



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Parking and Traffic Management Task Force

Wednesday, August 10, 2016

4:00 PM

City Hall
701 E. Broadway
Conference Room 1A

I. CALL TO ORDER

Staff:

Leah Christian
Drew Brooks
Tanner Morrell
Matt Gerike

Members of the Public:

Katie Essing
Ian Thomas
Gary Shallito
Alvin Cobbins

Meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Mike Trapp.

Present: 15 - Gregory Cecil, Michael McClung, Michael Sokoff, Sarah Klaassen, John Clark, Karl Skala, Michael Trapp, Chuck Graham, Jason Patrie, Mark Stevenson, Kenny Kvam, Deb Sheals, Katherine Lee, Saad Malik and Annette Triplett

Absent: 2 - Janet Hammen and Cindy Neagle

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mike McClung made a motion to accept the agenda
Kenny Kvam gave the second.
Motion passed.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Draft Minutes 7-27-16

Attachments: [DRAFT Meeting Minutes 7-27-16](#)

John Clark further stated that although the minimum requirements for meeting minutes as set out require only start and end time, motions and seconds, and items for consideration, that we should, in the interest of transparency, construe the state law generously and not just adhere to the minimum requirements. Mike Trapp said he felt the task force would find the minutes robust.

John Clark made the motion to approve the minutes.
Kenny Kvam gave the second.
Motion passed.

IV. REVIEW OF DOWNTOWN PARKING MAP

<http://www.como.gov/Maps/cityparking/>

Mike Gerike - City of Columbia GIS - Review of downtown parking map - presentation with Task Force discussion regarding maps, apps, accessible parking, interactive map features.

John Clark is interested in the private (purple on map) surface - he would like to know how much of downtown is occupied by surface parking. He considers we have too much surface parking downtown. The goal for the future should be to have some of that space be more productive for providing jobs and taxes. Leah asked if he is interested in the ratio of private/public spaces.

Clark would like to know the number of spaces to businesses AND the percentage of the surface that is dedicated to parking. He would like absolute numbers concerning what is built and what is the surface parking, including the building environment (parking and structures). Leah mentioned that other cities use square footage of building space to see how much space for parking is needed. Leah said she would be willing to work with John to look at that.

Deb Sheals - Asks if there is data on how many permits are available. Are there permits for city garages available? Tanner noted there is data available. Drew Brooks said it is on the parking website - what each garage capacity is. Deb would like to know how many permits are sold and how many are still available. Tanner answered that they are sold out. There are no more permits available to be sold (with the exception of the permits available for the on-street parking in the North Central area adjacent to downtown).

Chuck Graham would like to look at the policies and procedures and the types of wait lists we have for these permits. He has spoken to business owners downtown and there is a wait list. Some business owners have been on the wait list for several years. Some of the lists allow for others to buy the permits and the small business owners can't get their permits. Downtown business owners are kept from getting in the loop. Some developers are buying them and that keeps them away from the downtown business owners. Some of the permits are purchased for \$35.00 and then sold to the developers for \$75.00. Chuck would like to see who is on the waiting list, what categories of people they are (business owners, etc.) and how long they have been on the waiting list. Leah mentioned that other cities have requirements for who gets the parking permits. Mike McClung said this was discussed at CID - that some businesses have been waiting for years and they haven't been able to get permits. Suggested that business should have some type of priority.

A strong note and suggestion is that this, above, will be an item of discussion for this Task Force.

John Clark asks who we want to be serving. Chuck Graham asks how it is allowed they can be re-sold as buying them for \$35.00 and then selling them for \$75.00 amounts to subsidizing a private profit margin.

Kenney Kvam asks if the demand is so huge do we look at building more parking garages? Mark Stevenson asks how would we fund the parking garages? Mike Trapp asks how does the parking utility determine when we need to add more parking? Tanner stated a consultant comes in to do a study. Mike asks when the last time that took place. Tanner advised that is was with the Short Street garage in 2009. Procedure in the past has been that the idea is brought up and a consultant is brought in.

Jason Patrie would like to look at the process of looking at the market value of the spots - it could be warranted, but how is the price adjusted? If they are bought by the developer, is there a review of what the pricing is?

Mike McClung says there is a parking utility we're trying to meet - need to determine who we are going to serve. We set enterprise rates to recover costs - rather than based on the market. Deb Sheals noted that if someone wants to move their office from downtown then they don't have to pay. Mike Trapp noted that rates for parking have been raised about every year. Chuck Graham asks what is the policy and procedure for this.

Tanner mentioned the 10 hour meters with the available technology to pay by phone - parkmobile.

Deb Sheals asks where is the lower occupancy? CID is looking at this. Some of the parking is across Providence which is a barrier for some.

John Clark further probed into an item mentioned earlier by parking staff, concerning one parking garage is nearly empty at 1700 and another one is long term parking. Tanner mentioned that at the 10th and Cherry garage - 75% of parking is Brookside. Students park there all week and take their cars out at the weekend. Businesses would like to have people be able to park - Clark mentioned targeted ends that there should be Council directed policies. We now have some of the tools. He is appalled that we've approved residential units downtown and they make money from it. Parking requirements were not in the MDT area (downtown). He states we need to get some sense of how to grab this.

More parking garages may not be the answer, however Clark says surface storage could be replaced with garages - perhaps not downtown, but not far away.

Consideration of parking garages away from downtown, and use transit shuttles.

Jason mentions consolidation should be considered to use bike/ped ways, bike

spaces and bike storage in conjunction with the above potential solution.

Mike Trapp brought up the discussion on MDT. The P & Z was given a reprieve of their deadline. Recommendations are to be finalized in October, which gives this Task Force a little extra time, but our recommendations on MDT parking should be out before that so that they can be incorporated into their work.

V. DISCUSSION

Downtown Residential Parking Requirements and Fee in Lieu Programs

Attachments: [Residential Parking Requirements & Waivers](#)
[Transportation Development Charge](#)

John Clark sent out some payment information - how much it costs for parking spaces. The decision would be how to come about a decision for the parking requirement or a fee in lieu. He pointed out that in the MDT the concerns only residential and there is nothing in the MDT for commercial. Downtown is not included. He doesn't think we should do anything about only residential. P & Z should be told about the other sectors.

Discussion ensued between Mike Trapp and John Clark regarding if C2 does not require or allow surface parking. The parties were unsure if it was a requirement or allowed. Clark would like a clarification from legal.

Clark restated that not having anything in MDT is problematic. There is no parking requirement for commercial development.

Discussion if we will keep the quarter parking space per bedroom (Leah)

Mike McClung mentions two things:

1. Is it more effective to let the city build parking or the individual developers build it and what would the ramifications of those options be? He mentioned the city would do better with esthetics, and therefore he thinks the city should do it.
2. How would the money be used and what would that mix be? Would the mix be a live or static number? How much to parking utility, vs how much to other (transit)?

Saad said the main concern is that we do have $\frac{1}{4}$ space per bedroom. For student housing - if they are renting per bedroom it might increase volume of cars at that property as opposed to single rent spaces (not the bedroom, but the unit itself). A 4 bedroom apt. is then like a 4 family house.

Jason said Fort Collins did differentiate - they had a structure for that. It was separated based on whether it was rented by the bedroom or by the apartment.

Kenny Kvam said the developer has to decide then if he is going to build more parking spots for a 4 bed apartment or if he will opt out. The developer might think the best investment will be go half for the unit and the rest elsewhere. Times could change and the developer could consider not wanting to invest in a lot of parking if future prospects could show there isn't a need/demand.

Karl Skala says as he's listening to the discussion that it seems we're not starting with zero, but we are looking ahead to new development. Things to consider:

- Differentiate between residential and commercial, high density college students, vs standard residential.
- The direction could be some sort of hybrid approach.
- Some of the developments have certain requirements or ability to build a certain number of spaces, yet they have an obligation for their warehouse arrangements. This is a direction we might have to consider - having some on site requirement at some level and also a requirement for overflow for warehousing - some sort of parking system you pay for (fee in lieu).

Mike Trapp mentioned that for warehousing downtown may not be where we want to warehouse/store. If Brookside is using the garages for warehousing they could go to a different location and then use transit.

Deb Sheals - Mentions the timing is crucially important. What we have now is not just insufficient - it is non-existent. We must look carefully at how we time this. We can't have 100 bedrooms added and then people don't supply the parking. This has to be done now.

John Clark - Mentions that fee in lieu would not be for building parking garages. He says we have parking meters on our neighborhood streets due to development. He wants money to pay for the enforcement for Benton-Stephens and other affected areas. How do we pay for parking enforcement so we can have a larger area? How do we get people downtown - use alternative means of transportation? Different aspects to it - use the fees to subsidize the transit system. He mentions parking permit plans and a funding source that is not based on more collection and meters and fines. Long term transportation plans need to be addressed. Who are those in need? Employees, business, etc. If we sink big money into garages then we are stuck in a dead end for downtown. Clark wants to see how we get people

into, around and out of downtown. The $\frac{1}{4}$ space requirement is part of an auto-centric development plan. It guarantees we'll have to build more parking because we will have more cars downtown. How will we attract people to come to downtown? Would we build a 10 story parking garage outside of downtown and then provide a shuttle/driver to get people back?

Chuck Graham disagrees with John. He thinks fee in lieu doesn't work. Developers will make it a part of their business plan and will pass it out to their renters/students. Chuck thinks it should be included and there are ideas without building garages. It feels like there is unlimited growth, but there will not always be a market for that. Future trends should be considered. Many of these buildings could end up transitioning to senior housing. Students will be taking more and more on line classes in the future so the trend will be to a changing demographic and that needs to be considered. Additionally, from a disabilities standpoint the parking needs to be closer. Shuttles back and forth for disabled and potentially elderly residents in the future could be difficult. Think 10-20 years in the future to see what this will look like.

Kenny Kvam thought MU might have more people. Saad believes for now and the future the students want and will need cars. Deb Sheals says this is a huge issue we are struggling with. What will happen with the future, but we also need to see where we are right now. The Central Business District was founded on communal parking models, and centralized parking. That worked until the residential development came about. Now this is in danger of damaging businesses downtown. Nobody can get a parking permit. There needs to be a way to figure out how to manage to protect the businesses downtown. If the employees can't get to work then the stores will be gone and the people who live in the downtown will have no place to go.

Mike Trapp brings the discussion to consider what process do we need to move forward? Is there any information we need brought to us before we enter into our next discussions? What are proposals as the Task Force moves forward.

Mike McClung would like to know what it really costs the city to produce a parking spot. Is it still profitable to produce a garage/public parking?

Leah mentions different cities go about making those assumptions in different ways. Some are from parking utility. Considerations are given to occupancy rate, commercial and residential requirements, historical data etc. Example: Naperville, IL.

John Clark states he is leaning more toward what Chuck Graham said - about internalizing costs. Going forward, somebody is going to build. The public will not subsidize. If you want to build downtown you need to figure out how you are going to build parking. The key is to internalizing the costs in these developments. John

would also like to hear more from Deb Sheals about protecting the businesses downtown. Can we revoke the spaces sold to the developers? (answer - no, the city would not do that). The focus should be on public parking downtown to serve a specified group of people and that group of people is not residents downtown. Future developers will need to figure out how to handle the parking so downtown can be protected.

Karl Skala - would like to see an idea and strategy to go forward - looking at other's failures and successes can be helpful. We have benchmark cities to consider. Fort Collins has no parking meters, wide streets. We, in Columbia, are not alone in being descended upon by students and residential. How have other places worked with it. Considerations: Students vs. regular residential, commercial vs. residential, looking to the future. These should be put in context of what others have done. Some are not unique. This could be a helpful framework to continue this discussion. Concern that we are getting egocentric about Columbia and the downtown area. We need more context.

Deb Sheals - totally agrees with Karl. Look into ways to restructure parking permits. Tanner adds that by ordinance parking is not allowed overnight in lots or garages. If that was enforced then that could solve part of the issue. There are ways to manage the demands so businesses can get space. The market will find the solutions for the students.

Chuck Graham mentions we should work on a prioritization list - who are the people who need priority parking. We in Columbia also have unique needs. Downtown includes the city, major university, courthouse, businesses, residential . It is good to look at other examples, but we need to consider our unique needs and look at our users. How do we prioritize the assignment of parking (by garages etc.)? Certain garages are critical for a thriving downtown. This is one of the greatest things we market about Columbia - our downtown.

Annette Triplett mentions the Smart Growth parking audit. She asks didn't they find we had adequate parking so is the issue one of needed more spaces for larger demand or is it more enforcement of those spaces we do have. Trapp mentioned there is ample parking, but it might involve moving several blocks to get where it is.

Further discussion - What does it cost to create a space - if we were to do in fee in lieu - what is the actual value? McClung - and on top of that - not everything is 100 bedrooms. We don't want to create a perverse incentive.

Moving forward Task Force will look at fee in lieu programs and then have a discussion. Mike Trapp suggests a presentation on fee in lieu would be helpful. Clark says we should go more in depth on one subject and then have further discussion.

Karl comments on Chuck's comment in dealing with priority. The priority would be a partial solution to distribute the parking spaces equitably.

Mike Trapp asked Greg Cecil about the downtown churches concerns for Sunday a.m. parking. There are concerns as the students will be back, Shakespeares will be open, there is construction, and a lot of parking meters are bagged. Mike and Greg will discuss this situation and how to bring up.

VI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

Ian Thomas - likes the idea of vigorous analysis of the true cost of building and maintaining parking. Factors to consider are bond interest, lost property and sales tax. Cost can be between 25-50 thousand per space. The \$75.00 parking fee doesn't come close. Further, adequate enforcement is not done. There is the concern if we were to take away parking then the students would park somewhere else and take up spots they shouldn't take. If enforcement was funded that would help that issue. We should have well enforced parking in neighborhoods. One of the main recommendations of Smart Growth was that we must have good enforcement. The developers couldn't avoid building parking if they thought their people needed the spaces.

Alvin Cobbins from the Vision Commission. They had a public meeting downtown. A concern was about accessible parking. The question arose if the city feels it has met the need for accessible parking according to state and federal guidelines? Chuck Graham said he will discuss these things with Alvin and invited Alvin to the Disabilities Commission Meeting.

Saad mentioned, when questioned, that students would find a place to put their cars - whether it was 3-4 miles away or where ever. He thinks people might not care about limited parking. They would just pay the fines. Leah mentioned that data to back up that thought should be brought up. Saad further stated that students shouldn't be ostracized - they have parking and then suddenly that is taken from them.

Clark said if student housing hadn't exploded, if we had grown more slowly it would have been better. As is now we are subsidizing that housing.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

**Mike McClung made a motion to adjourn at 5:30.
Kenny Kvam had the second.
Meeting adjourned.**

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-7214. In order to assist staff in making the appropriate arrangements for your accommodation, please make your request as far in advance of the posted meeting date as possible.

