

**MISSOULA PARKING COMMISSION**  
**Minutes**  
**June 6, 2019**

A Regular Board Meeting of the Missoula Parking Commission was held on **Thursday, June 6, 2019** at the **Jack Reidy Conference Room, 140 W. Pine**, Missoula, MT 59802 at **12:00 p.m.** Those in attendance were Board members Matt Ellis, John Roemer, Joe Easton, Pat Corrick, and J.R. Casillas. From the Parking Commission office were Tiffany Brander, Interim Director and Zoe Walters, Administrative Assistant II. Jim Galipeau from JCCS and Linda McCarthy from Downtown Missoula Partnership were also in attendance.

1. **Call to order** – John Roemer
2. **Introductions** - None
3. **Public Comments & Announcements** - None
4. **Adjustment(s) to the Agenda** – None
5. **Approval of Minutes**

- a. May 2, 2019 Regular Board Meeting Minutes

Joe Easton moved to approve the minutes from May 2, 2019, Matt Ellis seconded. Minutes from the regular board meeting held May 2, 2019 were unanimously approved.

- b. May 21, 2019 Special Board Meeting Minutes

JR Casillas moved to approve the minutes from May 21, 2019, Matt Ellis seconded. Minutes from the special board meeting held May 21, 2019 were unanimously approved.

6. **Communications and Presentations**

- a. 2020-2030 Petition for the renewal/expansion of the Downtown Business Improvement District of Missoula – Linda McCarthy, DMP/BID

The BID is one of three organizations under the Downtown Missoula Partnership. There are 650 properties within the defined boundaries of the BID that contribute annual assessments for common area maintenance and management, economic development, and marketing. BIDs are renewed by petitions and cannot exist for longer than ten years. This BID was created in 2005 for a five year period and was renewed 2010 for a ten year period. MDA is seeking renewal of the BID that focuses on clean and safe programming, economic development, and marketing. City, county, parks land, and parking land are tax exempt parcels that contribute to the BID. In 2005, price per square foot was negotiated for tax exempt properties. Over the last fifteen years MPC has paid \$200 per parcel and 2.5 cents per square foot. The value of property within the BID since 2005 has increased by 25%. The BID, committee, and board proposed to adjust the tax exempt rate structure to match the 25% increase. In this renewal process, the BID is seeking a 1 cent increase per square foot for MPC for the next ten years. This does not change as property values change. Linda presented an overview of renewal and the proposed cost for property owned by MPC.

The annual assessment for MPC is \$6,195.90.

The BID annual budget is \$320,000. Joe asked if the BID provides any snow plowing, graffiti removal, hot water power washing on any of MPC's lots. Linda answered yes. Tiffany answered yes, it is by request and is at times a trade of services.

Joe asked if Linda projects any change in services. Linda answered that it is difficult to foresee out ten years. Based off of annual surveys, businesses appreciate the services of snow removal, recycling removal, hot water power washing, ambassador policing, and the Clean Team. It is possible there will be enhanced or revised services incorporated from the Downtown Master Plan.

JR asked if there are any concerns or complaints from businesses that the level of service has decreased.

Linda answered that the DMP has not received any complaints about the level of service.

JR asked for clarification of public common areas. Linda answered sidewalks, tree wells, ADA ramps, alleys, patrol of zone 1 and zone 2 (riverfront parks and trails), trash and recycling, bike lanes on N Higgins, and Caras Park.

Tiffany noted that trash removal seven days a week is helpful for MPC, specifically around Central Park. MPC Maintenance does not have to worry about trash removal over the weekend.

## **7. Interim Director's Report**

Tiffany will be attending the International Parking & Mobility Institute Conference and meeting with Dennis Burns to discuss the Downtown Master Plan.

Central Park Remodel: The wall has been removed and flooring will be completed soon. There will be new LED lighting and paint. Cubicle furniture will be in after July 1<sup>st</sup>. We are projected to move in by the end of June.

Budget: There are baseline adjustments for utilities. The admin fee increased by 2%. There is an extra \$10,000 for the intercoms installed at all gates when gating equipment was upgraded. This expense comes out of IT's budget because they have the contract with Century Link.

Missoula Ravalli Transportation Management Association has requested \$6,000 for funding. MPC supports this each year as it is in line with MPC mission and goals. Tiffany would like support. This request is included in the proposed annual budget.

Policy Update: three policy items are written out into policies and attached as action items.

The next board meeting will be July 11, 2019 due to the Fourth of July holiday falling on our normally scheduled monthly meeting.

## **8. Financial Statement**

The on street technology project is at a \$478,000 difference year to date. This is the only category that has changed since last year. In the liability section, the city took accruals out. Jim thinks we will see more of this in April and May. JCCS will be looking at financials through May. Page 3 shows the Cash Recap: There is a little over \$700,000 of unobligated cash. Revenue: March \$230,000 and \$1,974,000 year to date. Fines are up \$28,000 year to date. Meters were down a couple thousand dollars because of about \$30,000 reduction in meter bag permits. There was a \$27,000 increase in flat meter revenue. Park Place and ROAM are up \$32,000. Lease parking is up \$12,000. Overall parking revenue, year to date, is up about \$65,000. Total expenses are up \$82,000. This includes three items: \$20,000 in professional fees, \$47,000 in printing, and \$37,500 for half the amount of Downtown Master Plan. These are more

than \$82,000 and the remainder is savings. While the MRA TIF is reflected in March 2018, it is not in March 2019.

Tiffany clarified meter bag revenue is included in meter revenue, but it depends on the amount of construction and contractors in the Downtown area. Printing expenses were showing higher for the month because we ordered new ticket paper, envelopes, and paper for Luke machines.

Matt asked if there was a reason why repair and maintenance is lower than last year. Tiffany answered that it varies with what our maintenance team is doing at the time.

Based off of the Master Plan, Matt asked if it is true that we do not have the bonding capacity to contribute to parking garages. Jim answered that they look at calculations and ratios of bonds. There is capacity.

Joe would like our consultant to provide parameters for what the current market could provide for a bonding of a new project. Matt and Joe would like to know who MPC can ask for this information. Jim suggested MPC reach out to Dorsey Whitney. Matt noted that this is a major point for when the board discusses rate increases.

Joe suggested that this might require a board motion. Joe would like to know if this question should be directed to Dorsey Whitney, Dennis Burns, or another financial institutions. Tiffany thinks it would be beneficial to ask Dennis to get an industry standard and, additionally, consult with Dorsey Whitney.

## **9. Action Items**

### **a. Renewal/Expansion of the Downtown BID of Missoula**

Tiffany clarified that the motion would be to provide staff with permission to execute the petition for the renewal and expansion of the Downtown BID.

Joe asked if the motion addressed the rate increase. Tiffany answered that it is not in the petition.

Joe made two motions: 1. Concur with the Downtown BID proposed rate structure in contribution to the Downtown BID in the event the BID is extended to the amounts on the handout - a \$200 flat fee plus 3.5 cents per square foot for a total of \$6,195.90 per year.

Joe clarified that the motion approves the rate increase, but is contingent on the petition being approved. He would like to separate the two. He doesn't want the BID to not be approved if we can stay at our current rate.

JR seconded this motion.

Joe explained that he would like to separate the two so that the Commission can support the petition in the event that the Commission does not agree to the rate structure increase, but may want to support the petition to renew the BID. This does not tie the two decisions.

John stated that they have presented what the BID expected rate increase would be, and provided that already. He asked Joe if he feels that we need this extra layer of a motion because they might change it.

Joe said no. He expressed that we as a Commission might support renewal of the BID, but we as a Commission might want to stay at our \$5,206.00 a year. It's \$900.00, but we, as a body, need to have the discussion about an external organization making the request.

John asked, "If they changed their mind and the rate structure was different than the rate structure currently proposed, would we have an out?"

Joe said that, if MPC remains at the current rate structure, MPC can still support the BID.

Matt clarified that this would be possible because the government rates are negotiated differently than private.

John called for the question. The board voted for the Renewal/Expansion of the Downtown Business Improvement District of Missoula and the motion was unanimously approved.

Joe moved that the Missoula Parking Commission authorize staff to execute a petition authorizing the renewal of the Downtown Business Improvement District.

Pat Corrick seconded this motion.

Renewal/Expansion of the Downtown Business Improvement District of Missoula was unanimously approved.

- b. Missoula Ravalli Transportation Management Association FY2020 request for funding, \$6,000.00.

Joe moved MPC contributes \$6,000 to Missoula Ravalli Transportation Management Association as was approved in the annual budget. JR seconded this motion. Missoula Ravalli Transportation Management Association FY2020 request for funding was unanimously approved.

- c. MPC policy items

- i. Number of spaces per business

Matt moved to approve the new MPC policy regarding number of lease spaces available per business beginning July 1, 2019 no more than 8% of total MPC inventory. Joe seconded this motion.

Joe clarified that 8% is more than any business currently has. The 8% is of total inventory. For example, a business leases 75 of 100 spaces in one lot, which is less than 8%. Joe asked Tiffany if this is an appropriate circumstance. Tiffany answered yes. Joe asked how MPC would communicate to businesses the maximum number of lease spaces available to them. Tiffany answered by stating the policy. 8% of the MPC inventory is approximately 103 spaces. The Mercantile is the near the 8% cap. Joe asked if the 8% cap was chosen because it is beyond any business that exists now and not because it is an industry standard. Tiffany answered that it is based on our current inventory. 8% will provide more flexibility in the future.

Joe asked if this policy would prohibit MPC from overselling in lease locations. Tiffany answered no.

Matt asked if other parking commissions have this type of policy. Tiffany answered not that she is aware of.

Joe clarified the purpose of this policy is to allow for turnover and decrease waitlists. Tiffany explained that this policy is to address the need for turnover. Joe wanted to make it clear that this policy is not targeting any large users. Tiffany answered no it is not targeting large users; there is need for turnover. Tiffany stated that there are multiple businesses that are nearing the cap. Joe does not want large users or a single large user to be “targeted.”

Matt pointed out that the public perception is that there are a lot more spaces available than there actually are. This is because some large users are not using all their spots.

The motion was unanimously approved.

ii. Short-term lease transfer

This policy is an effort to better utilize spaces and allow others to use unoccupied spaces.

Matt asked how much extra work this is for the office. Tiffany answered very little.

Joe moved to update the MPC policy of short-term transfer of individual leases with the provision one through five are presented. JR seconded this motion. Short-term lease transfer policy update was unanimously approved.

iii. Immobilization fee increase

Matt moved to approve the new MPC policy regarding vehicle immobilization fee and increase it to \$75.00 beginning July 1, 2019. Joe seconded this motion.

Joe clarified language of the policy. Joe does not want the policy to include “revenue generator.” There is valid reasoning for the increase. It is not a fee for service, it is a fee for cost.

Immobilization fee increase was unanimously approved.

## **10. Non-action Items**

### **a. New Business**

Joe would like board discussion regarding the new director search. He would like the chair and the director to plan timing, job description, length of search, priorities in draft form. Tiffany answered that most of that information is already prepared for board presentation. It was completed when Rod announced his retirement. Tiffany will add information about the Master Plan. Tiffany will be meeting with the new HR Director, Kathy Crego, on June 17.

JR is concerned about a time lapse and would like to have a plan in place.

### **b. Old Business**

i. Downtown Master Plan

Discussion about goals for deep-dive meeting on June 20: Joe would like to have the most organized meeting possible. Tiffany suggested we go in with our direct expectations. The board should discuss concerns prior and take group messages to the deep-dive.

The meeting will be two hours with Dennis Burns, Dover Kohl & Partners, Jim Galipeau, Steering Team, and Technical Advisory Team.

John thinks that we should talk about individual revisions and concerns today. JR agreed that we should be on the same page internally.

Joe is concerned about the justification and the public response for expanding MPC jurisdiction south of the river. The Master Plan gives advice, but not why MPC should expand south of the river. Joe wants to see reasoning from the planners for why they drew these boundaries, benefits to the neighborhood, number of spaces, and what MPC does and does well. Matt thinks there needs to be a discussion with Dover Kohl about management of the area and the potential garage. There needs to be the ability to move parking from the street into a garage. Matt noted that Jason King publicly stated that he does not recommend meters on the street in the Hip Strip. Matt stated that meters have to happen when the garage is built.

John noted a lack of understanding of parking enforcement among businesses on the Hip Strip. John restated the notion as, "Until further parking development occurs we would not meter the streets in the Hip Strip."

Joe does not fully agree with this statement. He would like to see a recommendation for what metering the Hip Strip streets would do for usage and revenue. Meters were initially put in place to prevent employees from parking in front of a business for eight hours. Parking in the Hip Strip is currently use of a parking resource without covering the cost.

Tiffany stated that Dover Kohl does not advise not to implement meters. Matt would like to see the plan explain that meters are not a necessity, but they could be an improvement for parking in the Hip Strip.

Joe does not think that meters are contingent on a new garage. Tiffany explained that the plan proposes that in order to form the new parking district, a study has to be done. The chapter does not explain how to pay for expansion. MPC would not meter immediately if we were to obtain jurisdiction in the Hip Strip. First, MPC would enforce what already exists. This would allow us a chance to get to know the area and businesses.

Tiffany explained that MPC already has a process for forming new residential parking districts specifically laid out through city ordinance. This is not seen in the Master Plan. Matt asked if MPC has received any complaints about parking from home owners in the residential Hip Strip neighborhood. Tiffany answered no.

Joe suggested different language that is not so restrictive around metering in the Hip Strip. Tiffany responded that metering in the Hip Strip is not specifically in the plan, but more so has been discussed in meetings as a potential parking improvement. Matt thinks that we should challenge Jason on why he does not recommend meters.

Joe would like further explanation about the usage of terminology "occupancy" instead of "availability." Tiffany agreed and stated that the plan needs to note the study was performed in March.

Matt is concerned about the layout of districts and the combined private and public numbers. MPC does not manage private parking. Tiffany stated the percentage shows an overview, but does not help MPC overall.

John would like the plan to more clearly state that “a parking system is considered at effective capacity when it is 85% occupied during the peak time of day.” John thinks our biggest challenge is educating the public about how parking strategies work.

Another overall concern is the tiered priority and recommended strategies section. Tiffany asked if the request is to remove the priorities or reorganize them. Joe answered that we would like to eliminate the word “strategy” and the numbers. Joe suggested the three dots on PR 44 should be removed.

Strategy #2: The board would like to see language to justify expansion.

Strategy #3: Joe thinks it would be important to have review and study over next ten years for performance based pricing.

Tiffany explained that throughout the document it states that MPC’s turnover rates are affected by the size of our jurisdiction and the number of enforcement staff.

Joe asked if there is an opportunity for the Commission to write to the advisor of these recommendations if we feel they do not support our mission of parking equality, access, and service.

Tiffany believes that this is currently the rebuttal period. This is a community draft. Tiffany does not believe strategy #3 is a high priority.

Strategy #4: Joe agrees with truck loading zone strategy on PR 55. Tiffany agreed that we need more information about loading zones. The use of alleys as pedestrian spaces is a concern because of deliveries. The implementation of a different loading zone system may be useful, but the recommendation should be that this happens before any alley activation occurs.

Strategy #6: Tiffany wants to add information about snow removal practices and strategies.

Strategy #7 Scenario 2: Joe does not want the document to include reintroducing parking requirements.

Pat has talked to employers and businesses in the Downtown and has learned that they are struggling to bring in customers. He would like to see types of parking requirements before he says he can support it.

Matt encouraged others to submit questions to Tiffany to be sent to Dennis and Jason.

## **11. Setting of next meeting (July 11, 2019, Jack Reidy Conference Room) and adjournment**

Respectfully Submitted,

Zoe Walters  
Administrative Assistant II