in our near downtown neighborhoods. We tried to come up—we realized that the cost coming back from staff was prohibitive to address this in this budget cycle. So we worked on an amended version that would be a compromise, a trial—a trial period of a year. But staff came back to us after some discussion—we, Alder Siebers and I worked with staff on this—listing the enforcement issue as the stumbling block to doing this. We believed that we could get past the street, the sanitation, the street sweeping issue. We believed we could get past some of the other issues—signage for minimal expense. So I believe the committee based on what's the information that staff came back with us, after this has been going back and forth in many discussions and for several months, agreed that—I'm not using Alder Siebers exact words, but—we need to step back and regroup and come up with a better solution to this.

Aldersperson Denise Fenton (District 6) 35:22

So I'm in hopes that understanding the reconsideration rule that we won't necessarily come back with the same resolution, but I intend for us to come back with some sort of proposal to at least look at the problem and try to come up with a way to handle it. We're not dropping it. We're not We're not abandoning it. We're not saying it's not a problem. But the reason that I objected to the referral is I think that everything that has been done for the resolution in this form in committee has been done. And I don't think it behooves us to spend any more time on it in this form. I think we should regroup and figure out a better approach. Thank you.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 36:13

Thank you. Alder Hartzheim.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 36:16

Thank you, Chair. Yes, we all agree that this is a problem that needs to be addressed. But it's not an easy problem, which means that there's not an easy solution. And just because we all didn't concur with what came forward, doesn't mean that we threw up our hands and aren't coming up with a solution or ignoring this problem. My suggestion all along had been, can we create some sort of task force within the city that would delve deeper into this problem, which I believe is what Alder Fenton was also kind of alluding to. We need to delve deeper into the problem than what we already did in the numerous committee meetings that this was taken up at.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 36:58

So I understand the frustration that Alder Schultz is talking about, but I don't believe that we have not—that we have shirked our duties here in this chambers or that that committee or anyone on our staff has shirked their duties in trying to come up with a solution. Just because the solution wasn't a rubber stamp on that resolution doesn't mean we have worked on it or that we won't continue to work on it. I intend to vote yes to uphold the denial of this resolution, but I too understand that there's an issue and we'll continue to talk about this potential task force issue. Thank you.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 37:38

Thank you. Alder Meltzer.

Alderson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 37:40

Thank you. I disagree with the way that the discussion has been characterized. I actually—I don't think a lack of consensus was a stumbling block or an obstacle for this issue. I think that we all had a great deal of consensus around the fact that the current system is not effective because of lack of enforcement, and implementing a new system, likewise, would be doomed to failure unless we have that enforcement piece. We are here to do our jobs, but we can only do our jobs within the resource constraints that we're given.

Alderson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 38:16

With discussion about the one-year rule and when this could come back, I think that that timing would be good, because once the parking utility has more money in it then we do have the resources to address the obstacles that were preventing us from moving forward. I think that we had some very, very good discussions, and we identified some very, very valid possible solutions that we can explore. We can only explore those when we have the resources to create the environment that would make that exploration successful. So I think that denying this resolution at this time and coming back a year from now, when the budgetary situation regarding the parking utility will be different—I think that is prudent.

Alderson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 39:03

And you know, we are here to do our jobs, but we're not here to bleed away our energy against a brick wall while we do our jobs. If there's a brick wall that's likely going to start crumbling a year from now, then it's our jobs to make sure that we keep this conversation alive but that we honor the proper timing so that we have the appropriate resources available when we do try to implement solutions. Because if we went from the status quo to something new but weren't able to properly educate and enforce, then we really haven't actually addressed the problem that we all agree on. Thank you.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 39:48

Thank you. Alder Wolff.

Alderson Nate Wolff (District 12) 39:52

Thank you, chair. I think that we've had a really great conversations on this this year. I've liked the way that's gone. Most of what I was going to say has been set by different colleagues. One thing that hasn't been touched on is I would like to thank the Director, Danni Block, and staff for working with us and answering any questions we've had and they going through this process with us to try to find a solution and giving us some answers on how we can get there. I do think we can get there, and we know the path we have to take to get there. It's a tough project to tackle, but I think we're gonna get there eventually.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 40:44

Thank you. Alder Firkus.

Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 40:47

Thank you, Chair. First, could I ask for the vote to be notwithstanding?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 40:50

Sure.

Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 40:52

Beyond that, at committee we ended this item, the discussion on this item, with a call the question and then vote. At that point, I was in the queue, I guess you could say, and there was—and I wasn't planning on doing this tonight, but the way this discussion's going I at least want to throw it out there. I had want to amend the amendment to remove reference to it being a trial and see how that went. I had made some arguments about I would rather fail forward. I also made arguments against it that our enforcement capacity is a struggle for any set of rules. But as I've thought about it, that argument could cut the other way too. I do believe that alternate side parking probably solves more problems than it creates, especially with the way this amendment that was offered at committee was presented. So if it would be okay, I'd like to offer an amendment which would effectively be that amendment minus some of the tribal language. I can state it if you wish.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 41:54

So Alder Firkus has offered an amendment to remove the language about the amen—it was in the amendment.

Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 42:01

The amendment did not pass. So my understanding is it is not part of the item that we ultimately denied because we never—we did not succeed in amending the item at committee.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 42:12

If what I'm understanding is you would like to amend this item similar to the wording that was—

Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 42:19

Yes, I can offer—basically would be the first part would change. That's instead of saying that "the city of Appleton will initiate a trial program," it would just say "the city of Appleton will initiate a program allowing alternate side" so on so forth. And then the "be it further resolved" with would be changed to say "be it further resolved that the COA DPW will provide an evaluation of the program to municipal services committee and Common Council" and instead of "for one year after implementation" it would just be "on an ongoing basis."

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 42:19

—offered in committee without the trial.

Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 42:19

Yeah, I mean, I can I can—

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 42:55

So we have a motion from Alder Firkus, and we had—the second is moving. We do have a second, we'll just say. So discussion on that amendment. We're gonna have to clear the queue. All right. Alder Alfheim.

Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 43:16

If I can ask a question of Director Block. Um Director Block, would you please remind us of the approximate cost of implementing the program?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 43:26

Director Block?

Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 43:28

As amended.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 43:31

As amended. The costs would be associated with that additional enforcement. So two full-time parking enforcement positions to cover the overnight hours seven days per week, estimated annual personnel costs approximately \$165,000. And then an additional parking enforcement vehicle for that those two positions \$30,000 plus an annual costs—fuel, maintenance, insurance, etc. We believed that the intent was we would just extend our street sweeping rotation, and so there would not be any additional costs related to the street sweeping.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 44:26

Thank you. If I may?

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 44:27

Go ahead.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 44:30

I live in a downtown neighborhood that parking is an issue. So this is an important topic to me. I appreciate the amendment to want to move forward. My hesitation continues to be: that's a big number. It's a big—we argue about \$5,000 for hours, and we're just, just like that, gonna throw \$200,000 on the budget. I'm not prepared to do that. And I think that is part of doing our job.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 45:00

So I like the fact that coming out of all of these meetings (and there have been many meetings) we have finally gotten to the point where we accept that a problem exists, and I think that's fair. I'm glad we have that. And coming out of the last meeting, we have made it clear that we want to continue this conversation. I like the idea of this not being a trial—of us just doing it. But I also like the idea of having the positive revenue flow coming to the parking utility before we do it. Otherwise, what's going to give? We don't know that answer, and I'm not prepared to say, "Let's take it out of your budget or your budget or your budget." So with that being said, I accept the fact that we can't solve this today, but we are going to solve it soon. Based on that, I would vote down the amendment and the resolution.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 45:53

Thank you. Alder Schultz.

Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 45:56

Thank you, chair. We have illegal overnight parking on the streets now, as I've said before. We also have an opportunity to make it legal if we care to call in/register. So that can happen with anybody who's parking on the street now. I'm struggling to understand why the enforcement issue and the costs associated with it is such a precarious thing to move this forward. Why is it that we have to have two personnel and another vehicle to enforce this one?

Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 46:27

I think we're creatures of habit. People who are parking in the driveways will likely continue parking in their driveways. People who are parking on the streets will likely continue parking on the street, whether it's legal or not. I don't foresee a sea change in parking habits. I foresee the ability of people who are struggling to find places to park their vehicles, whether it's their kids or guests, or they're running a short term rental—the ability to park on the street without risking a citation overnight and having to struggle with, you know, communicating to whoever it is that needs to register that vehicle with the city through the app.

Alderson Alex Schultz (District 9) 47:06

I just feel like there's a lot of fear about this flood of people parking on the streets, when, again, we're creatures of habit. The people that are parking in driveways are going to continue to do so. Yes, there may be a little shift, but I don't feel like suddenly our streets are going to be clogged with overnight parking. And so I guess I'm curious to know why—why we're in a position where staff believes we have to have two full time personnel and another vehicle to enforce this thing when it's already happening. It's already not enforced. Why can't we do this program?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 47:36

Is this a question of staff? I just want to make sure I understand.

Alderson Alex Schultz (District 9) 47:39

Yes, sure. I'll direct it to staff. Why is it that we feel we need two personnel and an additional vehicle to enforce this when we're not doing that right now and people are parking illegally?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 47:50

Director Block.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 47:52

Thank you, chair. Currently, the parking utility does not have any staff that work during these overnight hours to do this enforcement, and I believe the police face a similar struggle with staffing resources as well. So two was identified in order to cover the entire city and provide that enforcement of the restrictions that would be associated with this.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 48:18

If we have people who park and are not abiding by the alternate side, we're going to have major issues when it comes to the side that we want to be street sweeping or when it comes to coordinating our garbage collection routes. So that's why. I mean the program would likely not succeed without enforcement. It's one of the largest complaints right now too that I'm hearing is lack of enforcement.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 48:48

Alder Schultz.

Alderson Alex Schultz (District 9) 48:49

I'll wait. Thank you.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 48:53

Alder Hartzheim.

Alderson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 48:56

Thank you, Chair. I'd like to encourage my colleagues to deny this amendment. As Director Block just stated, enforcement already doesn't happen. So that's a step one that we've completely missed, and we're going to just turn a blind eye to. These expenses that were called out by Director Block also don't include what is brilliantly stated as "while difficult to quantify, staff does recognize that there will be an increase in administrative burden to manage citations, appeals, and invoicing related to this program." So even though it's a big price tag already, there's going to be an additional price tag that we can't even quantify at this point. Those are things that are too vague and broad for me to say "Yes, this is a great idea. Let's move forward with this."

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 49:56

I want to go back to the potential for a task force to talk about all of these things, and even brainstorm other ideas that we never came up with, such as working with Lawrence University for a parking permit program, or, I mean, there could be a million other ways that we could address this problem and not affect negatively our taxpayers just for some people to do what they illegally already do to do that, legally, I, again encourage us to deny this amendment. I think it's a valiant effort on the part of Aldersperson Firkus, but I don't believe that we have the capacity to move this forward at this time. Thank you.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 50:42

Thank you. I've been trying to wait to get into this discussion, but it seems like the queue is never ending. So I'm just going to jump in and say that I agree with Alder Hartzheim, and that wasn't also discussing the towing contract, which is something we'd have to get into. I've said from the beginning that I think once the parking utility starts to make some money, then we can take a look at what we do with enforcement. I know there's been talks about parking studies. There's been talks about studies for police officers and our staffing there. I don't think that—I think it was really reductive to say that we're throwing up our hands here. We're just disagreeing with moving forward with this unfunded situation. Next, I have Alder Firkus.

Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 51:29

Thank you, Chair. I feel like maybe I'm confused, but this might be others are confused as well. When we discuss this amendment or what this amendment is based off of that committee last Monday, explicitly there was said "we would not add personnel at this time." We will not do some of these other larger expenses that were delineate—that were delineated in some of the older memos. As far as headcount, as far as equipment purchases, that was not what was going to be on the table if that amendment would have been approved at Committee last week.

Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 52:03

What was on the table would have been the expense of the signs at the city entries. There would have been some follow-up potentially with a towing contract, yes. So I think as far as worrying about enforcement, worrying about the personnel, worrying about the equipment, I think we all kind of realize whether which way we argue about this that those are needs—not needs for this amend—for the conditions created by this amendment. Or if we make no substantial changes to the park overnight parking rules at this time, we are still in the same situation of—enforcement capacity is just not available at this time. Whether it's through the parking utility or through the police department, there just is not the capacity to fully do the job as well as everyone wants at this moment. And at some point, hopefully, in the near future, we will have the resources based off of projections for the parking utility.

Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 52:58

That being said, if we're going to say, hey, we're gonna have more capacity in the future, or we're expecting to have more capacity in the future to enforce the rules. And if there is—if my colleagues do have interest in changing the rules to alternate side parking, maybe this gives us the opportunity. And I use the words "fail forward" at committee. This gives us an opportunity to get the rules in place, take as much of a pro—more educational approach. And then once we have the—if the resources do bear fruit, at that point, after we've had a sustained period of being able to educate the community, take a more learning softer approach versus the more heavy handed approach of enforcement, then when we have the time or in the capacity to better enforce whatever the parking rules are at that time, we might be in a better spot to make this type of change be successful.

Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 53:55

So that would be—really my main argument is that if this if alternate side parking has any appeal to you, if any of my colleagues feel that this is something that could and should would work in the city, then maybe getting—that first step is going to be the hardest. I don't think we're going to solve parking in one fell swoop. I think it's going to be incremental. I think no matter what we're going to do, we're going to have to make changes, and we're probably gonna have to go back to the drawing board and make changes again and again until we work out all the kinks. And once we've worked all the kinks, who knows what's going to happen—some new technology, some new attitudes towards transportation, I don't know. We're always going to be changing it. But I think if my colleagues—again, if my colleagues feel that this is the direction we want to go long term, maybe we rip the band aid off now and fail forward if needed.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 54:47

Just to clarify, what I heard from the people who are talking about money wasn't that this is going to make us spend money but that the enforcement is the key component of that. That's what I was hearing. Folks we—yes?

Alderson Patrick Hayden (District 7) 55:02

Are we talking about the amendment? Or the amendment to the amendment?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 55:07

Well, the amendment is to just start it. So, essentially, it's pretty hard to limit the discussion when the discussion is to just start allowing overnight parking. We have a revolving door of alders, and I just want to make sure that we take into account everything that's been said here before we move further because we just keep going in circles with the same folks. So Alder Meltzer.

Alderson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 55:39

Thank you. I seconded this amendment. I think that following my colleague Alder Firkus' understanding I also was thinking that this was not adding expense. And I think the concept of failing forward—you know, lacking the enforcement piece is a problem for the status quo just as much as it would be a problem for the new the new system. And I think that, you know, taking an educational approach first, while we wait for resources to be available to increase enforcement, seems like an experimental thing that we can try. I know that there is a lot of desire from the constituents that I represent to see some kind of action taken. So I am willing to support this amendment. I do think that, obviously, ultimately, for the new system to succeed, we will need that enforcement piece. But I think that my colleague's argument is compelling that we can start being educational about it, and, you know, see how the increments that we can move forward with can be approached slowly. Thank you.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 56:53

Alder Fenton.

Alderson Denise Fenton (District 6) 56:58

I'm gonna with—I'm going to yield right now.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 57:00

Thank you. Alder Schultz.

Alderson Alex Schultz (District 9) 57:05

Thank you, chair. Just for the record, I wouldn't have supported the original resolution, and I also had issues with the trial period for the amendment that was offered at committee. So just for the record, neither of those would

satisfy what I was looking to do. I was more on the line of what Alder Firkus was attempting to do at committee and essentially rip that band aid off and just move forward without these associated costs that are basically the primary argument for not supporting this move forward. That's what I'm hearing right now, that the only hesitation by some of my colleagues is that we have a substantial cost to implement the program when what came out of committee was a motion, or at least the discussion to move forward without those costs and kind of see where we headed as we implemented the program.

Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 57:53

So I would encourage our colleagues to just let's get this done. Let's move forward. We'll take it as it goes. But I think it's going to alleviate some of the issues that we're having now. Certainly, there's going to be some parking on both sides of the street, and that's going to cause some issues, but we'll deal with it as it comes. I just—I don't feel like the sky is gonna fall if we move this forward, introduce it to the community and sort of take our take baby steps forward and essentially change the way we thinking about how we have to deal with congested parking in our community, which we all—I'm telling you, every morning, I wake up, there's dozens of cars parked in my neighborhood on the street. Why are they there? Out of necessity. People don't elect to do that because they feel like it. They like to do it because they have no other choice. Otherwise they could park on their lawns, which some do as well. So I think we fix it, and we figure out how to enforce it as we move forward.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 57:53

Alder Hartzheim.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 57:59

Thank you, chair. The amendment presented is not a baby step. It's a big giant, huge step. Do we want to fail as a city and tell the DNR that we can't do our street sweeping because we haven't educated properly our constituents about how to park on our streets? they already do not understand that you can call in seven times a year or whatever the number is. I don't even know; I'd have to look it up.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 59:26

Education is not free. And again, this is not a baby step. And it doesn't solve the problem all year long. So we coax people into believing that "Oh, all year long, I can just do odd even number parking." Now we have a problem with snow removal. This will avalanche into something bigger than we want it to be because we have not looked at—we have not really studied what's going to happen here. Again, I go back to we need a task force or something of that sort to really delve into what will occur here. Thank you.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:00:01

Alder Hayden.

Aldersperson Patrick Hayden (District 7) 1:00:02

Thank you Chair. I would like to echo what Alder Hartzheim has been saying. I'm seeing a lot of issues with this in my district where we don't have a lot of on the street parking. And what I've been seeing and what I've been hearing from my constituents consistently is a lot of businesses are using on—the street parking for their business parking, and it's becoming a lot of—it's becoming a problem in these neighborhoods outside of downtown. I do recognize that it—there is an issue when you get into the more dense neighborhoods where you're going to have multiple vehicles and nowhere to park. And there does need to be a solution to that. I like the idea of a taskforce so it can find a solution that is a multi-pronged solution instead of this one size fits all that is more of a solution for our dense parts of the city but causes more issues in the suburbs.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:00:58

Thank you. The queue is clear. So with that we will vote on the amendment which—Clerk Lynch, do you have something that we could just read through and clarify what the amendment would be?

Clerk Kami Lynch 1:01:20

So the amendment as—it's as noted in the municipal services committee minutes "that the city of Appleton will initiate a program allowing alternate side street parking on all streets within city limits except on streets where parking is only allowable on one side, areas with more restrictive parking limitations, and those where parking is not permitted at any time. Overnight street parking will remain prohibited during the winter months to facilitate snow removal. Snow emergency parking restrictions will remain applicable. DPW and parking utility will undertake additional measures to implement—" we'll remove the word trial—"to implement this, including providing signage, sufficient enforcement staffing within the parking utility, and altering street sweeping schedules to accommodate overnight parking while still remaining compliant with the Wisconsin DNR requirements for stormwater water quality. Be it further resolved that the city of Appleton DPW will provide an evaluation of the program to municipal services committee and Common Council after implementation on an ongoing basis."

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:02:24

All right, so—and I will—are you pointing for me, Alder Hartzheim? Oh, your microphone. Okay. Got it. Yes.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 1:02:39

Thank you chair. I would like to remind everyone in these chambers that for us to change the College Avenue striping it took us months, lots of talking to our constituents, lots of buy in from folks, lots of methodology that was a step-by-step approach. We are planning to cut the rope if we vote yes on this amendment. Thank you.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:03:07

And with that Alder Alfheim has snuck in. Alder Alfheim.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 1:03:11

I apologize. As the clerk read that, in the in the amendment, it talks about DPW is going to provide this this this and this, which doesn't come for free. There's a price tag. So I have an issue saying yes to this when the words are in it that say we're going to provide enforcement and all of those things. So I I'm gonna vote no for the amendment. I don't like that we're trying to smooch this through right now. I agree with my colleagues that this is a much—this is a great topic that needs more time so that we don't turn it into a mess.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:03:53

Thank you. I agree. That's why I wanted Alder—I'm sorry, Clerk Lynch to read the entire amendment. Because I was hearing that differently. Alder Smith.

Aldersperson Martyn Smith (District 4) 1:04:06

Yeah, I agree that this seems like a really big change just to start allowing street—on street parking. Am I correct in understanding that it's the—that in the winter, this would be kind of would go away so that there would be no street parking in the winter?

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:04:26

Director Block, did you want to talk about our rules in the winter for parking?

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 1:04:31

You are correct that overnight street park—on street parking in the winter would not be allowed. Correct.

Aldersperson Martyn Smith (District 4) 1:04:37

So people have to park all year round. So this—how does this it seems still seems like we have the same problem. It's just for half the year, and I guess I feel sympathetic to the idea that we need to come up with something that really works more holistically right off the bat then then then this that I—seems like a big change and with things that haven't been fully thought through.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:05:05

Thank you. And with that, I'm not going to test this again. Let's go ahead and vote on the amendment. An aye would approve the amendment, and a nay would defeat the amendment.

[Someone said something off microphone.]

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:05:16

Thats that's on the item, yes. It—was that clear? Just want to make sure. Okay

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:05:41

The amendment fails seven to five.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:05:44

And we are back on the item as was presented to us on the agenda. Any discussion? Alder Siebers.

Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:05:53

Thank you Chair. I just want to let Aldersperson Schultz know that me being blessed with retirement, I am going to take a suggestion—I don't think she made it as a suggestion, but I thought it was a suggestion. It was a good suggestion. I made the statement to our public works director as well as to others that seven out of 10 communities our size have on street parking. I don't know how they do it. I thought that maybe we should find out. So I'm going to take alder—Director Block said she'd be interested in what their parking utility is like. So I'm going to do a little traveling in the next few months to find out what other cities' parking utility is like. And who knows, I may come back with a resolution changing the parking utility in the city of Appleton. But I just want you to know that I'm going to go forward in finding out what other communities are doing.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:07:03

All right. Detective Siebers is on the case. Alder Hartzheim.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 1:07:09

Thank you chair just two words: Task Force. Thank you.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:07:14

You could even make it one if you wanted to

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 1:07:16

Taskforce

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:07:17

Put them together.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 1:07:18

Taskforce.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:07:19

All right, the queue is clear. So with that we'll go ahead and vote. Cast your votes on the item notwithstanding meaning that an aye would approve overnight parking and a nay would defeat. The item fails eight to four.