



# Allentown

435 Hamilton Street  
Allentown, Pa. 18101

## Minutes - Final

### City Council

---

Wednesday, June 5, 2024

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

---

#### Committee of the Whole - Parking

#### Roll Call

**Present:** 7 - Cynthia Mota, Daryl Hendricks, Ed Zucal, Natalie Santos, Ce-Ce Gerlach, Candida Affa, and Santo Napoli

[15-6848](#)

Bill 40  
Fine Increases

**Sponsors:** Hendricks and Napoli

**Attachments:**

[Bill 40 Parking Violations](#)

[Parking Authority Exhibit A 2](#)

[Attach A Violation Rate Change Proposal](#)

[Fine Proposal Letter to Council 4-3-2024](#)

[Fine Comparison Line Chart](#)

[Violation Comparison](#)

[Stopping, Standing and Parking - Code](#)

[COA - APA Report - Final v2](#)

[Exhibit C](#)

[Exhibit D](#)

[LVJI Parking Enforcement Patterns in ABE 1.9.24](#)

[Justice Institute](#)

[Exhibit E - APA Advisory Comm](#)

[Ordinance #16019](#)

Ms. Cynthia Mota asked if they have anyone from the Parking Authority.

Mr. Jon Haney stated so here we are again. He stated that he is not sure what more that he can add to this. They kind of covered this at length at the last meeting before it was tabled. Other than to point out, he believes everyone received the parking study that Mr. Zucal had requested. The only thing that he would add in if they read through the study, one of the recommendations in it that is very hard to miss was that the study recommends that they raise their fines to match the regional neighbors and counterparts which is exactly what the proposal Bill 40 does. He asked if

there were any other questions or anything else he could answer for anyone.

Ms. Cynthia Mota asked if there were any comments from the dais.

Mr. Ed Zucal stated that he thinks that his comment would be for the administration.

Mr. Jon Haney stated understood.

Ms. Ce Ce Gerlach stated that she has a question. She asked if they know in the last six years how many new properties has the Parking Authority acquired. If six years doesn't work, just the last couple of years.

Mr. Jon Haney stated for him to think off the top of his head and asked Ms. Gerlach if she is speaking in terms of a parking structure or just property in general.

Ms. Ce Ce Gerlach stated property in general. Things that now the Parking Authority has to pay for. Maybe is in debt for.

Mr. Jon Haney stated that is around six to the best of his recollection.

Ms. Ce Ce Gerlach asked Mr. Haney would he say because she is trying to understand because when she is in debt, she knows that she is in debt. Even if something happens to exacerbates that knowledge like she loses a job or some type of family emergency happens. It makes her debt situation worse, but she knew she was in debt before that debt happens. She asked Mr. Haney when would he say and she knows that he hasn't been the top guy the whole time, but when would they say that the Parking Authority saw the writing on the wall. Like, they were not exactly in a strong fiscal stance.

Mr. Jon Haney stated that he doesn't know of one particular date he can give her, but it certainly would have been in the probably second to third quarter of 2023.

Ms. Ce Ce Gerlach stated that everything was gravy until then.

Mr. Jon Haney stated correct.

Ms. Ce Ce Gerlach stated that is when the changes happened with.

Mr. Jon Haney stated that referring back to the Parking Study that was submitted for everyone. It makes it quite clear when that happened. It was the decision to eliminate overnight enforcement. That was the main cause

listed by the study for the downturn in the financial status of the Parking Authority.

Ms. Ce Ce Gerlach stated that she guess her question is some of those changes, and the Parking Authority agreed to make those changes. The recommendations were made by the Parking Authority. She asked if there were any fiscal planning when those changes were made to kind of anticipate, if they do this at the will of the people and Council, what fiscal impact that might have.

Mr. Jon Haney stated so certainly, they did their best to keep expenses on only what is necessary. There were some staffing moves that were made to try to reduce that expense. The overall impact of that move was such that it could not be overcome with those types of maneuvers. It is roughly \$2 million and is hard to overcome with expenses and those kinds of changes. He stated that it sounds like he is echoing everywhere and he is trying to speak a little softer.

Ms. Ce Ce Gerlach stated that he is not echoing on her end. She stated that the changes that were made, they were made for a reason. It was determined by a collective group of people, the public, and the Parking Authority and the board. At that time, there were three members that were here and were there on the board that these changes needed to be made. She guesses that she is just thinking if the Parking Authority agreed to make the changes, knowing there would be a fiscal impact, why weren't the changes made before, gradually so instead of all at once. Why wouldn't it be more preparation fiscally. Maybe not buy another building, but take over a parking lot after the changes were made.

Mr. Jon Haney stated ok and to tie back to Ms. Gerlach's initial question she asked about a number of properties. He should probably put that in some perspective for her. A number of those were very small properties that were acquired and converted into lots, namely the 7A lot located at 7th and Allen. That was a three or four parcel property that is now a functioning surface lot. There was another small property on 718 Walnut that was acquired in preparation for a deck construction there that ultimately pivoted from that location to now the Maple Street deck where those properties were then were converted in what it is now today the deck. The last property would have been the 940 Linden deck which on its face, that purchase, the lease agreements there paid themselves. It wasn't a debt incurring transaction there. Where as the other ones were. He stated that hopefully that puts it in a little bit more perspective for you.

Ms. Ce Ce Gerlach thanked Mr. Haney.

Mr. Santo Napoli stated that he thinks to add from a board perspective and with full transparency, he sits on the board along Mr. Hendricks. The only acquisition that was made after they realized about the deficient was the parking deck at 940 Linden Street. The Maple Street had already been under construction and once the board realized the deficits were occurring, the only acquisition made since that point was 940 Linden. The next question is, so why did you buy it. Well, for starters, it was an amazing opportunity to pick up parking at a very low price. They go by purse bakes and compares to other cities, they picked up the 940 Linden Street at \$11,000 a space. He stated that their neighbors in Bethlehem are building a new parking deck now at \$45,000 per space. They could have not purchased it, but then the next deck that would have been constructed would have been constructed at four times the cost and which would exacerbate the issues even more. The other point he would like to make is, the board doesn't authorize decks to be built just to be built. They put thought into it. It is to meet the demand of economic development in the neighborhood. They look at why 940 Linden. They see the development that is occurring there. Whether it is the new hotel, whether it is a music hall, and there a bunch of other projects that are in the works that are still not public in that area and the Parking Authority knows that they have to meet the needs of that development or the development doesn't come. His example and have said this before, and said it last time, the community deck behind his store the first couple of years he parked there. He parked on the second floor. Nothing was around him, but over the next four or five years all that development came. Tower 6, apartments, and now he is on the sixth floor, but the difference is if that deck was only built for two floors, then other stuff doesn't come. Projects brings tax revenue for our city and school district. They bring jobs. It is to meet the needs of development and that is what the Parking Authority is task at doing. They have also seen opportunities with 940 Linden for residential parking. The board has been kicking around ideas and offering discounted parking to the neighborhoods around that deck to help with the issues of on-street parking. That is an opportunity to really work with our residents and our community to give them a place if someone has a third car, let's give them a better rate and get them in the parking deck. That is an opportunity that will be a really interesting when they decide to get that going. To Mr. Haney's point, that parking deck isn't costing the Parking Authority money. There is a contract with PPL that goes to the end of the year. It is not adding to any issues at all from a deficit standpoint.

Mr. Ed Zucal stated that he would just make this comment. The purpose of raising these fines is not so much for the parking decks. It is more for the people that are parking on the streets. He asked is that fair enough to say.

Mr. Jon Haney stated yes. By and large.

Mr. Ed Zucal stated as mentioned, most families have and years along people were lucky if they had one car per family. People have four on up. This is in a way of kind of punishing them because there really is limited spaces to park and most people don't have a parking deck to park in. He knows that they are contemplating getting a new director at some point.

Mr. Jon Haney stated that the board is currently looking at it.

Mr. Ed Zucal stated that he would like to recommend at some point when everyone has had their say to still table this in committee. Rather than vote it down or have it not pass and perhaps come up with a different plan rather than put the burden on the people that are following the rules. He stated that is just his thoughts.

Ms. Cynthia Mota asked if there were any comments.

Ms. Candida Affa stated that she understands that residential areas are, but this is what the Parking Authority is trying to do is to have more lots in the residential areas. She stated that Mr. Spang brought it up at last meeting that for people to have a lot there. This is what the Parking Authority is working for to try to alleviate that problem. As far as the fine itself, a city our size that it is \$10 if you park there all day long. She asked what about our merchants? What about going to Mr. Napoli's shop? There is no parking because somebody decided that they are going to have dinner. They are going to go to PPL. They are going to do this and it is a well known fact because she was on the Parking Authority that many lawyers from Philadelphia in our federal building will park on the street rather than in the lot and they write a \$10 check. It is a deterrent along with other things. She thinks that the Parking Authority buying up properties and putting surface lots in its going to alleviate some of those problems, but she still believes that a \$10 fine is not a deterrent for anybody to want to park on the street all day long.

Mr. Jon Haney stated to Ms. Affa, you are absolutely correct and it is kind of and find themselves in a catch 22. He stated to her point and to borrow off of what Mr. Napoli mentioned, the Parking Authority is here to meet the needs of all of Allentown. Granted in the past several years a lot of the focus has to keep up with the big development going on downtown. That doesn't mean that they lost sight of the neighborhoods or was recently was able to work with the redevelopment authority and acquire a property in the ward. In the first district which is the first step in developing some off street parking there to help alleviate the parking in that neighborhood. There are several other areas that are of interest to us and here is where the catch 22 comes in. He stated that he doesn't have revenue. He is operating at a

loss right now. Part of that is because the fines are antiquated and well behind the years. They mentioned the last time they were here it has been 20 plus years since these things were adjusted in any kind of meaningful way. They have a study that was paid for in part by Council and the administration to ask an outside entity to take a look at this and give them recommendations on what they should do given their circumstance. That recommendation as it pertains to this is you are way too low. You are nowhere where you should be and you need to raise your fines to at least to the levels where your regional neighbors are. That revenue is what would allow him to further develop off street parking. It is one thing to buy a lot, but you have to develop it. The Phase work that goes into it. The paving of it. The striping. Putting in lights. Gated equipment if it is needed. That are takes revenue to do and if they don't have that revenue, they are spinning their wheels and not able to meet that need. The acquisition of the 940 deck, he thinks positions the authority in a very good spot to continue to meet the ongoing downtown development without a further need for more deck parking downtown. That would allow them to shift their focus into looking into the neighborhoods where it is desperately needed. Their own data shows that what few neighborhood lots they have are packed full and there is a waiting list to get on those. That tells you that we need that. He stated that he understands what Mr. Zucal is saying. There is a lack of parking availability and that does put people in a tough spot. He suggested that they raise the fines. Those that would violate the parking, that revenue is what will go back to helping them create more parking so they won't have to do that. It gives them more options to comply which is what we are looking for. If they don't do it, he can't meet that need. They have to do it so they can position the Authority so they can step beyond what they have been focused on downtown and start assisting the neighborhoods in the area if they can with providing that off street parking.

Mr. Ed Zucal stated to Mr. Haney you said by raising the rates you will be able to focus on creating more parking lots. He asked wouldn't that increase your debt more.

Mr. Jon Haney stated absolutely. He stated that the debt for the surface lots are tremendously lower than what the parking deck is. As Mr. Napoli mentioned, \$45,000 a parking space. He stated that it is not what it costs for a surface lot. It's far lower.

Mr. Ed Zucal asked Mr. Haney what is his perceived income from that.

Mr. Jon Haney stated that it will depend on the property.

Mr. Ed Zucal asked Mr. Haney what is his perceived income from that.

Mr. Jon Haney stated that it can depend on the property that he can acquire and what kind of spaces it can provide. By and large on what they have seen over time, surface lot parking is not tremendously a return on investment as far as time. When they are able to do that. You are looking at on depending on how it is priced and what it is anywhere from a 20 - 30 year return on investment for the Parking Authority. For a surface lot, you are looking at anywhere from \$50,000 - \$200,000 versus \$45 - \$50 million. The increase in revenue that would be generated from this put us in that realm. Where they can do those kinds of things and to address some of the overcrowded parking in our neighborhoods. He stated without it, he cant' do anything.

Mr. Daryl Hendricks stated that as a member of the board of the Parking Authority, what Ce Ce had mentioned one of the lots they purchased was a direct response to the double parking violations occurring on Seventh Street. That was purchased on the 600 Block of N. Seventh Street. There was a safety problem with cars double parked and now a lot of those vehicles that would be double parked can now park on the surface lot. Any decisions they made on purchasing lots and/or the deck were made by the full board with absolute consideration of what the financial situation is going to be and they take it into serious consideration. He strongly recommend that his colleagues vote for this. It is necessary as Mr. Haney said. It has been 20 years since they have increased these. He stated that he sees it all the time around city hall. You have everybody in court parking illegally. They get a \$10 ticket and they will gladly pay that rather than paying at a meter or the parking deck for the hours that would have cost them far more.

Mr. Ed Zucal stated that he knows that everyone has said so far around the courthouse and the things that people are taking advantage of. He stated that he knows that Ms. Gerlach had asked for a parking meter study. He asked is it possible to geographically increase the fines. Everyone is saying that the issue is in Center City.

Mr. Jon Haney asked one area versus another.

Mr. Ed Zucal stated that is what they are saying. The issue seems to be in one area.

Mr. Daryl Hendricks stated that he is not saying that. There are issues citywide. That is just one that he pointed out that is very glaring. He stated that they all drive around and see it on a daily basis.

Ms. Ce Ce Gerlach stated if she could jump in. That would address one of the concerns that there are meters. They acknowledged this and all acknowledged it. There are meters, where there should not be meters.

She stated that she just got a \$10 ticket the other day on her block. She lives on a residential block. The meter doesn't work and she is not putting her credit card information in there in that mobile thing. If it was able to be geographic and get like a Hamilton Street thing in the business district. It would have to be in accordance with the new zone Allentown. She noticed that her neighborhood is zoned residential which is great.

Mr. Jon Haney stated here we go again. They are back to the same catch 22. He is all in favor of doing the meter study. He has to be able to pay for it. He stated that he is operating at a deficit. He can't pay for that to get it done and it ties into what they already been discussing. Allentown has changed greatly in the past several years. Those meters were laid out and he is not even sure when. As they are taking a look at some of these things that haven't been adjusted over some time, decades. The meters are probably in the same boat. It is probably time to start doing those things. It is just unfortunate that the Parking Authority by law is only permitted to generate revenues off of a small handful of item. One of which is enforcement fines. The board has taken some action for what's underneath their control with some parking permits, with transient rates in the decks. He thinks these adjustment they have made to try to address this issue, but the issue is too great. The fine increase will definitely help.

Mr. Santo Napoli stated to address some of the concerns that were brought up. The first thing that the board did was raise rates in the decks. He stated that their first goal was not to hit the neighborhoods. They raised contract parking in the decks. They raised transient rates in the decks. That still wasn't enough to move the meter. They tried everything else and really did have a vote on nighttime enforcement. As the board, they didn't have enough consensus there and that's why they didn't go back to nighttime. He stated that he voted against it. He stated that he prefers not to. It comes back to people always ask him why are you for this. This will actually negatively impact him. His customers will be impacted by a fine increase with higher tickets on Hamilton Street, but it is the right thing to do. He thinks that the conversation always ends up with downtown. Whatever they are talking about, it is always downtown. The Parking Authority gets, averages about 1,800 phone calls a month for calls for service. There are so many folks throughout the city that block driveways, that block garages, block alleys, and they are calling the Parking Authority for help. The reason they are calling is, it is \$15 when you block someone's driveway. Some people think it is only \$15, it's ok and if that fine goes up to \$35 or \$40 for a driveway. He stated that he forgets what the numbers are for driveways. They get a little bit more for driveways because it is such a hot button issue with residents. They looked at every fine and compared them to every city and said listen, this is what is happening in 2024. He stated that they did the same thing for them. Let's have an honest conversation. He stated



Council said their salary was woefully behind. Five colleagues stated hey, let's compare to other cities and did the exact same thing that the Parks Authority did and had that addressed. It is just about catching up with things. It is time again, to make these fines match what's going on in today's world. The Parking Authority can't function with a salary based on 2003 or 2002 and with 2024 expenses. It is impossible. The economics is upside down and if they don't do something as a Council, they are setting these folks up for failure. And, failure to some might be a good thing. To the majority of the city, it would be a bad thing because they rely on the Parking Authority. It is nothing against the APD, but they are busy elsewhere. When folks have issues, they need someone who is going to respond. The Parking Authority needs that service. He stated 1,800 service calls a month doesn't lie. It is very important to the residents of our community.

Ms. Cynthia Mota thanked Mr. Napoli.

Ms. Candida Affa stated that she has a suggestion. With Ms. Gerlach and Mr. Zucal, she agrees with them with the parking meters. One thing she disagrees with is that you can't pick and choose what sections of town they are going to. She stated that her suggestion is raise it to the 10 and then they will have some money to do a study on where they can take some of the parking meters away from the residential areas. In time, they need that study. They need money for the study. Her suggestion is raise the prices, see if they can get more surface lots built and then they can do a study on possibly taking some of the meters away from residential areas. She stated that is just her suggestion.

Ms. Cynthia Mota stated Ms. Gerlach.

Ms. Ce Ce Gerlach stated that this will be her last comment. She stated that it was going to be something else, but this is in response to that. She stated that she hears them and they have publicly stated since she has been on Council at least that they wish they had a better working relationship with the Parking Authority. That they wish it was more communication between them and the Parking Authority. She stated that has been a struggle. So therefore when there is lack of communication sometimes that builds into sometimes a lack of trust. She is not yet and it is nothing against you in this role. She doesn't have yet the faith and trust in the Parking Authority to do that study. She stated that she hopes she is proven wrong. She hopes a year from now if this increase passes and you get the money that you need, she hopes that they can come back and say told you so. She stated that she is not there yet. Maybe some of them may be. Just base don her experience with the Parking Authority before getting on Council and now since getting on Council there hasn't always been that

close communication, working relationship. It took a bunch of residents coming here for any changes to be even be made. If it wasn't for residents getting up in arms. You said you were working on things. Great, but the action didn't happen until residents came here in arms. That is one thing. What she was going to say as it was stated, other municipalities including surrounding ones and those who have similar demographics and populations as they do have increased rates, but yet there is no evidence and there is no proof that actually improves the parking situation. If the goal is to improve the parking situation by increases rates, but there is no evidence that it does that in these other municipalities, then why are they doing this just to purely make sure that they have their money. Because if it is, let's just call it what it is. Let's not pretend that it is also to make sure that parking in adequate and spots are being turned over and residents have the parking that they need. Again, if that were the case then there will be evidence in other cities that is happening, but there isn't. She stated that they raise the rates, they get their money, but the parking is in the same situation. Who wins? The Parking Authority, not the residents.

Ms. Cynthia Mota thanked Ms. Gerlach.

Mr. Daryl Hendricks stated he just was going to say, he knows where Ce Ce lives and he doesn't disagree. He traveled that since a child when they were in town. That is a simple fix too. He stated as you said, he thinks it should be looked at. It is more residential than anything. He does believes it is probably a good area. He stated that they can do that anywhere and do that kind of a study and remove it. He stated in your last comment, other Parking Authorities aren't facing deficits as we are. They have not waited 20 years to increase their fines. That is a big difference.

Ms. Cynthia Mota stated that she has a question. If the rates are being raised, are there like any payment plans for people that cannot afford it. She asked if they have a plan for that.

Mr. Jon Haney stated that currently, people have the option to appeal the MDJ as it sits currently where they could obtain a payment plan to handle any kinds of debts that they could not afford in a limp sum.

Ms. Cynthia Mota asked if Mr. Haney is saying that a person gets a ticket, they have to go to court.

Mr. Jon Haney stated that they don't have to go to court, they can go straight to the MDJ and ask for a payment plan. Unless, they go there and plead guilty and ask for a payment plan. That being said, the Parking Authority is currently working with the vendor and exploring the possibility of being able to make that option available at the Parking Authority's level

before it would go to the court.

Ms. Cynthia Mota stated a payment plan.

Mr. Jon Haney stated yes.

Mr. Santo Napoli stated that the board has been discussing this for the last three months to the point at the last meeting, it was a motion on the floor that if the parking fine increase was approved by City Council, one of the first orders of business was to start working on a payment plan because it is going to cost around \$30,000 - \$50,000 to the Authority to have it implemented, but we can't do it because obviously it is a deficit. That is one of the first things that they want to work on. He asked Mr. Hanlon if they vote on this, if the fine increases are increased, can they make it that a condition is that a parking study must be done in the next 12 months. Is there a way for them to wrap it in. He stated the parking study for the meters. Not the parking study that the mayor's office did. A meter study. It is something that they talked about that they would love to do. He stated that Ms. Gerlach is right, it needs to be done. The fines are outdated and so are our meters. It is all outdated. They have to work together to figure out how they are going to fix this, but they can't fix this without fixing this. He stated that his thought process is, if it is possible and there is a fine and they vote on it and let's say they have enough votes, he would want to make payments plans and the meter study part of the deal. These have to be done as part of this vote, if it goes yes. He stated to Mr. Hanlon that is just his idea and doesn't know if it is possible.

Ms. Candida Affa stated can they do it in 12 months or 24 months.

Mr. Jon Haney stated that he has to look at it and see. He doesn't want to over promise and not be able to deliver on time. He stated that he would say this in closing, he does enjoy a challenge from time to time. And, to borrow off of what Ms. Gerlach said don't vote to increase the fine amounts and wait for him to do it. Increase the fine amounts and let's do it together. He stated that they mentioned communication and team work. He would like to do that. He would like an opportunity to work together with them and work through this meter study and make it happen and see if they can't make a change and get those things brought up to more inline with the times.

Ms. Ce Ce Gerlach stated that she needs to prepare for how she is going to vote at a regular Council meeting. If there was a motion to be made during the Council meeting that would include language that Mr. Napoli just suggested. Maybe it is 12 - 24 months and maybe that's the language. She asked if it is something he would be amendable to.

Mr. Jon Haney stated absolutely. A lot of the preliminary work for a meter study is already in place. It is just a matter of coming to an agreement on a scope and then putting up the funds to do it. Not wanting to speak out of terms, he doesn't want to make comments because the board is an independent board and has to make decisions to authorize expenses and things like that. He can tell them in whatever capacity that he is able to and certainly spoke to Ms. Gerlach on this before stating you have my vote for the meter study. It is already almost kind of ready to go and in place. Just needs to pay for it and find what it needs to be. He would love the opportunity to work with members of Council in pushing that forward. Ultimately, any changes in the meter block has to be a legislative action by the Council anyway. It would make perfect sense to have a committee involved with them as they move forward.

Ms. Cynthia Mota stated a meter study and payment plan.

Mr. Jon Haney stated that both already kind of correct.

Ms. Ce Ce Gerlach asked Attorney Smith you said internal.

Attorney Charles Smith stated internal payment plan.

Ms. Cynthia Mota stated internal. Yes, internal.

Attorney Charles Smith stated to Mr. Haney, correct him if he is wrong. Didn't he have some type of mechanism for people to have their tickets considered by the APA before.

Mr. Jon Haney stated that the Parking Authority always had the ability to hear an internal appeal however some of the limitations that were on that were believed. Making it a far more broad operation. He stated yes, they have seen a lot more deals coming through and at present, the rate is somewhere around 50/50 between tickets that are found to be valid versus others that were able to be reduced as a warning or even dismissed if certain positions were presented.

Mr. Santo Napoli stated the last thing, there are some folks here that weren't here a month ago. How many less tickets have been written since this time last year from the Parking Authority. He stated he thinks Mr. Haney mentioned a number and wants to say 25.

Mr. Jon Haney stated 25 is probably nearer to 32,000 right now.

Mr. Santo Napoli stated 25 to 32,000 less tickets from this time last year.

Ms. Cynthia Mota stated that she thinks that they should listen to the comments from the public.

Mr. Jose' Cartagena stated that the reason he came here is that it is an excellent proposal for Napoli and Mota of payment arrangements. That is a necessity because they living in hard times. He stated if they are planning to vote on this and they want an increase, give us a break because we living in hard times. Take it serious before you vote. A payment arrangement will work for them.

Ms. Karen Ocasio stated that she came in a little bit late so she missed part of the meeting. She asked is this just for the meters.

Ms. Cynthia Mota stated yes.

Ms. Karen Ocasio stated just for the meters.

Mr. Jon Haney stated all violations.

Ms. Cynthia Mota stated all violations pretty much.

Ms. Karen Ocasio stated that they did not ask the name of the other person, but she will tell them Karen Ocasio from South Allentown. She stated her thing is and this is before the gentleman went to APA. Remember, the tickets that people were giving out at when they were trying to go to the food bank. This is a community that is already being gentrified. Our people cannot afford these increases. While she understands that everything is going up and they are for profit and needs to make money. She gets all of that. She gets every single side, but what is happening to the people that are double parking on Seventh Street. That's still an issue and has been an issue for a long time and still not being fixed. They should be tackling that and that should be coming down more. That is something they should be focused on. Our community is already being gentrified as it is. People are being pushed out and putting these tickets up is outrageous. There definitely needs to be some kind of study. They understand that times are and everything is going up and therefore for profit and she gets it that everyone wants to make sure they make money. This is something that needs a little more study and honestly for once, people need to look at the people that are in need in this community that don't have food, can't pay their bills, can't pay their rents, and not going to get into the fact that they can't afford a home to buy and give to thei

**A motion was made by Santo Napoli, seconded by Candida Affa, that this Bill be forwarded favorably to full Council.**

**Yes:** 7 - Cynthia Mota, Daryl Hendricks, Ed Zucal, Natalie Santos, Ce-Ce Gerlach, Candida Affa, and Santo Napoli

Enactment No: 16019

**ADJOURNED: 6:52 PM**