



Meeting Minutes
Municipal Parking Utility Board

Wednesday, January 22, 2014

4:00 PM

3rd Floor Conference Room

Call to Order, Roll Call

Present: 9 - Audrey Kader, Richard Swantz, James Cherf, Andrew Gavrilos, Robin Moses, Leah Mudler, Michael C. Pieper, James Warsinske, Dan Wettstein

Absent: 2 - Joe Ledvina, Bill Sacia

Agenda Items:

Approval of Minutes

Cherf/Mudler moved to approve minutes of November 27, 2013. Carried.

Code of Ethics Annual Review

Chair confirmed that all members reviewed and understood the Code of Ethics.

[14-0069](#)

Parking Utility Report - Police (December 2013)

A motion was made by Cherf, seconded by Swantz, that this Report be RECEIVED AND FILED. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

[14-0072](#)

Parking Utility Report - Public Works (January 2014)

A motion was made by Swantz, seconded by Cherf, that this Report be RECEIVED AND FILED. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

[14-0073](#)

Access Card Policy

Cherf/Swantz moved to approve. Concern was expressed with #4 of the proposed policy regarding issuance of a duplicate card for someone who wishes to share a stall, as there could be potential for abuse of the policy. If someone wants to share, they should make arrangements to swap it themselves. In response, it was stated that the machines will be programmed that only one possessor of the card can access/enter, as the card has a unique ID number assigned to it. Warsinske/Cherf moved to amend #4 to add that duplicate cards with the same card ID number shall be given to persons sharing the same stall. Carried. A motion was made by Swantz, seconded by Gavrilos, that this General Item be APPROVED AS AMENDED. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

[14-0074](#)

Fee for parking in ramps, on street, and on evenings and weekends

Subgroup met and returned six scenarios which are before this committee. They did not take into account increasing lease rates; focus was on parking metered fees. Proposal #1 was first recommended by the Parking Utility Board, which was insufficient to pay for debt. Projections were made using as much data as possible. Subgroup didn't have consensus. In the spreadsheet is only operating costs; there's a lot more behind the expenses. Subgroup looked at trying to make \$100,000 so users pay and not the entire city. We're a long way from breaking even. We have to make leases attractive to business people, and also want to take into account that people may not want to pay to use the ramp. Suggestion was made to change lease rates slightly since they have not been raised in 12 years, which is not one of the proposals. Gates and leases will generate revenue; finding every way possible to raise the money is important. The reason for the three-hour grace was to keep people off the two-hour shuffle. We are looking at the users of ramps, and considering the concerns previously raised by downtown merchants – two-hour shuffle and the nights/weekends being no charge. A three-hour grace period with an amount that shows a positive gain should be considered. We have a two-hour shuffle going on now and we don't charge; they only park in the ramp if no other parking is nearby. The idea of a shorter grace period is to avoid the two-hour shuffle and make it useful for short-time use. Sacia arrived.

Public hearing comments:

- *Free nights and weekends is non-negotiable. Astounded at cost of Parking Utility; less is not an option and doing nothing is not an option. Safety and security has to be addressed. Share information ahead of time.*
- *Put meters on every spot; should not encourage people to drive; parking is not a right.*
- *Experience with meters was not a good thing. Utility has never balanced; won't achieve soon. Most important is customer – external and internal. Nowhere else in the city do you have to pay to park. Without customers we won't exist. How do we bring customers downtown? What we're doing won't bring customer back. Only Milwaukee charges for nights and weekends, not Madison or Rochester. Good idea to charge more for leased spaces. Listen to internal customer.*
- *Foot traffic and recognition as a viable downtown shopping area. Weather, wind, mall, and parking concerns are all factors. Not going to be able to cover costs without prices being ridiculous. Willing to pay general yearly tax rather than have customer pay. Consider event parking or charging for the later night crowd. It needs to be clear; it's already confusing.*
- *Majority of stores are small, independent, privately-owned which makes downtown unique. They compete with mall and internet which don't charge for parking. If lose downtown stores, nothing will be there to attract people.*
- *Can't be one out of three; has to be all three. As a downtown community can't lose ability to promote and market self. Downtown is hub. All customers are important. Just one concert event might make their month. Downtown merchants rely heavily on the fact that they are downtown merchants; they are a community within a community to serve any need you have to go to the mall for. Willing to use promotion budget to help maintain the ramps. Nights and weekends and grace period are really important.*
- *Send a survey to businesses.*

The reality is the gates are going in; they are here and doing nothing is not an option. The reason there is a parking problem is because we need to do more education; businesses need to instruct their employees to not park on the street. They must leave spaces on the street for customers. If we're going to increase the use of ramps,

we need to provide safer ramps and need to know the cost to do that. We also need to know what it would cost for free parking on weekends and nights, a three-hour grace, increased leases by \$5 and \$3 based on 12 or 24 hour lease, and \$1/hour for parking. Work group was supposed to figure out the rate for meters, but not lease revenues. It makes sense not to change numbers in the leases at this time. The taxpayer is a customer too; maybe there needs to be a little better balance of users/taxpayers. Look at total revenue, big picture, in order to get the job done. Regardless of where this falls, ramps do not pay for themselves; the taxpayer pays. Need to look at what are we going to charge in the ramp, how long the grace period is, free nights/weekends. Then, we can revisit the lease revenue. Other goal should be to identify the target for revenue. Security and cleanliness issue has to be addressed. Revenue goal should include the cost to make ramps secure and clean, and Public Works staff was directed to determine that number. This matter will be discussed further at February meeting.

Swantz/Gavrilos moved to eliminate proposal #2 from consideration, which has a negative estimated net revenue. Carried.

Present: 10 - Audrey Kader, Richard Swantz, James Cherf, Andrew Gavrilos, Robin Moses, Leah Mudler, Michael C. Pieper, Bill Sacia, James Warsinske, Dan Wettstein

Absent: 1 - Joe Ledvina

[14-0075](#)

Marketing campaign plan

Until decisions are made, no further action on flyers.

[14-0076](#)

Policy for bulk coupon purchase discount

A motion was made by Mudler, seconded by Gavrilos, that this Item be APPROVED. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

[14-0077](#)

Roll-out of paystation system

Refer to next meeting.

[14-0078](#)

Residential parking permit issues - establish work group

Cherf, Gavrilos, Pieper and Sacia volunteered to be part of workgroup.

[14-0079](#)

WTC Revenue Report for 2nd half of 2013

A motion was made by Swantz, seconded by Sacia, that this Report be APPROVED. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

[14-0080](#)

Status of MTU/PUB work group

If going to move forward, more money will be necessary to fund a position.
Workgroup was going to call the former Transit Manager to meet.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:28 p.m.