



A Regular Board Meeting of the Missoula Parking Commission was virtually held on **Tuesday, January 11, 2022, at 12:00 p.m.** Those in attendance were Board members Joe Easton, Pat Corrick, 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 were Brenda Peyton, JCCS; Aaron Wilson, Infrastructure and Mobility Planning Manager; Katherine Auge, Missoula In Motion.

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 November 9, 2021. Peter Walker-Keleher motioned to approve the minutes. JR Casillas seconded the motion. The minutes from November 9, 2021, were unanimously approved.

6. **Communications and Presentations**

- a. **Transportation Options Action Plan (30 minutes) – Aaron Wilson, Infrastructure and Mobility Planning Manager**

Aaron Wilson's team works on transportation options or transportation demand management (TDM), which is the transportation education, outreach, and the behavioral side of transportation. They kicked off a planning process for a transportation options action plan about six months ago. It is focused on the education, outreach, and programmatic side of transportation. They are midway through, and he is here to give an update. Aaron shared a slide show.

Transportation options are education and outreach (wayfinding, transportation classes, and hands-on engagement), incentives (free transit, bikeshare membership, mobility wallets, incentives and rewards, guaranteed ride home), policies (parking management), technology (ride-matching services, gamification, transit apps), and small-scale infrastructure (transit stop improvements, bike parking, curb space management). The need for this project starts with existing policy directives at the MPO level. The City Growth Policy calls for accommodating new growth and redevelopment by providing transportation options to maximize the use of our infrastructure and more effective planning for the effects of parking, accessibility, and transit. The Long Range Transportation Plan calls for improving the safety and convenience of biking and walking, connecting destinations with travel options, and increasing access to high-quality and high-frequency transit stops and routes.

Existing policy directives aim to reduce drive-alone commute share to 34% by 2045, reduce drive-alone commute trips by 20,000 by 2045, triple bike and walk shares, and quadruple transit share by 2045.

The existing transportation options programs in the City are through Missoula In Motion, MPC, Missoula Ravalli Transportation Management Association (MRTMA), UM ASUM Office of Transportation, Mountain Line Community Outreach Specialists, and Free cycles. Missoula is often used as an example for other cities. There is a good foundation to build on for this plan.

Missoula is growing, and we need creative ways to use existing infrastructure. The majority of Missoulians drive alone to work. The plan's needs are also linked to affordability and City's climate action plans. There are currently limited policy tools to encourage people to adopt the goals.

This project will explore three things – Transportation Options Programs, Incentives and Requirements, and Districts and Partnerships.

In this action plan, they want to develop a tool to guide City staff and Partners with the goals of equity, flexibility, ease of implementation, clear and objective requirements, and collaboration. To develop this tool, they will assess the City's existing parking requirements – look at a comprehensive TDM approach and make priority code amendment recommendations.

The project will help attract and retain tenants and employees, reduce congestion and traffic, promote sustainability, improve community health and wellness, enhance equity and choices, and decrease development costs.

To date, engagement has consisted of a steering committee that functions as a sounding board and a functional workgroup that advises on City processes. The steering committee and functional workgroup will form the Project Management Team. Stakeholders will advise the Project Management Team by identifying issues. The first stakeholder focus group took place in the fall of 2021. They introduced the project and identified key issues and opportunities. The second meeting will take place in the winter of 2022, and they will be looking for feedback on proposed strategies.

The themes that came out of the stakeholder meetings were normalizing transportation options, providing targeted outreach and service, providing more targeted travel training, and helping residents and employees reduce vehicle ownership/driving through additional options and amenities. Ideas for requirements and incentives were fees and other incentives, incentivize affordable housing, remove parking minimums; institute maximums, update bike parking requirements, and implementation considerations.

Peter asked if this is a list of ideas or if there is broad agreement among stakeholders on these items, specifically with development and parking requirements. Aaron responded there is not broad agreement at this time. There is agreement that it is worth pursuing, but not what it looks like at the end of the day.

In the discussion of corridors and partnerships, stakeholders believe that there is a need to connect developing corridors and districts, explore paid parking districts outside of downtown, parking downtown needs to be more dynamic, and explore district-based and daily parking downtown.

Other stakeholder ideas were to connect land use and transportation, safety barriers limit transportation options, staff capacity and funding, and unintended consequences.

The PMT has started to make progress on their best practice review and peer frameworks. They aim to provide a brief description of the strategy and the benefits, general implementation details, challenges, metrics for success, and peer examples.

The next steps are preparing for the next round of steering committee meetings. Looking for a final plan in summer or early fall. The total project length is 8-9 months.

Evaluation will consider if the tool is right-sized for Missoula, collaborative, flexible, clear and objective, equitable, effective, if there is the capacity to implement, and the cost to implement.

Joe Easton requested that any conversation about changing policy or approach with regard to parking (example: changing leases from monthly to daily) would have Ian or Jodi in the room during those discussions and have the information brought to the Board before moving into a public approval process. Aaron said as they are establishing recommendations, they will bring those to Ian.

Peter is excited to know that work is underway. He asked if Aaron could be explicit in the role or opportunities the MPC could play to best support this ongoing work. Aaron responded that from a policy standpoint – things like how are lease spaces being managed, how is curb space managed, and how that relates to other modes like car share, being a partner in planning for those types of things. Expansion of the district relates to this. Think about districts – one or more Downtown districts - having MPC involved in those as a key partner is essential.

JR asked about the mobility wallet. In Portland, they had ones tied to people that lived in affordable housing. What are those wallets/apps? Aaron hasn't used one but has read about them. In Portland, they were working on a mobility wallet where you can go to car share, bike share, ride share with all one service you subscribe to. They were offering parking buyouts to get funds toward mobility services. One service in the mobility wallet could be parking pass.

There were no further questions. Aaron will come back when they start to get into recommendations. This will be more of an action plan.

Joe summarized his request. Whenever parking is discussed, please have someone from the commission in the room.

7. Financial Statement

a. JCCS November Monthly Financial Review

The financials are in draft form until the audit is completed. There is not a lot of movement in assets or liabilities. Cash has been steady over the years. The revenue numbers for November and the year to date are good. Short-term revenue is up 25% over budget and up 28% compared to the prior year; lease revenue is 4% ahead of budget and 16% ahead of last year. On the expense side, we are 9% below budget. We are 18% over last year, but that is to be expected because of the reduced expenses last year. This month, professional fees are a bit higher due to a payment on the audit and recognizing six weeks of security expense. There was a \$3000.00 sprinkler repair at Bank Street and a snowplow purchase of \$8000.00. Net income for the month of November is at a loss of \$30,000.00. Year-to-date income is \$54,000.00 compared to a projected loss of \$157,000.00. There is not a lot of movement in our top ten revenue and expense accounts. Leases will spike in December. For cash and long-term debt, there is nothing to note.

Joe stated this is not outside of expectations for the winter months. He asked about the audit document that was provided to the Board. Ian stated that it is just for their review, and Anderson ZurMuehlen will present the audit in a future Board meeting.

8. Director's Report – Ian Ortlieb

We are working with HR to fill our open Parking Enforcement Officer position. We are in the reference check portion of the process.

Ian sent out our Passport contract, which included a facilitation amendment. Rates and terms did not change, but there was some added language.

Ian noted we had our kickoff ROAM condo association meeting. In the first meeting, we discussed dues coming up for FY22. MPC agreed to pay some condo association dues. We have to work with some of

the numbers provided, specifically electricity cost. We sent the plans for the ROAM garage to McKinstry to get an estimate for electricity for our section of the garage. The estimate will be considered for how much MPC will pay in dues. The condo board is also working on getting the study for the reserve fund. Peter asked Pat if there is any involvement with Farran Group. Pat responded that they still review the asset management for the ownership group and have a small ownership percentage in the ownership group. He should not vote on anything related to ROAM or the condo association.

Ian noted there is an action item regarding the sub-station rebuild next to the Riverside Lot. We have discussed some costs for the parking lot rental with Northwestern Energy. The draft lease agreement was included in the Board documents, and we'll discuss it in action items.

We continue to conduct occupancy studies so we can provide recommendations on managing our lease areas. Joe asked to confirm that the occupancy table is for 2021. Ian confirmed.

9. Action Items

a. Northwestern Energy Parking Lot Use Agreement

The sub-station rebuild project is scheduled for February 2022 – November 2022. Initially, they wanted six spaces adjacent to the substation within our Riverside Lot. They also want to use the Sletten Construction area when Sletten vacates. In all, it is a loss of 6 spaces. Ian feels confident that we have the room and availability to help them do that. We used our standard contractor cost of \$10/space/day in the agreement.

Joe asked about the Bridge project - how long will Sletten stay? Ian answered that they should be out by June. They have already started moving things out. Joe asked Ian to touch base with them. He doesn't know the Famers Market expectation. Ian explained that the Clark Fork Market would like to continue using the Caras Lot instead of moving back to the Riverside Lot.

Another concern Joe has is foresight for an expectation of when the lease can no longer be extended. He asked what are the conditions that would allow it to be extended. Ian stated that they would need to be out before November 30. If they can't be out by then, he would recommend that we extend it out. It would be a discussion closer to that November 30 date.

Ian noted that he sent this draft agreement over to Northwestern Energy, and we have run it through the City Attorney's office. No issues have come up to date.

Peter moved that MPC support the execution of the Northwestern Energy Parking Lot Use Agreement. JR seconded the motion. JR also suggested something to the effect of we support execution of the agreement subject to final review and approval by the City's legal team. Peter amended the motion to MPC supports execution of the agreement as written and, if there are changes, would support execution of the agreement pending review by the City Attorney. There was no further discussion. Through a roll-call vote, the motion was unanimously approved.

Joe asked Jodi and Ian for a draft of suggested motion language in the future.

b. City Granted Utility Easement- Northwestern Energy Overhead East Caras Park

Part of the Northwestern Energy project includes a public utility easement agreement. This relates to where the placement of the power poles will go. There is a light post in the parking lot that could be impacted. Parks and Recreation is seeking MPC recommend approval of an overhead utility easement over the lot. Ian wanted to note that within that utility easement, Northwestern Energy needs to return everything back to original condition.

Joe asked if this language needs to be added to the contract that was just approved or if it is a separate thing. Ian clarified that this is separate. Parks and Recreation is seeking MPC recommendation to send to the Mayor and City Council for this utility easement.

Peter asked who has reviewed this in detail. Ian stated that he has reviewed it. It is an easement coming out of Parks and Recreation. He felt it was worth mentioning with the potential conflict with the light pole in the Riverside Lot. Joe asked if this is an action item. Ian explained that Parks is seeking a recommendation from the Parking Commission Board. Joe does not believe there is anything to object to. Peter said Ian can just say it "looks good" and approve it.

JR assumes this will be reviewed by the City Attorney's Office. There is no indemnification language in it. Joe stated that the commission reviewed it, and there are no objections.

10. Non-action Items

a. New Business

i. Waitlist Policy discussion

After reviewing, MPC does not really have a written policy. We have a working procedural document that guides our internal staff on the process of waitlist management. We need to make some refinements to be a little more evenly spread. Ian performed a peer review with cities that have waitlists. It seems we're not operating outside of the norm where it is a first-come, first-served. Bozeman has a policy that does not allow bulk permit sales. Pat asked if any other cities have written waitlist policies. Ian answered no. The guiding policy for Bozeman was their permit policy. Ian noted that this conversation came up before his time with some refinement suggestions. He would like to circle back and resolve that.

Joe stated that in the recent past, managing our waitlist has become difficult and not reflective of the demand and our efficiencies and use of our existing spaces. He directed MPC to bring a draft policy to the Board that meets MPC occupancy goals.

Pat agrees that we need a formal waitlist policy. It would assist in clarifying how staff manages the waitlist. Pat asked, in the first paragraph of the procedures, it says skip to selling – is that the awarding lease spaces section? On bullet point 3, he would like to add that if they do not respond, they go to the back of the waitlist.

Joe encouraged Ian and Jodi to work with MDA and to bring in a policy recommendation. It may cause consternation, so we need stakeholder engagement. JR agrees. Peter wants to throw out the possibility of bringing in a consultant. There could be a good return on investment in collaborating with a specialist. There was no further discussion.

b. Old Business

11. Setting of next meeting (February 8, 2022, Jack Reidy Conference Room or via virtual meeting) and adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Jodi Pilgrim
Parking Services Manager