



A Regular Board Meeting of the Missoula Parking Commission was virtually held on **Tuesday, September 14, 2021, at 12:00 p.m.** Those in attendance were Board members Joe Easton, Glenda Bradshaw, Peter Walker-Keleher, and JR Casillas. From the Missoula Parking Commission (MPC) were Ian Ortlieb, Parking Services Director, and Jodi Pilgrim, Parking Services Manager. Also in attendance Melanie Brock, Missoula Midtown Association and Brenda Peyton, JCCS.

1. **Call to order – Joe Easton**
2. **Introductions**
3. **Public Comments & Announcements** - None
4. **Adjustment(s) to the Agenda** - None
5. **Approval of Minutes**
 - a. Board Meeting held of August 10, 2021. Peter Walker-Keleher motioned to approve the minutes. Glenda Bradshaw seconded the motion. The minutes from August 10, 2021, were unanimously approved.
6. **Communications and Presentations**
 - a. **Midtown Master Plan, Melanie Brock, Missoula Midtown Association**

Melanie Brock is a representative of the Missoula Midtown Association. She is here to bring us up to date on what is happening with Midtown Master Plan.

Background – The association represents businesses and residents in the central area of Missoula called Midtown. They have set out to do a feasibility study and a strategic planning for Midtown as Missoula grows. What came out of that feasibility study was a request for a Midtown Master Plan. What they have lacked during rapid growth is certainty and predictability. They want the whole community to come together to determine what they want to see.

The Midtown Master Plan project goals are to create predictability for private investment, provide a voice for people who live, work, and utilize Midtown, promote equitable development, promote a sense of belonging, and to leverage local dollars to attract Federal infrastructure funding.

Areas of Study are people and equity, land use, connectivity – the East to West is an obvious challenge and it is difficult to get a kid from Playfair to the Fort, healthcare – Community Medical Center, infrastructure and parking, retail, housing, urban design, parks and recreation, culture, arts and history – making sure we are not losing the character with all the growth, and tourism. We have a Fort and Fair Grounds attracting tourists, but there are few places in the area for them to stay overnight.

The RFP will be issued next month.

Melanie was brought on board by the Midtown Association in February. The first goal of the white paper was to have paid staff. She will refine the scope and boundaries. They have a budget

of \$550,000.00. The next goal is to procure a team. Winter of 2021 through spring of 2022 will be time to plan and articulate a vision. Implementation is scheduled for fall of 2023.

Steering Committee Members include private developers, major employers, and partner organizations.

The hardest thing when getting started was defining the geographical boundaries to study. Urban Renewal District III (URD III) was the obvious answer. Each block that was added to that district for the product had to meet 12-point criteria. The recommended boundary is starting on Mount and going down to 39th including residential neighborhoods of Franklin to the Fort, Brooks to Bancroft on the southern side because they will be directly impacted by the changes happening – they want to be sure there is affordable housing, and 14th to Reserve.

For the \$550,000.00 budget, there is \$174,700.00 funding committed. Next month they are going to MRA to ask for help from URD III funds. They are getting funding through multiple private sectors, Missoula Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Mountain Line, and a whole list of others. They are hoping to get to \$200,000.00 prior to going to MRA.

They would love to talk with us about what would be beneficial for a community wide parking conversation to be included in this study. What could Parking Commission presence South of Mount Street look like and is there an appetite for that? They are planning a very extensive community involvement process in this. Melanie stated that she met with Ian and it is a great opportunity for MPC to look at and if there is funding involved, it would be possible. Funding for each aspect of the project will make it easier.

Melanie shared the Brooks Street word chart which showed auto-centric, great parking, scary to walk, fairgrounds, lacks green space, Southgate Mall, and growth. They want multi-modal transportation and to be more bike- ped- friendly.

Melanie finished by stating that they are in the process of securing funds so that they can issue the RFP in good faith.

Joe Easton asked Ian and Melanie to characterize the conversation they have had up to this point about Midtown which is outside of the parking district.

Ian Ortlieb noted that they discussed, basically, a condensed version of this presentation. They have a residential area butting right up against a growing commercial area. There is a ripple effect that could be seen in the residential area with growth of industry. The meeting circled around that parking piece and was primarily informational. Melanie followed up with it very much was a hypothetical. There have been multiple master plans in the area and so far none have included what Parking would look like South of the river. They just don't want to go further down the road without taking the opportunity to ask about parking.

Glenda Bradshaw appreciates the presentation. It does seem like it would be a missed opportunity not to put that question in to the charettes and meetings. Parking and transportation should be a huge piece of this – knowing what that would look like would be helpful. Is there room for managed parking and is there an appetite for that from the public? There is still room and space in the plan right now for that question. Maybe there should be a transportation hub there with parking and bus lines. We had a conversation in our last meeting about whether or not we should extend our boundaries. She would be interested in public feedback.

Joe asked Ian and the Board to remember that we contributed \$75,000.00 to the Downtown Master Plan. We did not make a contribution to the Hip Strip Master Plan because it was a continuation of

the Downtown Master Plan. He asked if Ian and Melanie discussed a dollar amount for contribution and if not, what would be a dollar amount to be considered by the Board. Ian stated that a dollar amount was not discussed. Melanie explained that they just wanted to bring it to MPC as a presentation at this point. They did not discuss a dollar amount.

Joe's goal in contributing and having the question asked and answered through the Master Plan would be first property owners or developers or other public agencies appetite for having managed parking. For him that is parking managed for the public benefit by the Missoula Parking Commission. He is open to a contribution to the master planning but asked for comment from other Board members.

Peter Walker-Keleher asked Joe if he is recommending to Mel that as a part of their scope of study that it would specifically answer the question of managed parking as it relates to the MPC.

Joe said yes and stated that several shoes have to drop before MPC could manage parking in that area and Ian is taking steps to do that. It all depends on the dollar amount we are asked to contribute if our district is not going to be expanded South of the river. He would be interested in a contribution in a lower amount just to forward the public good.

Peter recognized as Mel spoke that his instinct would be to leave MPC completely out of the RFP and really focus on function and the appetite of business owners and property owners for managed parking. Leaving MPC out of it allows the public to determine what managed parking would be desired for Midtown. Once that is determined, it may point to MPC, but it may point in a completely different direction.

JR Casillas echoed that. With respect to the Hip Strip plan there was a focus on appetite for managed parking and concerns. At the end of that process, it was kind of a mixed bag. Some wanted expansion of the jurisdiction and some did not. It was helpful in identifying the situation to let us make intelligent decisions about whether we should be involved.

Mel agrees that setting the conversation up that way would be more palatable.

Glenda totally agrees and is interested in seeing what comes out of the conversation around parking. Leaving MPC out of it makes the most sense.

Peter still thinks it would be super valuable for the team that is selected to consult with Ian or others with the expertise that are affiliated with MPC. He believes that just as a focus item or bringing attention to MPC by name would be a mis-step.

Joe stated a willingness to participate and financially participate. He asked Ian to look at the budget and work with Mel to come up with a dollar figure.

Ian will look at it. He thinks it is good to come up with something to further the work of the greater good with this.

Mel stated that there will be a Technical Advisory Committee launching and she will let Ian know when it is happening. The feedback has been helpful.

7. Financial Statement

a. JCCS Monthly Financial Review

Brenda Peyton does not have updated financials this month. She explained that we have been working through the budget and she will get those worked up shortly for everyone.

Joe asked Ian and Brenda if there is anything that has come up – any red flags.

Ian wanted to note that the delay was on our part. We noticed some allocation issues between the City and JCCS, so we have been clearing that up.

There were no questions from the Commission.

8. Director's Report – Ian Ortlieb

Ian wanted to update the group on expansion of the jurisdiction. It was recommended to form a work group. Leading that group would be a group charter. He is currently working on drafting that group charter. They will start looking at forming a group to look at expansion on the River Triangle and the Hip Strip.

Modem replacement has been completed. There was some communication that caused issue for a few people. Kudos to the admins and maintenance for getting it resolved efficiently.

When the budget was adopted by the City, we started to form the FY22 budget worksheet for JCCS. There were some areas where we know we will have increases in expenditures, like Bank Street repairs. We are hoping to improve the turn around time for JCCS. We are refining our reconciling process.

We are in the process of starting a recruitment for the Administrative Assistant II position. We are hoping to find a good quality candidate that can increase our customer service.

There were no questions.

Joe explained that he and Ian have been working on determining the level of communication necessary for Board level.

Glenda asked if there is any sort of report of when we may anticipate some of the surface parking being returned to the public from the ongoing construction East of Higgins and the hotels. East of trailhead and Dram Shop is primarily leased parking and it is quite difficult to park in that area. Could we take a look at that and if anything could be done for to get that parking back or if it is just as much parking as the construction crews want for as long as they want. Ian asked for clarification on the area. Glenda clarified it is the area North of the river and East of Higgins – on Front and Main to the Madison Bridge.

Ian stated that a question came up on the Front and Main conversion meeting. The main issue in that area was parking in that area and how difficult it is to find parking there. We have not looked into it too far as of yet, but there may be some opportunity.

Peter asked about the desired composition of the internal working group for expansion of the jurisdiction. Ian stated it would likely be an internal City group to determine the policies and procedures. The group charter will shape the strategic goal. There will be some level of stakeholder engagement after that. It will be about policy and procedure as it relates to the City.

Peter asked about the Missoulain project. What are Ian's plan to engage with that project as it goes through the re-zoning process? Ian has reached out to Cole Bergquist about that project. The process is moving forward and the conversation has been started with him on what future planning will look like in terms of that site.

JR Casillas stated that they are representing Bergquist on that development and would be happy to facilitate conversations.

9. Action Items

a. Midtown Lot Lease Agreement

The Midtown lease that we have with the France's expires at the end of September. Currently we house 16 parkers in that lot. It is wise on our part to continue that lease. Ian has been in communication with Tim France. Tim is concerned about the cost of the lot increasing based on growing taxes. He negotiated for rent to be adjusted to \$750.00/month. The lease agreement has been redrafted to reflect this new rent amount and includes a stipulation that we would review any property tax increase or decrease and adjust the rent accordingly.

Joe explained that we have been leasing and managing this lot. This would be a new lease for the same area. Joe is prepared to support it. All the spots in there are currently leased up and it is inventory for us.

JR Casillas asked about the lot cost analysis. What is the current rent? \$550.00?

Ian stated \$550.00/month paid out on a quarterly basis was the prior rent.

Peter asked if the Board should be reviewing all leases. Joe stated that the Board only reviews new leases.

JR thinks the language in there about potential increases or decreases based on additional information is probably not enforceable. It is an agreement to agree because we don't know what that looks like. It is only enforceable if it is more specific with dollar amounts and percentages. He is not suggesting it be removed and is sure that both parties will negotiate in good faith.

Peter moved to approve the lease agreement as proposed. JR seconded the motion.

There was no further comment or discussion on the motion.

The motion to approve the lease agreement as proposed was unanimously approved.

10. Non-action Items

a. New Business

b. Old Business

i. Contractor Code discussion – Data from Peer Review

Ian explained that a few meetings ago an analysis of parking construction codes was requested.

Ian stated that we currently charge \$10.00/space/day. We did a peer analysis of similar cities. All of that information was detailed in the Directors' report. We are middle of the road. Some are working to get up to where we are (Helena) and some are way above (Salt Lake City).

There was also a request to determine our daily/space revenue. It was determined to be \$3.21 for 2021. \$10 is still much below our daily max, but much above the daily average.

Glenda asked if we have a maximum number of days or number of spots a contractor can utilize. She wants to make sure the employees and residents are being considered. Some construction seems to be going on forever.

Ian explained that he only looked at the financial side so far but would be happy to look at it with a more qualitative lens. there are a few cities that set escalation for on-going projects. He highlighted how some other City's navigate that.

Peter added a comment that Glenda brought up a great point. It kind of comes down to concentration of the impact. It seems like it may be important for us to revisit this. If there is a construction project going on for 6 months – maybe they should be dispersed. When things are short is supply, the value goes up. He is in favor of us being on the high end.

Ian added the way in which our zones are set up, pulling good data on one set block face is difficult to do. Getting a space inventory by block face, we could make some reasonable assumptions about people parking in the specified area. There is a difference in impact based on location but having localized shortages due to construction impact is worth taking a look at.

Joe mentioned that we do not have a Vice Chair of this Commission. He would like to elect Glenda if no one is opposed. Peter approved. Glenda accepted. There were no objections.

11. Setting of next meeting (October 12, 2021, Jack Reidy Conference Room or via virtual meeting) and adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Jodi Pilgrim
Parking Services Manager