



MINUTES
Downtown Advisory Board
Thursday, June 23, 2011 – 12:00 P.M.
350 Commercial Street NE, Salem, OR 97301
<http://www.cityofsalem.net/DAB>



Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Guests
Jim Bauer - Chair	Darr Goss	Jeff Barnes – UD	Rick Williams
Bill Davis	Jim Lewis	Sara Bratcher – UD	
Paul Gehlar		Renee Frazier - UD	
Jennifer Martin		Sean O'Day - CMO	
Mark Messmer		Therese Van Vleet - UD	
Brian Moore - Vice Chair		Julie Warncke - PW	
Bill Putney		Sheri Wahrgren - UD	
Allan Pollock			
Carole Smith			

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair called the meeting to order at 12:03 PM, noting a quorum of appointed members was present.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms Smith **MADE A MOTION** to approve the agenda of June 23, 2011. The **SECONDED MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – June 9, 2011

Ms Smith noted Bill Davis and Jim Lewis were not present at the meeting, but are shown as present. Also, she requested the minutes reflect: under action item Chair letter to DAB, the Chair testify at Budget and Council meetings whenever items such as tax increases are discussed; and include a letter from DAB with the downtown parking tax. Ms Smith **MADE A MOTION** to approve the minutes from June 9, 2011, with above corrections. The **SECONDED MOTION** was approved unanimously.

4. REPORT ON COMMITTEES

None (Chair asked minutes reflect Mark Messmer arrived)

5. PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

6. ACTION ITEMS:

Demonstration Program Criteria

Ms Wahrgren noted from discussion at the previous meeting the title was expanded to include “Riverfront”; block was changed to “program” to be more encompassing. First paragraph, third sentence changed to “any number of buildings” instead of one, as it could be more than one. Paragraph three, “demonstration program goals” and removed “block.” Under “Evaluation Criteria” added a project timeline and a paragraph about the readiness to proceed. Everything else was the same as previously presented. (Chair requested minutes reflect Bill Davis arrived.)

Ms Smith **MADE A MOTION** to give priority to any applications that have plans that most closely reflect the goals of the Strategic Action Plan. The motion was seconded.

Mr Moore offered an **AMENDMENT** to take five evaluation points from the “Impact on tax values...” and add them to the “Demonstrated relationship of project to Demonstration Block goals,” as stated in the Strategic Action Plan. The amendment was seconded, but not accepted by Ms Smith.

Ms Smith **AMENDED HER MOTION** to take three points away from “Ability of project to impact square footage” and take five points from “Impact on tax values” add them to “Demonstrated relationship of project to Demonstration Block goals.” The motion was seconded.

The question was called: Motion carried. Mr Messmer and Mr Putney voted against.

Ms Smith **MADE A MOTION** for staff to identify two blighted block faces in the historic core, talk to the property owners, and report back to the Board. The **motion died** for lack of a second.

Mr Moore **MADE A MOTION** to approve the document as amended above. The **SECONDED MOTION CARRIED**. Ms Smith was opposed.

7. OLD /NEW BUSINESS

Downtown Valet Parking Business Proposal

Ms Bratcher reviewed the submitted proposal and associated staff report. The two main requests were: utilization of the parkades with no fee, but charge patrons; and reserve on-street parking. Staff did not recommend moving forward with the proposal as submitted, but provided alternative options within the staff report to assist the proposer.

- Q. Can the municipal parking lot by Valley Bank be taken out of the City’s recommendation? Can DAB influence what’s offered?
- A. The property owner has already received the staff report, and the municipal lot was included as a response to a specific request.
- Q. If the applicant wants to enter into a lease agreement, would it return to DAB for approval before going to Council?
- A. Yes, a lease agreement would need to be drafted by Legal, and would be brought to DAB before going to Council.
- Q. Do past studies take into account parkade utilization past 5:00 PM? If the parkades are not being utilized in the evenings, why not facilitate this as mutually beneficial?
- A. Liberty Parkade is a perfect location for overflow parking for evening events. This business proposal was specifically not interested in the parkades, but did want to utilize the municipal lot. That’s why the response suggested utilizing private lots. If they don’t charge for parking and recoup the cost in tickets, they could park in the parkades, and a lease agreement would not be needed.

8. INFORMATION ITEMS –

Analysis of Financials – Downtown Parking District – Rick Williams, Rick Williams Consulting LLC.

Ms Wahrgren noted the four years of Parking Utilization Surveys were used to create parking strategy recommendations. Mr Williams presented a draft report, which was distributed at the end of the meeting. His report examined the financial state of the Parking District as it is today (revenues/expenses/expenditures); and he forecasted ten years out with various financial scenarios to answer the questions: What does it really cost to operate the system? Can it be self supporting with direct parking fees?

Of the 3,592 parking spaces within the District, only 1,106 directly generate revenue from permits. Other sources of revenue include: Parking Tax Assessment; Leasehold; and Urban Renewal Agency reimbursements.

The draft report shows even at status quo, the District will have a deficit over the next ten years, which includes a three percent increase per year in tax assessment and permit rates. The true cost of parking per stall per year is \$124. The draft report outlines a variety of financial alternatives to the current budgetary composition of the Parking District system, however the next step recommendation was for a task force to be created and examine these alternatives.

- Q. Would paid meter parking be a good alternative? Would it damage business?
- A. That is a policy discussion about the proper way to balance the budget to cover true cost of normal operating expenses, to attract customers, and (if the District needs to) be self sufficient, then paid on-street

parking would be relevant. Free parking can be damaging to business, a successful system doesn't preclude paid parking.

Q. What portion is Leasehold income? What if it was kept in the budget? What about parking fines?

A. Leasehold income ranges from \$90,000 to \$100,000 and pays for itself. Enforcement is a separate fund.

(Bill Puntney and Brian Moore left @ 1:30.)

Q. When you gather data, what is a significant number?

A. It depends on the total number of unique license numbers and the turnover number.

9. ADJOURN

Chair Bauer adjourned the meeting at 1:42 PM. The next scheduled meeting is July 14, 2011.

Visit the Department web page at www.cityofsalem.net/UD

Transcribed by: Therese Van Vleet: 503.588.6178, tvavleet@cityofsalem.net

Reviewed by: Anita Sandoval. | Edited by: Sara Bratcher and Sheri Wahrgren | Digitally recorded.