



# CITY OF TOPEKA

CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES

## PUBLIC WORKS INFRASTRUCTURE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

CITY COUNCIL  
City Hall, 215 SE 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 255  
Topeka, KS 66603-3914  
Tel: 785-368-3710  
Fax: 785-368-3958  
[www.topeka.org](http://www.topeka.org)

Date: July 19, 2021

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Location: 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room; Cyrus K. Holliday Bldg 620 SE Madison (*option to attend virtually via Zoom*)

**Committee members present:** Council members Neil Dobler (Chair), Tony Emerson, Michael Lesser

**City staff present:** City Manager Brent Trout; Public Works: James Jackson, Tony Trower, Mark Schreiner, Robert Bidwell, Todd Workman, Dave Bevens, Jehan Zeb, Hannah Uhrig, Jason Tryon, Kristi Ericksen, Brian Bigenwalt; Finance: Stephen Wade Legal: Mary Feighny Utilities: Braxton Copley

### Call to Order

Chairman Neil Dobler called the meeting to order at 2:00pm. Committee members, and other Council members in attendance introduced themselves.

### Approve Minutes from June 21, 2021 special meeting

Committee member Lesser made a motion to approve the minutes. Committee member Emerson seconded the motion. Motion passes 3:0.

### 2021 Project Updates

[This presentation will be made available on the Committee's webpage:

<https://www.topeka.org/citycouncil/public-infrastructure>]

Public Works Director, James Jackson, provided an update on the 2021 Street Projects.

### Highlights:

- SW 10<sup>th</sup> & Wanamaker to Fairlawn - Third asphalt lift of four is down between Woodbridge and Chatham Pl. Storm System being installed between Chatham and Kent Pl. The forth lift will be placed once this year's construction is done. Completion date November 19, 2021.
- SW 12<sup>th</sup>; Kansas to Washburn - Curb & gutter being placed between Kansas to Topeka Blvd. Subgrade work continues from Topeka Blvd to SW Western. Extensive underground storm sewer work in the SW Lane and SW Washburn Ave intersections. Completion date for Kansas to Washburn is November 23, 2021.

1 - Public Works Infrastructure Committee

Minutes Taken: July 19, 2021

Minutes Approved: September 14, 2021

- N. Kansas Ave; Curtis to Norris - Scheduled to reopen Wednesday (7/21), Construction began mid-August 2020 included water main and stormwater structure replacements. Placement of these underground utilities under the railroad took place during winter months. The work delayed the project a few years while the railroad and City worked through the logistics of boring under the railroad.
- N. Kansas Ave; Morse to Soldier - Waterline replacement nearly completed from Morse to St. John. West half of the Kansas and Morse intersection is expected to be poured in the next few weeks following curb and guttering. East half of intersection will be reconstructed next. Anticipated completion of the entire Morse intersection is mid/late August. Project completion date: December 2, 2021.
- SE Deer Creek Trfy; I-70 to SE 6<sup>th</sup> Ave -Southbound lanes continue to undergo extensive full depth patching. Additional work will increase time for completion. Contractual completion date was July 16, 2021 but was pushed back to this fall due to discovery of more subbase failure than anticipated. Two-way traffic has been maintained at all times and is going well.
- Central Park Neighborhood SORT - Construct 37,826 sq. ft. sidewalk, Alley work on five alleys, and some sewer main work continues. Completion date October 29, 2021.
- Lane, 15<sup>th</sup> - 16<sup>th</sup> Street (emergency repair) - Project complete.
- SE 37<sup>th</sup>; Turnpike Bridge to SE California - Complete curb & gutter replacement on south side, with some on north side near the bridge. Mill & overlay will follow. Open to through traffic except for 3 days at the end for the overlay work. Scheduled July 6<sup>th</sup> to begin, final completion late August/early September.
- NW Furman Rd; Lower Silver Lake Rd to ¼ mile north - Complete reconstruction including reshaping of all ditches and raising roadbed on south end of project. Schedule: June 22 Bid opened, August 2 construction begins, Substantial completion by October 25<sup>th</sup>, Final completion November 8, 2021.
- SW Urish; 21<sup>st</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup> (accelerated repair) - 2 Phases; split at golf course entrance. North end to be constructed first. Schedule: Bids opened June 29, Construction began July 26, Substantial completion August 27, Final completion September 3, 2021. Waiting for contracts.
- SE 29<sup>th</sup> & Kansas Intersection - Most of the north leg to be completely replaced; raised median removal and turn lane striped. Middle of intersection will be milled & overlaid. Schedule: Bids open August 13, Construction begins

September 13, Substantial completion October 22, Final completion November 5, 2021.

- (In Design) 17<sup>th</sup>/Wanamaker/Westport/Bridge - Both projects on 17<sup>th</sup>. I-470 Bridge to Wanamaker, and Westport Dr. to 17<sup>th</sup>/Wanamaker will be reconstructed in 2022 prior to the start of the SW 17<sup>th</sup> MacVicar to I-470 Bridge Project which will occur in 2023 & 2024. Waterline replacement from Westport to the Days Inn and Econo Lodge hotels. Bids in spring of 2022.
- (In Design) 17<sup>th</sup> - MacVicar to I-470 -Public engagement and outreach planning and preparations underway. Outreach to business owners, City Staff and elected officials, and neighborhood leaders in August; public meeting with preliminary plans to be shared in the fall. Construction 2023 and 2024.
- (In Design) SE California; 37<sup>th</sup> to 45<sup>th</sup> Streets - Reconstruct SE California from a 2-lane rural section to a 3-lane section with curb and gutter. Complete street repairs, road rehabilitation, and complete reconstruction from I-70 on the north to 45<sup>th</sup> on the south. Public Meeting August 5<sup>th</sup> at 6:30pm at Highland Park Methodist Church. Bids in the spring of 2022.
- Review of additional 13 projects under design.

#### Questions/Comments:

- Regarding the SW 10<sup>th</sup> Street project from Wanamaker to Fairlawn...people have asked why crews have to wait until the very end to complete the final two inches of asphalt?

Committee member Emerson explained that throughout the process, segments are often completed at different times, and leave joints in the asphalt. At the very end of the project, the final two inches of asphalt is laid to create one continuous coating of street. Another advantage is that any scarring, and stuff that occurs during construction, that may create little chips and blemishes. That final two inch coating of asphalt creates a great finished product.

#### **2022 Pavement Plan** [video 12:40 minute mark]

[*This presentation can be found in the "Supplemental Materials" section on the Committee's webpage.*]

Robert Bidwell, Pavements Improvement Manager, introduced the 2022 Pavement Improvement Plan. The projects listed are slated to begin in 2022, although some may begin work in 2021.

#### Highlights

- Funding is \$7.6M, achieved by the adopted 2022-2031 CIP and Citywide Half-cent sales tax. The product achieved includes 25 lane-miles of pavement improvement through: Mill & Overlay, Reconstruction, and Pavement repair.

- Mill & Overlay:
  - Neighborhood - SW 21<sup>st</sup> St. to 29<sup>th</sup> St. from Urish Rd to Kingsrow Rd. - This is a \$1.4M budget. The average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is 48. Some streets have been microsurfaced within the past two years.
  - SE Gary Ormsby Dr. (east of Topeka Blvd) - This is a \$1.15M budget. PCI is 40. Will be 1.3 miles from Topeka Blvd east to the City limits. Will include full-depth patching as needed.
  - Neighborhood - SW 22<sup>nd</sup> Ct. to 27<sup>th</sup> St. from Indian Hills Rd. to Ancaster Rd.- Budget is \$900,000. Average PCI of 60. Some streets have been microsurfaced within past two years.
  - Neighborhood - SW 17<sup>th</sup> St to 21<sup>st</sup> St from Burnett Rd to Gage Blvd - Budget of \$780,000. Average PCI of 50.
  - SE Adams St - 37<sup>th</sup> to 45<sup>th</sup> - Budget of \$490,000. PCI of 40. Full-depth patching as needed. Detour route for California Ave. reconstruction project in 2022. Full reconstruction is in the 2027-2031 timeframe.
  - SE Lafayette St/Leland St/Tefft St - Budget of \$250,000. Average PCI of 42. In conjunction with East Topeka North SORT project.
  - NW Gordon St (Buchanan to Topeka Blvd) - Budget of \$240,000. PCI of 55.
  
- Reconstruction:
  - SE Carnahan Ave (I-70 to 21<sup>st</sup> St) - Budget of \$490,000. PCI 27.
  - Private Dr (Knollwood Dr to 28<sup>th</sup> St, west of Burlingame Rd) - Budget of \$310,000. No PCI value.
  - SW Kent Pl (north of 10<sup>th</sup> Ave) - Budget of \$300,000. PCI of 15.
  
- Pavement Repair:
  - SW 6<sup>th</sup> Ave (Oakley Ave to MacVicar Ave) - Budget of \$280,000. Joint repair/panel replacement.
  - Pavement replacement for waterline projects - Budget of \$270,000. SW Jackson St (8<sup>th</sup> Ave to 10<sup>th</sup> Ave) and SW 21<sup>st</sup> St (Washburn Ave to Topeka Blvd).
  - SE California Ave (I-70 interchange) - Budget of \$130,000. Select concrete panel replacement. Combined with adjacent median replacement work.
  - SE Golden Ave (north of 21<sup>st</sup> St) - Budget of \$110,00. Ditch regrading/realignment and pavement repair.
  - Miscellaneous Pavement Repair - Budget of \$500,000. Emergency or requested pavement repairs. 2021 work included SW 17<sup>th</sup> St emergency repair, SW Lane St emergency repair, SW 9<sup>th</sup> & Fillmore mill & overlay, and SW 57<sup>th</sup> & Wenger pavement replacement.

## Questions

- Are you leaving the microsurfaced streets in the Urish Road to Kingsrow neighborhood, or resurfacing them?  
They will be left microsurfaced.
- After microsurfacing, what kind of general condition are the streets left at?  
The microsurfacing brings the road back five years on the degradation curve.
- Can you mill the microsurfacing?  
Yes.
- With regard to Adams Street, and a \$490,000 budget, is similar to the project on Urish. The Urish project has a bid of around \$300,000. Would this change as well?  
Adams is a little longer length, but we will review and make additional changes.
- If it would help to get the project done sooner, would it be possible to not do full-depth patching on Adams, with the plan to be total reconstruction in 6 years?  
We can look at that.
- With regard to “Private Drive” project, is it a City street or truly a private drive?  
Mary Feighny, Interim City Attorney, stated that it had been reviewed and found that the City has the obligation to maintain this street.
- Suggestion made to take an “after” picture of these projects. Great “before” photos. It may help to show what work has been done with the money.
- SW 6<sup>th</sup> Ave Oakley to MacVicar, do you know when that was constructed?  
Maybe 10 years ago.
  - Was it constructed after MacVicar?  
It was constructed the same time that Gage to MacVicar was. It went from Gage to Oakley, then Oakley to MacVicar.
  - Does this pre-date the current aggregate?  
Yes. When you have joint failure, like what is seen here, or when the aggregate is placed too soon, or too late and crews try to then cut the joints, it will cause failure. This seems to be an issue all over the city. It is a condition that Mr. Schreiner has been trying to review to see how the City can establish a better technique to try to figure out something better to eliminate that kind of condition. These concrete streets should be lasting 50 years or so.
- The repairs at California and I-70, the bridge repairs are not the City’s to maintain, correct?  
That is correct. The bridge is KDOT’s asset and responsibility.

- Committee member Lesser thanked Staff for their continued efforts to stay on top of the patching along SW Wanamaker, and noted he had not received near the same volume of calls about the street condition in recent weeks.
- City Manager Brent Trout stated that part of the Committee's charge is to seek approval for items above \$500,000. Staff will seek formal approval with a resolution at the next meeting.
- City Manager Trout also noted that the bid contracts mentioned earlier were sent to his desk this morning for final signatures. He has been in meetings all day, and will review those today.

**Fleet Lease Program: Action Item** [Video 31:10 minute mark]

[The draft ordinance and staff memo can be found in the "Supplemental Materials" section on the Committee's webpage.]

Hannah Uhrig, Deputy Director, reviewed the Fleet Lease Program summary. At the June 9, 2021 Special Committee meeting, the Committee had requested Staff review and reevaluate the list of assets that had previously been identified for potential lease vehicles through the Enterprise program. A draft ordinance has been completed. Once approved, the process to move forward with the contract negotiation phase with Enterprise can begin. A lease program summary was also provided to the Committee. This summary shows the different vehicles that have been identified, as of today. However, this list is subject to change up until the day the City receives the new assets. In the list being reviewed, there are two vehicles which have already been identified, and a third that was discovered recently to have died. Instead of spending more money on these vehicles, they will be included on the replacement list. If additional assets fall into that category, or have a catastrophic failure, between now and when the new assets are received, some of the vehicles may be switched in and out. Some of the numbers are subject to change, but likely will not have a material impact on what will be presented.

There is a maximum of 50 assets that have been identified, with a focus being on SUV's,  $\frac{3}{4}$  Ton Trucks, and  $\frac{1}{2}$  Ton Trucks over a 12-month term. The 12-month term is based on the current market trends of used vehicles, as well as the low purchase price that the City can get into them. The Net year 1 impact includes the sale of both the current assets, as well as equity upon sale of the lease payments which the City will be liable for, from the Operational Budget, and it takes into account the anticipated resale and equity that the City would receive at the end of the term. This figure is -\$207,296. This means, at the end of the one year term, Enterprise were to sell our vehicles on our behalf, the City would anticipate a check for about \$200,000. At that point, the \$200,000 would be used to go back into another agreement with Enterprise, or to purchase new vehicles, which is where the Cost of Exit risk comes into play.

Information found on the summary handout, shows:

- The department
- Number of vehicles, currently identified, per each department

- Year of each vehicle
- What has been paid for maintenance and repair to date for the assets. Across the 50 assets, the City has paid \$940,000. This is inclusive of the regular ongoing maintenance that would be expected with any vehicle, as well as any additional repairs that had to be made, and labor time. The billable rate was at \$88/per hour, which is %30-40 less than what would be seen in the private sector.
- Estimated non-seen current value of our assets, from Enterprise's perspective, totals \$130,000. This figure is subject to change once they have seen the assets.
- Lease payment estimates are estimated to be \$276, 674.
- Resale of leased assets is estimated at \$362,000.
- The net is -\$217,000.
- At the end of the 1-year term, to purchase new vehicles outright, estimated cost is \$1.7M. This accounts for some of the enhancements that are more pricy, such as the utility beds for some of the trucks.
- With the net of \$200,000, the City is looking at \$1.5M, in operational expenditures, for the net cost of exit. This could also be revalued into the lease program.

Chairman Dobler inquired if he understood correctly that the value would be roughly \$131,000 if the City sold them today? Deputy Director Uhrig confirmed.

Chairman Dobler sought confirmation that if the City went through the program and obtained newer vehicles for a year, and sold them, that the City would then get a check for \$207,000? Deputy Director Uhrig confirmed.

Chairman Dobler again sought confirmation asking if the City were to buy all 50 of the identified vehicles, today, the cost would be \$1.7M? Deputy Director Uhrig confirmed.

Chairman Dobler stated he felt this program made the most sense, financially, with where the City is at today. He asked what the likelihood would be of Enterprise getting 50 vehicles to the City of Topeka within the next 6-8 months? Deputy Director Uhrig stated the vehicles will be 2023 models, so there will be a waiting period for manufacturing to be completed in order for the City to get them off the line with the specifications required. Enterprise has tentatively held space for the City, with the anticipation of the City moving forward with some scale with Chevy; so they are very optimistic with that. This is an additional reason why Staff limited the scope to the ½ ton, ¾ ton, and SUV's. Half-tons will be questionable, and will depend on when the order is placed and when the prices go out. The market currently is such that entities are placing orders based on estimates, so the City will not receive the pricing for the ½ ton trucks from Ford until around August 15<sup>th</sup>. There are not solid pricing incentives, yet, because the information has not been released for the new models. There is a chance that we will lose that offer if the City does not place the order soon, but because Enterprise has the buying power that

they have, there is a higher likelihood that the City can secure the 50 vehicles and get them in production. Deputy Director Uhrig cautioned that it is still a very volatile market, which limits the City's abilities on some of the different makes and models.

Deputy Director Uhrig stated that in the current model, with having estimated costs, she did a six percent increase to account for anticipated increase in pricing of the 2023 models versus the 2022 models that had been priced out in the previous estimate with Enterprise. She also priced in some of the additional enhancements from the utility bed perspective, as it is a large impact for some of the trucks, and increased both the lease payment and the value of the asset accordingly, with the hope being to inflate the estimates a bit more than what the City will actually see, however it should remain on the conservative side without expecting to receive figures that are too much higher than what is in the estimate, in terms of the value.

Committee member Emerson inquired if the City comes to next year, and have the vehicles, are we able to decide to keep them? And is that what the \$1.4M is for? Deputy Director Uhrig responded that the \$1.4M is for if the City decides to cash out the \$200,000 in equity and put that toward buying new vehicles. The City could keep the assets at the book value. She would make the recommendation moving this direction if the market flipped, and the City was no longer seeing the \$200,000 equity, because that is more advantageous than just keeping those and purchasing new. In theory, the City could pay off and keep the existing assets, or pick and choose if there are some vehicles that would not drive the same resale value as what others would, based on condition or mileage, the City could choose to do different things based on the individual asset itself. The City would not be tied into choosing between one or the other.

Committee member Emerson inquired if the determination would be made on those vehicles at the one-year time? Deputy Director Uhrig confirmed that it would occur relatively close to that one year time. The City is a little late to the game in terms of committing to the next year's models to ensure that we get space on the lines. In the future, Staff would want to evaluate about six to nine months into the program, to determine the viability moving forward.

Deputy Director Uhrig explained the two graphs found on the summary sheet. The graph on the left is the maintenance repair cost by model and by year. The average age of the vehicles being flipped out is 16 years old, ranging from 1993 to 2012. The graph shows the years that have huge spikes. Deputy Director Uhrig added a caveat, stating that, as has been discussed before, it is known that some of the older vehicles are slightly underutilized because there are back-ups, as it is known by Staff that there will be issues. Those are areas that see an increased spending of maintenance dollars. That caveat explains why some of the 1993-2002 vehicles have relatively low maintenance and repairs over the life of the vehicle, because it is being held back as a back-up knowing the current day-to-day vehicle breaks down frequently. Newer vehicles will allow the City to flip that, and replace out the old



vehicles that are more likely to have large issues, and move forward to get new ones in which will also allow the ability to re-evaluate the size of the fleet.

With the maintenance and repair components included in the graph, the cost does not account for fuel and some of the other savings that would be anticipated to decrease with new vehicles. A 1993 truck is likely to have a far different gas mileage than a 2023 truck. Some of the operational efficiencies will begin to be realized at a departmental level.

The graph to the right shows the large influx of the Sierra 1500  $\frac{3}{4}$  ton trucks, the Sierra 2500  $\frac{1}{2}$  ton trucks, and the Chevy Traverse SUVs. The Traverse flip-out is the smaller, based on the assets currently identified, but that can be subject to change with the needs of the divisions.

Committee member Emerson inquired about the graph to the left of the handout asking if the vertical axis is showing the average spent per year by thousands of dollars? Deputy Director Uhrig confirmed.

Committee member Emerson followed up by asking if those costs are the average per vehicle? Deputy Director Uhrig confirmed, that the amount is the average per vehicle per year. The graphic allows for viewers to see what the costs will look like annually and what the likelihood will be for needing to spend additional money, for continue on the trend. She stated it is understood that the figures are not linear, that it has been smaller and gotten larger over the years, but the breakout is to show some sort of comparison point for the average.

Committee member Emerson asked if the price equally weighted, is it normalized with mileage? Deputy Director Uhrig stated it is not normalized by mileage, but rather a quick weighted average. When choosing vehicles, the logic the Fleet Manager was using was the cost of lifetime maintenance and repairs, with the mileage as a secondary, and the age of the vehicle coming into play as well. Those three factors were reviewed when choosing the vehicles, to ensure we were tackling those vehicles specifically which were costing the most to maintain.

Between Police and Fire, there are 12 vehicles. Can you explain which types of vehicles they will be getting? And what their uses will be? Deputy Director Uhrig stated they were SUVs and would mainly be used on the Administrative side. For example, with the Police Department, Staff did not want to include the frontline black and white units. Including the fewer number of admin vehicles was to gather information on what the true impact to the operations for that side of the fleet would be, while also gathering a representation of the entire light-duty fleet.

Committee member Emerson made a motion to recommend the Resolution of a fleet management lease plan with Enterprise FM Trust ("Enterprise") to the Governing Body for approval. Committee member Lesser seconded. Motion approved 3:0.

**FIRM Project Resolution: Action Item** [video 45:15 minute mark]

[*This presentation can be found in the “Supplemental Materials” section on the Committee’s webpage.*]

Deputy Director Uhrig reviewed a memo sent referencing the Facilities Improvements, Repair and Maintenance (FIRM) expenditure program. She stated that there were two topics included in the project resolution:

- The Resolution, which include the new projects that will be reviewed.
- Secondary memo, that was not attached and will be sent out later, that has updates on the unexpected repairs.

Beginning with the Resolution for the Planned Expenditures:

- Fire Station Renovation Program - The top of the memo lays out the funding amount by year that had been previously approved.
  - 2020 Expenses - \$72,300 spent
  - Currently requesting \$800,000 out of the 2022, and \$4.3M out of the 2021.

This is a very large package being put forth, that has been worked through primarily by SDG, but does have another roof replacement that was already in flight.

Deputy Director Uhrig stated that when reviewing the different packages being put together, the packages are based on the project grouping priority that Staff aligned with both the Fire Admin, and Facilities Staff. The first priority was fixing the core: the roof, HVAC system, and some of the foundational systems.

The first package of the first priority, includes roof replacements on Stations 4 & 7. Pavement, HVAC, lighting and fire alarm systems for these stations is also included.

The second package of the first priority, includes windows, generators, apparatus exhaust, access control, extractors/dryers, and sand & oil separators. Of this core group, generators are a key focus after experiencing some of the issues with power outages that were experienced earlier in the year.

Station 11 is broken out as a separate, third package of the first priority, but also needs a new roof.

Chairman Dobler sought to illustrate a point, by inquiring if a consultant had been hired to conduct a study of all of the fire stations to identify the critical core repairs that would be needed in order to keep the Stations operational? Deputy Director Uhrig confirmed.

And the additional funding in 2021 is due to excess funding that the City had available? City Manager Trout confirmed.

Deputy Director Uhrig stated that SDG was the consultant that completed condition assessments, and read out. Staff then took the information from the analysis to help create the priorities for the list. While improvements, in terms of upgrades and modernizations that are included, in the core infrastructure components, the renovation components will likely come in 2022 once the core aspects have been determined to be in good standing.

- The second part of the Planned Expenditures is the balance of the FIRM program. Funding allocations were treated as one line in the CIP, however have been broken out to be treated as two sub-projects.

The balance are the top priority, which have been identified thus far with the MENP assessments, as well as the start of the City's envelope assessments. This means the roof, windows, foundations, and such. These were identified as critical, and in a Number 1 or Number 2 condition, requiring immediate replacement due to failure or failure in the near future.

From this area, the Zoo had \$100,000 in remaining funding from 2020. The City had previously expended \$312,000 out of the total approved. Of the previously approved \$744,000, which includes some of the unexpected items, Staff is requesting approval to use \$360,000 from the 2020 funding, and an additional \$360,000 from the 2021 funding.

A balance in the 2021 budget remains, however they only identify Numbers one and two, and have not yet gone through the exercise of prioritizing it holistically. These were the immediate "have to fix now or we are going to have issues" items.

Items included in the plan are:

- Holliday Boiler Replacement
- Holliday Condensing Unit Replacement
- Holliday Exterior Lighting Replacement
- 2<sup>nd</sup> & Golden Lighting Replacement
- TPAC's HVAC Replacements (Main Entrance Lobby & West Air Handler Unit)
- TPAC's Condition 1: Roof & Envelope Issues
- Law Enforcement Center (LEC) Condition 1: Window, Overhead Door for parking garage & Envelope Issues

Chairman Dobler sought to better understand the presented spreadsheet, and inquired if he was reading correctly that in the 2020 budget, \$1.3M had been approved for the FIRM Program? Deputy Director Uhrig confirmed that for this component of the program, yes, it had received prior approval. Chairman Dobler stated \$300,000 had been spent, which left roughly \$700,000 remaining, and that Staff was requesting a sum of \$360,000?

Deputy Director Uhrig confirmed that the \$360,000 would be for projects that had not previously been brought to the Committee.

Committee member Emerson inquired about what was located at 2<sup>nd</sup> and Golden? Deputy Director Uhrig stated it was the City's Property Maintenance facility. There are a couple of Staff who office from that building. The building is also used for storing a lot of equipment and other items needed by that division. Essentially, it is a large yard that has a couple of buildings.

Chairman Dobler inquired if there would be action for this item. Deputy Director Uhrig stated this item included a Resolution, which spells out the different projects, and action would be sought for approval of the Resolution.

Committee member Emerson made a motion to recommend the Resolution for approval by the Governing Body. Committee member Lesser seconded the motion. Approved 3:0.

**Presentation: Parking Garage Infrastructure & Parking Fund** [Video 58:50 minute mark]

*[This presentation can be found in the "Supplemental Materials" section on the Committee's webpage.]*

These discussions began with the full Governing Body in 2019. Through the discussions, it was identified that this component would be necessary to support both the modernization efforts that were requested for our Downtown as we continue to grow, as well as to address the deferred maintenance of our infrastructure. There was a hard stop with these conversations during the COVID-19 pandemic, however it is time to begin addressing these needs again.

Jason Tyrone, Division Director of Business Services, provided an overview presentation of the parking, which focuses on the current financial situation, infrastructure needs, and to introduce some of the improvements that have been completed or are currently being worked on. Following the presentation, Mr. Tyrone stated Staff was seeking recommendations from the Committee.

Highlights

- Budget overview: April and May 2020, Parking decided to forego revenue for 2 months during height of pandemic, resulting in \$500,940 lost revenue. Revenue did not recover to the full 2019 levels, even after re-implementing the payment program.
- Current budget forecast: Lost roughly \$1.2M in revenue since March 2020. The Parking Revenue Reserve fund has taken a hit. During first initial months of pandemic, all repairs ceased and only did what was urgent. At this time, decision has been made that there are some repairs that need to take place at

the Townsite Garage. COT is currently bidding out for those. Some repairs have already been completed because they were urgent. Reserve forecast is shown to be down to about \$1.5M by the end of 2021. Reserve at beginning of the year was \$2.5M.

- Recent changes implemented mobile payment app, Passport, for paying for permits and meter parking Downtown.
- Currently, most meter customers pay by coin, however the number of users of the app payment system have increased. Most widely adopted for the 10 hour meter zones.
- Brief synopsis of the 2022 proposed budget: total revenue is \$2.5M. Forecasting the revenue will come back up from 2021, but not fully returning to 2019 pre-pandemic numbers. This creates an operating deficit because of the capital improvements that are needed for the garages. Operating expenses alone, without making capital improvements, would still be negative about \$50,000. Deficit with capital improvements will be about \$1.4M.
- Garages Condition Assessment: Walter P. Moore consulted and provided opinions of probable cost/priority list for 4 garages under 8 categories. All estimates are in 2021 dollars, and are forecasted out over the course of 10 years.
  - Garages will need roughly \$1M annually
  - Garages generate roughly \$2M in annual revenue, but they have a capital improvement need of \$1M annually over the next ten years.
  - Study only included four of the garages. Staff went through an assessed the other three garages to get a sense of how much the entire garage system might need.
  - Most repairs suggested to be completed within first four years due to urgent nature. This averages out to be \$2M for the first four years, and then approximately \$450,000 for the remaining six years.
  - Early focus of repairs prioritizes electrical work first, followed by water proofing to ensure electrical repairs will not be needed as frequently in the future.
- Repair Funding Options:
  - Reduce expense - Accomplished by continuation to delay maintenance improvements which would see the continued degradation of facilities. Costs would continue to accelerate. Or to lower operating expense. Currently, less than 20% of operating expense is for employees/office.
  - Sell asset
  - Adjust garage levers
  - Increase on-street parking rates
  - Increase parking violation fines for both first time offenses, and doubling for sub-sequential offenses.

- Bond funding
- Upcoming improvements:
  - Improved public information. This would include a more user-friendly interactive map to see where available parking spaces are in the Downtown area. It would also provide a direct link for purchasing a parking permit.
  - Comprehensive reports to allow users to access the information whenever they would like to have it.
  - Passport App reports to gain a better understanding of where people are parking the most on the street, where the most citations are being generated. This would guide Staff into making suggestions for changes to the ordinances, or understanding if it is just a place that is causing more confusion where clarifying signage for that location could be useful.

### Questions

- Is the garage at 9<sup>th</sup> Street, just outside of the BNSF building, a lower rate? Yes.
- Why is that 2/3 of the price?  
The City owns the garage, but BNSF owns the land. We have options to raise the rates, but it has to remain at 2/3 the price of the other garages. Any customer who wants to use it, may. This reduced rate is for both hourly and monthly.
- What are the ramifications for removing the hoods and starting to charge again?  
There is no specific ordinance that was put into place, it would be a decision the Governing Body could reassess. Deputy Director Uhrig stated the only risk would be to assess the current condition of the meters under the hood. There is a chance that since they have been sitting, covered, for so long, a number of the meters may no longer be functional. The operational cost to replace with new meters is very high. Staff would want to inventory the current need and the current number of backups that are salvaged and ready for replacement. There are no ramifications from an operational standpoint otherwise.
- The total decline of revenue was over \$1.2M, likely due to COVID-19. Is that something our American Rescue Plan grant would provide an allowance to assist with?  
City Manager Trout noted that, so far, the grant has not allowed for pulling separate enterprise funds as being something that we could reimburse. He stated he would be looking into the situation further, as well as the grant allowances, to see what options would be available.
- What is the urgency on this? How quickly do we need to figure out a plan to produce more revenue?  
The current needs far surpass our revenue. The more quickly we can start addressing some of the issues, the better off we will be as a city. In terms of needing to address the holistic viewing with rates, and what that looks like

moving forward, it would not be advantageous to raise the rates. Based on the timing that it takes, given the passion around parking, Deputy Director Uhrig stated she felt it was something that needed to begin being brought back as conversations with the community partners, and with the backing from the Governing Body, to move forward. We are not here to generate a revenue. We are here to sustain a mechanism that supports our continued growth.

- From the numbers standpoint, do we do this type of contract on an annual basis, six month basis, or month-to-month? If an employer wants to reserve a set number of stalls for their employees, how does that work?

Mr. Tryon stated it is month-to-month. For employers that are reserving 5-10 spaces, they typically can set that up and manage the account through the online portal. There are a few long-term contracts in place with some of the State agencies and some of the larger employers, however most are rented month-to-month.

- We didn't charge in April and May of 2019, correct? For those months where we didn't charge, who made that decision?

Yes, that is correct. Deputy Director Uhrig made the recommendation and City Manager made final approval.

- For the 2021 numbers, through June, are those real numbers or projections?

Those are real.

- Are we beginning to see a trend at this point; are the numbers leveling out?

Yes. Earlier in the year, we were down 39% from 2019. For June, we were only down 16% from the 2019 figures. Year-to-date, we are down 22%, but it has been climbing steadily since January.

- Are there other options to month-to-month, such as a six-month contract?

There is no six-month option, as a standard. There have been larger contracts, in the past, with a few employers, where a large scale contract was made up. However, the majority are month-to-month.

Chairman Dobler stated he would like to start the next conversation with Parking Garages, noting some changes were going to need to be made to improve the parking debt.

### **Interactive Discussion: Speeding**

Chairman Dobler stated time was running close and would like to have this item moved to the August meeting.

### **Items from Staff**

No items.

### **Items from Committee**

No additional items.

**Other Items**

None.

**Adjourn**

Additional details regarding the next meeting will be made available on the committee's webpage and the City's Public Meeting Calendar, once known.

Chairman Emerson adjourned the meeting at 3:45pm.

Video of the meeting can be viewed at: <https://youtu.be/opEezmo0XqY>