

Development Activities Meeting Report (Version: 01/24/2024)

This report created by the Neighborhood Planner and included with staff reports to City Boards and/or Commissions.

Logistics	Stakeholders
Project Name/Address: Reduction of RPP Area “KK”	Groups Represented (e.g., specific organizations, residents, employees, etc. where this is evident):
Parcel Number(s): Public Right of Way Areas bound by S. 21 st Street, S. 22 nd Street, Merriman Way, and Wrights Way. [Map of full “KK” RPP area can be found at link provided in “Notes” at bottom of report.]	South Side Community Council (SSCC) Board Members (RCO) Area residents and stakeholders DOMI staff (official applicant)
ZDR Application Number: N/A	Council District 3 Office (coordinated with DOMI staff related to proposal)
Meeting Location: Zoom	DCP Staff
Date: January 15, 2026	
Meeting Start Time: 6pm	
Applicant: Department of Mobility & Infrastructure (DOMI) staff	Approx. Number of Attendees: 26
Boards and/or Commissions Request(s): Planning Commission and City Council for review of proposed reduction in size of the “KK” RPP Zone	

How did the meeting inform the community about the development project?

Ex: Community engagement to-date, location and history of the site, demolition needs, building footprint and overall square footage, uses and activities (particularly on the ground floor), transportation needs and parking proposed, building materials, design, and other aesthetic elements of the project, community uses, amenities and programs.

<p>The applicant (DOMI staff) provided an overview of the management of the Residential Parking Permit (RPP) program, explaining how DOMI manages the process for creating new and evaluating existing RPP zones. Pittsburgh’s Parking Authority issues the permits and enforces regulations.</p>
<p>The applicant outlined the process for reduction in size of an RPP zone. This includes: Initiation (via petitions, comprehensive plan or neighborhood plan, or parking permit officer discretion), a parking study by DOMI collecting data in the field and other sources, a Parking Management Plan (DOMI evaluates if a proposal meets eligibility criteria in code and issues recommendations), community engagement process (information added to Engage PGH and a DAM held), Planning Commission (Briefing and Hearing/Action), City Council (final vote).</p>
<p>Applicant explained that the “KK” area was created in 2015, and has since been amended 4 times. It most recently had a minor expansion. There are 398 users of the “KK” area.</p>
<p>Applicant provided a visual mapped highlight of the area in question that is being proposed to be removed from the remainder of the larger “KK” zone. This area that would be removed is bound by S 21st St, S 22nd St, Merriman Way, and Wrights Way. DOMI received 41 petitions from residents on the subject blocks. No other streets in the KK zone are changing at this time.</p>

Applicant highlighted the Parking Study findings – parking studies were completed 8/25/25, 9/17/25, and 10/14/25. There are 85 legal parking spaces available in the subject area to be removed. Average parking space utilization is 77%. Average number of parked resident vehicles is 9%. Average number of parked non-resident/commuter vehicles 91%.

Applicant explained the Reduction Criteria. One criterion relates to the impact of commuter vehicles if the changes are approved. Per DOMI, the high rate of non-resident parking demonstrates that RPP has not been effective at managing parking demand; and states that the removal of these streets would not have an impact on other RPP streets. Another criterion was that residents of the overall “KK” area request more than 50 permits annually. Since 398 have made those requests, it is still anticipated that at least 50 will do so again.

Applicant described their outreach methods, involving a mailer to permit holders, an email to permit holders, and the creation of an EngagePGH page, which so far has generated 5 responses.

Outlined the next steps of going to Planning Commission at least 30 days after the DAM. Scheduling with Planning Commission is TBD, and likely would be late February 2026. City Council then reviews the legislation submitted after Planning Commission issues its recommendation. This would likely be March-April 2026.

Applicant provided a link to the Engage page. The full memo is available as well on the Engage page.

Input and Responses

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
<p>[Council District 3 Office spoke:] Thanks for all being here tonight. Just want to be clear that this is very much not a City-driven process, it’s a resident-driven process. I will submit whatever residents want to do. The way KK zone was drawn was originally from neighbors advocating to be in KK zone, but if it’s not working and not desired, happy to support that. As Councilmember, I do not have a dog in this fight. Continue engaging. Feel free to keep engaging with Council District 3, but will direct back to this process as best as possible so captured in Planning Commission and in recommendation from staff to Planning Commission. I will have to hop off the meeting at 7pm due to another meeting.</p>	
<p>I don’t understand what the parking situation will be for residents who are in the KK area that is proposed to be removed. What would the new signage be? When my street is full, will I be unable to park on adjacent KK streets since I’m not in KK anymore?</p>	<p>Streets would go back to undesignated parking. Anyone would legally be able to park there. It would not be paid parking either. It would be like other regular streets where there is no RPP. If you’re not on a street of RPP you would no longer be eligible for permit, and if don’t have permit, cannot park in RPP zones except for a 1 or 2 hour period (grace period).</p>
<p>[RCO member:] When DOMI got petition for KK reduction in these zones, were the residents who circulated these petitions required to give you a reason to remove it, or is it a simple petition to remove it from these certain blocks from this zone?</p>	<p>Not required to give reason and I don’t want to speak on their behalf, but from other conversations, appeared to be due to increase in permit costs, which went from \$20 to \$40 and</p>

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
<p>That may give clarity to people on the phone about why this came about, that neighbors in the zone were upset about increase of RPP permit cost from \$20 to \$40 per year.</p>	<p>feeling like that cost doesn't justify efficacy of program.</p>
<p>[Chat Comment:] That's what it seems. Residents in this area may be screwed from a parking perspective</p>	
<p>Thanks for answering my question. I live on Merriman Way and live in the zone that would be affected, and my street is often full and I have to park on side streets, and I have to park on other KK streets sometimes and so I'm surprised this is proposed. I read the study by DOMI about the number of residential vs. commuter cars, and not sure if it's possible to revisit this, but it said there are zero residential cars on my street, and I park on my street every single day and so do my neighbors and we all leave and come back at about the same time almost every day, so I think there may be holes in the study, to lead to idea that less people are parking in the area than really are as residents. I'm really against this change, and I hope I'm not only restricted to my street and other three unmarked streets near me. I hope we'll have parking availability in this area.</p>	
<p>We live on Sydney Street between 23rd and 24th at the center of the block. My wife and I both have permits. What you're proposing is 23rd down to Wharton Street, and 24th down to Fox Way, and those are the two adjacent streets to where we live. If that is removed and it is just open parking, that will obviously put more burden on Sydney Street. The question I have is it seems like they don't do much enforcing of the permits on the street. There should be more enforcement. People paying permits often come home and there is no space on streets and there are a lot of visitors on street who are not getting ticketed or citations.</p> <p><i>[RCO member requested to see map and clarify location of impact of project]</i></p> <p>[Commenter noted the following:] 23rd from Carson all the way down to Wharton, and then 24th from Carson down to Fox way.</p> <p>The letter I think shows otherwise, that we received. 24th street from Carson Street down to Fox Way, that's east of the Birmingham Bridge.</p> <p>23rd is the first street east of the Birmingham Bridge.</p>	<p>[showed map] The proposed area is bound between 21st and 22nd on Merriman Way, Wharton Street, Fox Way, Sydney Street, and so the area east of Birmingham bridge is not being directly changed here.</p> <p>I will try to pull that back up. I apologize about typo in mailer if that's showing wrong.</p>
<p>We're looking at area west of the Birmingham Bridge.</p>	<p>Yes, west of the bridge.</p>

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
[RCO member:] Basically the area across from Ormsby Park /Field between Merriman and Wrights Way.	
<p>So the letter I received was wrong? Because 23rd and 24th is east of the Birmingham Bridge.</p> <p>Ok, that's fine.</p>	<p>If that's what the mailer said, then I apologize, that's a typo.</p>
<p>How many parcels or residences are there in the zone that is being removed relative to the 41 petitioners. Is it half the voting parcels, or all of them? What proportion of the voting parcels are included? Clarify statistics please</p>	<p>I would have to pull up my notes. If a parcel is non-residential, it is not eligible for petition. But if the apartment building has 3 units, each unit can have its own petitioner. We did it based on the number of permits issued in the area as an approximation for the number of households. I'm not sure on exact number, I would need to check notes.</p>
<p>[Comment in Chat]</p> <p>1. To clarify, if this KK reduction passes, anyone coming to South Side can park here for as long as they want. Correct?</p> <p>2. If this reduction goes through, will I not be able to get a KK permit, even if I want to pay for one, correct?</p> <p>[Chat commenter then verbalized:] The earlier comments by DOMI answered my questions but I want to second people's thoughts that in addition to creating more congestion, and this being South Side, this area is hard to park in. If the real issue is that people are mad about the cost going from \$20 to \$40 per year, this won't change that, so I'm not sure why we would hurt ourselves to not change anything.</p>	
<p>My wife and I live on Wharton, which is half covered. It is a free-for-all where the office building is, and then there is a residential area on the side we live on. I reiterate what others have said about the petition. I signed the petition but I never would have signed it if the goal was to remove the parking. The woman who presented the petition was talking about not wanting to have our rates raised. I am adamantly against this. It was not under true pretenses. There is not good parking for residents as is now. If release this, there will be nowhere for us to go. The office building across the street will take our spaces and they have the whole lot under the bridge that they're supposed to use, so this seems driven a lot by that.</p>	
<p>And the office workers really don't use under-the-bridge parking.</p>	

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
<p>And I get it, especially in winter, I'd like to park across the street and walk to the office, but they're taking spots from residents.</p>	
<p>[Chat comment:] Can someone explain the reason that 40+ people think they'd be better off without this facility? What possible advantage is it to them? <i>[In the chat, 3 people loved this comment.]</i></p>	
<p>[RCO Member:] We seem to be hearing that the residents who circulated the petition were concerned about the raise in the cost.</p>	
<p>I understand their logic in thinking that they will save \$20/year, but I do think we need to take into account that far more people will suffer if these 40 people who did this get \$20, than all those people who need to use their Residential Parking Permit and have nowhere else to go. If they cannot use KK areas elsewhere, which they're not, then they're screwed. I am completely against this. I think this is appalling subterfuge on the part of people who signed petition.</p>	
<p>Agreed.</p>	
<p>Agreed, it cannot be the few dictating to masses on this one. Spot on.</p>	
<p>I'm on the 2100 block of Wrights Way. My family is deeply concerned about this in terms of access to parking. We are less than 300 feet away from Carson Street and 300 feet from community pool and within 1,000 feet of restaurants and bars, and if open up area to free parking to anyone, it essentially blocks out the residents from being able to park anywhere near their homes, and encourages people going to East Carson Street businesses to use free parking in front of the residences rather than the paid parking 300 feet away from us. If City moves forward with this consideration, it is essentially encouraging homeowners to move away from this area, because it essentially blocks us from parking anywhere near our homes.</p>	
<p>[Chat comment, also summarized verbally by RCO:] I don't understand how the parking study determined that there were a high number of commuters parking in this area legally, rather than residents, since two residents have said they park there every day. Are those people with business RPP permits, or in theory are they "commuters" only parking within the free 2 hour window?</p> <p>In the presentation, it referenced commuter and parking legally. But if commuter working 8 hour work day and only 2 hour allowed to park there, how are they parking legally if they are there all day,</p>	<p>We conduct our parking studies at several different times of day to get a representative sample of parking behavior, and we determine if resident vs. non-resident based on license plates as to whether they're associated with residents or non-residents in the permits and we also check visitor passes.</p> <p>"Legal parking" referenced in the study means legal parking spaces, in terms of not blocking fire hydrant, intersection, driveway etc. If someone is</p>

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
<p>since that would skew data that looking at, since kind of messing numbers around if talking about these spaces being used by workers in one of the business buildings nearby using all the spaces? As somebody with a KK permit, I don't understand how somebody can come in and park for 8-9 hours and that's considered legal. Can you explain to me so I understand data being referenced?</p> <p>So it may be that this is coming back to the business building and workers taking up residential parking. As a business woman, it sounds like people are saying the petition was not circulated in good faith. I find it concerning to move forward on that. I understand responsibility to read what one signs, but I would be concerned for City to move forward on something when residents on this call are saying petition was not circulated in good faith, since in standard business, one would disregard a petition if not done in good faith. I would like to hear from people who created and circulated the petition. I'm concerned we're proceeding with all these actions and meetings and plans when perhaps it was presented as quite deceitful. I want that on record, I hope that neighborhood council would not move forward on this if done in that deceitful way.</p>	<p>parking more than 2 hours, that is not captured in our analysis, and we did not time it for that, as that is not a requirement of the Parking Study as written in RPP code. That's where definition of legal parking comes from. "Commuter" term may be misleading, but it is a technical term in code and just means a non-permitted user.</p>
<p>[RCO member:] There are several comments in the chat reflecting that same view.</p>	
<p>[RCO member:] I'm not sure if anyone is on the phone that can represent why they circulated the petition, I'm not asking you to raise your hand and talk about it, but there seems to be a pretty unanimous feeling against this. As Councilmember Charland stated early on, this is resident driven, and not driven by the City or by the RCO (Community Council) or by another partner organization in 15203 driving this. These were residents in this area that circulated this petition. And the majority of people who joined tonight are in opposition to this. We could belabor this for hours saying they're against it, they're against. And that's why we have this meeting so we can hear that. So what would next steps be if people who are in this portion of KK zone that are completely opposed to it, that may or may have not signed this petition, and what can they do to potentially stop this from moving forward? Please explain to everyone on here.</p>	<p>This is why we bring these proposals back to the community to have these sorts of discussions. As I stated previously, nothing is on the books for a Planning Commission hearing, which would typically be the next step here. Maybe we can talk to Councilmember Charland about this and where we go from here, if we reengage the residents who did the petition in a conversation, or maybe bring this to Planning Commission with both sides presented and give residents another chance to speak. Then we can decide maybe this is something we don't want to present to Planning Commission. There is also the opportunity if we decide more public discussion is warranted, we could present it to Planning Commission, and the DCP DAM staff report would get presented to them, and I have my notes too, and we could speak to the Planning Commission, at which point they could issue a recommendation based on the feedback. Those are the decision-making bodies. DOMI is not the decision-making body in any of this. We don't have authority to make these decisions on behalf of the community. That's why</p>

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
	we bring it to these types of engagements and work with elected officials to figure out these paths forward. Ultimately it will not be on DOMI to make any of these decisions.
Can this be killed before it actually makes it to Commission?	Potentially, we can take this back and consider it and discuss with Council Office
[Chat Comment:] If the basic reason for these petitions is for the petitioners to save \$20 per year on RPPS, to grant this is an insult to other residents, especially those in the proposed area who value and use the RPPS which they will lose with no alternative [2 people liked in chat]	
[Chat Comment:] Was the petition clear what they were requesting. It appears that it was about the cost hoping that they would have it reduced.	
[Chat Comment:] to summarize, the survey was poorly explained to those who signed, the parking study is inaccurate on residential use, and people in the reduction zone are being screwed. What do I need to do stop this? New petition? [In chat, 3 loved the comment; one wrote "wholeheartedly agree."]	
[Chat Comment:] it sounds like the petition signers were not fully informed of the actual purpose of the change, does that not nullify the legitimacy of the petition? [1 liked comment in chat]	
[Chat Comment:]: wrong solution for a price increase. Are these seniors on fixed income, perhaps the city should look for a different solution its penalizes residents	
[Chat Comment:] Can a business get parking permits around their building or where do they go?	
[Comment in chat:] it totally felt like we were scammed when that woman was going around having residents sign the petition for "reduction cost." That petition was not fully explained and there was clearly a secret motive. [2 liked comment in chat]	
<p>[Comment in Chat:] I think you need to redo the study, it sounds like the data was flawed and not telling the full story. You need to check license plate/permit info for vehicles multiple times per day, multiple days in a week, over a 2-3 week period to account for vacations, people who commute outside of the city during the workday, shop on the weekends, etc. you can't use 2 data points and clarify that as accurate. [2 liked comment in chat]</p> <p>[RCO member summarized chat comment verbally as the commenter wanting the study redone over multiple days and multiple times].</p>	Correct, that's across multiple days, multiple days of the week and across multiple months and times of day, and we collected in morning, afternoon, evening, we try to collect a representative sample of data based on our Standard Operating Procedures and City code regulates how these parking studies must be conducted. There might be an opportunity, if this were brought to Planning Commission, to do another field audit or two, if that is the desire, that might be worthwhile.

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
[RCO Member:] I'm hearing you say you did the study according to what the regulations say?	
[Chat comment]: With these streets taken out of KK area will this lessen the enforcement.	
<p>Thanks for having the meeting here. I was actually part of the SSCC and part of the original formation of the RPP around 14 years ago, knocked on hundreds and hundreds of doors, along with another [RCO member] and others. It's been a big part of our community. That process took over 1.5 years, and many public meetings, and was a big lift for SSCC at the time and as residents. I was shocked as well last year when they announced the doubling of the fee for the RPP. We talked about that when we first set it up, that it hasn't changed that much and that it might in coming years increase cost, but no one ever mentioned it would double or that it was that far back/behind on cost of ticket or permit. That's part of problem here, is that City has gouged us for this increase. At the same time, a few years ago, they dropped the requirement for having stickers on cars, which as a side effect does not allow residents to identify when cars on the block are not supposed to be there. They're not zone cars. They told us at the time that the sticker was 50 cents or 1 dollar cost of that \$20, and that's why they were dropping it at the time. I hope that they will bring back the sticker. Since they have doubled the \$20 cost, they clearly have enough money to do that, and that would allow us to have awareness of which visitors have stickers, and we know who to call, and now there is no way to know if a person is a visitor or not, and that's highly problematic, and Parking Authority has been giving excuses about staffing for years now, and we're being asked to pay more and we're getting less for it. I think Parking Authority should have been part of this meeting – it's an enforcement issue once again. When asking for changes to this, with stickers coming back, yes it's a pain to put on dashboard, and the online is still a good system, but it allows people to identify when a car is appropriately parked and not appropriately parked in zone and help manage enforcement.</p>	
I agree. I don't have a problem paying for a parking permit, but I want to get something that I'm paying for, and they don't enforce down here at all. I'm hearing of cars parked on 8 hours visiting businesses, they shouldn't be here for 8 hours -- they are taking up residential parking that we are paying for.	
I have car next block down with 5 tickets on it and it's been there over a month and has still not been towed. Why it doesn't have 30 tickets I don't know. And why not towed?	
Raising price and not enforcing own rules.	

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
I agree, I live in KK, and I don't see the car as often as I did in the beginning.	
[Comment in Chat]: one of real issues here is lack of parking enforcement that benefits the people who PAY for our parking permits. We have multiple bars, a pool/gym/library nearby, offices etc. I am not alone here when I say that us residents in this area do feel screwed out of parking spaces at all times of day due to what seems like a lack of enforcement. It's my understanding that the Parking Authority is supposed to benefit residents. I've felt nothing but the exact opposite since moving here. I do not see enforcement for parking violations nearly as often as I'd like. I pay \$40 + a year, but others park for free with no/little enforcement.	
[Comment in Chat] I park on my street every day and the study said ZERO residents on Merriman Way. I have no faith in this study. I think it's fair to acknowledge its flawed and did not capture residential parking in this case. <i>[2 liked comment in chat]</i>	
[Comment in Chat] They only time parking authority enforces is when there is street cleaning – that's when I've received tickets.	
[Comment in chat] There is zero enforcement. I can't remember once seeing an RPP vehicle on Wharton. <i>[1 liked comment in chat].</i>	
<p>[Comment in chat] We have 91% non-resident parking, so the problem is obvious. The rationale for dropping PART of the KK zone is there is no enforcement. It turns out that is not only illogical, it is false.</p> <p>It is illogical because the remedy for non-enforcement is enforcement. It is false because this whole thing appears to be [complaining] about the cost, not a matter of enforcement at all. <i>[2 liked the chat comment].</i></p>	
<p>There were a couple of questions about if this could be stopped, and there were a lot of "maybes" and "mights." Is there an actual process to know if there will be a petition to cross or change this? And for people answering these questions going forward and checking notes, will we see anything out of this meeting? Will there be any results? Just seems very vague responses in my opinion?</p> <p>That's incredibly frustrating, for, I assume all the residents on this call, especially when you're considering removing multiple blocks of parking</p>	<p>There is not a process...we have not been in this situation before where have started an RPP change, got to the community engagement stage, and tried to stop that. That is not something outlined in City code or a procedure I've encountered in my time at the department managing this program. So that's some of my hesitancy, in that we're kind of building the plane as we fly.</p> <p>DOMI is not the decision-maker here. Planning Commission makes the recommendation to City Council, and City Council is the ultimate decider here. It's not my role at DOMI to also decide that. That's why I'd look to opinion of Council District about maybe talking with residents who submitted petition, see if we can get on same page about</p>

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
	<p>what desired effect was. In terms of notes from meeting, DAM report will be posted on City Planning website. And if there are outstanding updates, I've been taking notes and I will post on RPP Engage PGH page if needed, and if we end up in position to not move forward with Planning Commission, we could send out another mailer and email blast and we hope to get help from SSCC on communications so people who came here are aware of change of course and it doesn't simply fall off, and we can get info out either way, as to whether it goes forward with Planning Commission or is paused before that.</p>
<p>I did not get original petition. I live on Sydney. I didn't get mail or email notification – nothing. Is there anything that can be sent out in the mail or email that can reassure that everyone is well-notified in a timely manner when decision made or before it's made?</p>	<p>Petitions are completely community-driven process. We do not have any follow-up with any door-knocking or mailers for that. We did send out a mailer ahead of this meeting, as well as an email blast, using Parking Authority's system. So if you did not get either of those, I'd suggest you contact Parking Authority to ensure they have your correct contact info. And otherwise you could look at DAM report posted on City webpage.</p>
<p>Since there was an issue with people on 23rd St. getting the mailer, maybe a correction in the mailer needs to be sent out.</p> <p>I understand, but since the mailer was wrong, maybe a new letter should be issued clarifying it was wrong and providing an addendum that talks about this meeting. I'd suggest that send mailer first before next move is made so everyone has right information. That would be appropriate thing. I'd also suggest that we hold this meeting again, and we treat this meeting as null and void, because the wrong information was given and so people who lived on that block may not have come since they didn't see their block on it, and so really the public has not been engaged.</p>	<p>We sent mailer to everyone in KK.</p>
<p>That also makes one question the accuracy of the study if the letter itself that went out was inaccurate.</p> <p>The back page of the letter above the picture with the zoned out area. Towards the bottom where you talk about Sydney Street. 23rd, Sydney, East Carson. From East Carson to Fox Way to Wharton Street, and 24th Street, from East Carson to Fox Way. That's all east of Birmingham Bridge.</p>	<p>I am pulling up the letter here. Was it on first or second page where the error was?</p> <p>We listed out all streets in Area KK when we made the mailer. Those streets are not impacted by the proposal, but that is all the RPP zone.</p>
<p>I understand what you did. I get it. I see what you're saying that you identified all the streets. But still, I think the point is fair.</p>	

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
<p>It seems that the only way to quash this is to start a petition to quash it with all those who are against it. If there's no formal process to squash this.</p>	
<p>[Chat Comment:] Can DOMI stop this now when it is so obviously poor idea to move forward with it? I have little faith in government to make a good decision that benefits residents <i>[1 loved comment in the chat]</i></p>	
<p>[Chat Comment:] we did not receive a mailer and we live in KK</p>	
<p>[Comment in Chat:] important to note the RPP program was previously subsidized by other parking authority revenue. They now say the \$40 makes the program revenue neutral, but at previous enforcement levels. The expansion of the ticket-by-mail process should make enforcement more efficient. Hybrid parking is also an option, so commuters would newly have to pay for parking and the parking authority would have an incentive to do more frequent enforcement.</p>	
<p>[Comment in Chat:] Can I get a concrete answer on how to stop this from moving forward. Does DOMI actually have to escalate this. We've provided overwhelming evidence of the issues. It feels irresponsible to pass this on to another body for decision making. <i>[2 loved in the chat]</i>. [Reply in chat:] YES</p>	
<p>[Chat comment:] I gladly pay \$40/year for parking near my home that is not available to non-residents. <i>[1 liked in Zoom chat]</i> [Chat reply to comment:] Agreed. Cost isn't the issue for me. The issue is me paying for something that others get for free.</p>	
<p>[Chat comment:] Also difficult to re-up your permit if you have lapsed.</p>	
<p>[Council District 3 Office:] Obviously this is pretty unanimous here tonight. I thought this would be much more contentious and not just unanimous about how people feel about the zone there. DOMI and DCP staff – I'd like to get together with you to figure out a game plan. South Side Community Council – can you send a list of contact info of everyone who joined on the Zoom, or was there an email sign up?</p> <p>[RCO member:] My Zoom should show us participants here this evening and I can screenshot that as well. If you want to contact them directly, everyone please put your email address in the chat and that way I'd definitely have a record of that in Zoom.</p> <p>[Council District 3 Office:] Based on what was presented, it seems the rationale for a lot of folks to get rid of this was the jump from \$20 to \$40. RPP has been the same since the 1990s and I think we're all in agreement that it should have had a more gradual</p>	

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
<p>increase. By the time it got to the South Side and RPP, it should have been \$20 to \$22, to \$24 etc. and people would not have noticed the difference. I've received death threats over the \$20 to \$40 jump and I'm being serious about that. I get it that people don't like the additional cost. RPP is also the loss leader at Parking Authority. It does not generate revenue, they lose more money in the RPP than any other program they due, and that will continue even with this \$40 increase. The rationale was that increasing the rate would hopefully allow them to hire more enforcement agents, which has been a problem. The Parking Authority board allowed the Parking Authority to hire outside the city, hoping to get more people applying, and we have seen that happen a little bit. They're also paying the enforcement agents more than before, and they're doing ticket by mail, which I know none of us love but I think is a necessary evil now, where the enforcement agents don't have to get out of the car and by scanning the license plates can mail the ticket, all of which is supposed to increase efficiency and enforcement. We haven't seen those enforcement numbers improve yet. We're hoping to see that start to bear fruit this year. We do go over the enforcement numbers every 2nd Tuesday of every month at the South Side Planning Forum. There's no doubt there's a lot to be desired in enforcement numbers in the South Side and throughout the city. To me, it doesn't make sense to move forward with this process. I do understand, that this being legislation on the table, we can't just kill it without a Planning Commission meeting, so I think we'll have to go through that, but, while I said earlier I didn't plan on putting my finger on the scale, and with it being pretty unanimous, I would not support this. As DOMI and DCP staff laid out earlier, the way this process works of Planning Commission and it going to Council, eight Councilmembers do not care what happens in a parking zone in South Side and they would follow my lead on that, and so unless something changes dramatically, I'm going to vote to kill this.</p>	
<p>We appreciate that.</p>	
<p>[Chat Comment:] Thank you <i>[2 liked in Chat]</i></p>	
<p>[Council District 3 Office:] I was kind of hoping there was a compelling argument of something I didn't hear or didn't think of that wasn't just the concern of the additional cost, and I have not heard that tonight. If any argument exists and someone hasn't spoken up, please do, I'm all ears and want to understand people's needs and concerns, but this seems pretty cut and dry. I do have to run to another meeting but I will put my email in the chat if people have additional feedback for me. <i>[Council District 3 Office provided email address in chat]</i></p>	
<p><i>[Zoom Chat started to fill up with email addresses of meeting attendees who wanted to stay informed of the project's future status updates]</i></p>	

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
<p>Who do we contact or what will it take to get something moving on getting the stickers back into play and the visitor passes that fit nicely on top of the dashboard so all can see? How do we make that change? Anybody know?</p> <p>Why isn't the Pittsburgh Parking Authority here?</p>	<p>That would all be up to the Pittsburgh Parking Authority, so DOMI has no role in that.</p> <p>Because it's DOMI's responsibility to shepherd through these sorts of changes through the community process. If there is a desire to have a more general meeting about the RPP program, and the need for more enforcement and do we bring back stickers etc., that could be separate conversation to convene with representatives from the Parking Authority.</p>
<p>Can you convene that?</p>	<p>If that's the desire of people here, I'm happy to help get the ball rolling.</p>
<p>I think it's clear. The City is losing money on this. It's a loss leader. You make money from two things -- the permit process itself and by enforcing it, and they're only doing one part of that. They're taking money, and they're not enforcing it.</p>	
<p>Parking ticket is only \$40. There's no way it's making money if it's not being enforced.</p>	
<p>[RCO member:] I think Council Office District 3 heard us on that issue too.</p>	
<p>It's not Council Office District 3's fault, we know it's the Parking Authority.</p>	
<p>[RCO Member:] Typically there is an additional 30 days of comment. This may be a bit different than normal and maybe there will more discussions with the Council Office and Planning Commission, but if you have further questions, thoughts, concerns not voiced tonight, you can email SSCC (RCO) and we will compile them and give a letter the about matter. It sounds like next steps for the project is Planning Commission and that may potentially get squashed by Council District 3 Office. But official announcement will be made on PGH Engage website or by Planning Commission / City of Pittsburgh.</p> <p>Can join South Side Community Council e-mail list-serve at info@southsidecommunitycouncil.org.</p> <p><i>[Additional RCO members shared their email addresses in the chat]</i></p> <p>More info on DAM and previous ones are available on SSCC website and DAM video recordings are posted on YouTube page. Notice of upcoming DAMs are sent out on email list-serve 10 days prior to DAM.</p>	
<p>Is there anything on website or any activity taking place to address issues with nuisance bars on the South Side?</p>	

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants
<p><i>[RCO member encouraged the attendee come to Neighbor Night, on 3rd Tues of every month, held at 6pm at Market House, providing updates on various groups or “action packs” that take efforts on specific projects, including safety, and referenced the local resident lead for the Safety action pack who the commenter could speak with there. Commenter asked if there was law enforcement presence and RCO member explained their presence.]</i></p>	
<p>Thank you all.</p>	

Other Notes

Attempts were made to capture both Zoom chat comments and verbal comments in these notes as close to actual sequencing as possible, but may not always reflect accurate sequencing.

The term “RCO Member” was used to note when Board Members of the SSCC provided guiding feedback as part of their role helping moderate the meeting. There were multiple Board members in attendance.

In summary, there was widespread opposition in the meeting voiced by community attendees to the proposed change to the “KK” RPP zone. There also was strong interest in holding a future meeting that included Parking Authority representatives to discuss parking enforcement-related matters. At the conclusion of the DAM, it was not entirely clear if the proposal would proceed to Planning Commission or not. DOMI staff indicated they would be consulting with Council District 3 related to next steps, and Council District 3 mentioned it would like to discuss that with DOMI and DCP. DOMI staff mentioned how they could help communicate publicly the future status of the proposal.

Various items were shared in the Zoom chat as reference for attendees:

Engage PGH Page (on this page is a link to the Parking Study Memo): <https://engage.pittsburghpa.gov/residential-parking-permit-zones>

Link to map of RPP areas in city - <https://pittsburghpa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/basic/index.html?appid=7fe146cc03d0484a89f3fc812f3e517d>

Link to City Planning meeting calendar page - <https://www.pittsburghpa.gov/Business-Development/City-Planning/City-Planning-Meetings>

Link to RPP chapter 549 in code - <https://ecode360.com/45464085>

Planner completing report: TS