

go to other food pantries and be able to pick up more food from different places. He expressed their appreciation for the donation.

Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Tornga commented on the good work this organization provides in the city.

Commissioner Kynes commented on the entire community helping during the holiday season bringing food to various places to help give Dunedin Cares a start. She congratulated the organization for filling a huge need in the community. She expressed appreciation to Commissioner Gracy for her work on the first time for the Aid to Organizations Sub-Committee.

Vice-Mayor Livingston advised he is working diligently with a vinyl vendor in an attempt to get the van wrapped for Dunedin Cares as a donation. He cautioned regarding the importance of collaboration and not duplication in the mission and in this case especially with items like utility bills and so forth and to check with other organizations to be sure whether the service is being provided by others and therefore maximizing the efforts in their primary mission.

Commissioner Gracy recalled when Dunedin Cares first approached the Commission and were asked to become a legitimate organization which they accomplished and she expressed appreciation for their efforts.

Mayor Bujalski recalled Dunedin Cares over a two-year period presenting their plans and goals which they have accomplished quickly after receiving their 501-C.

Commissioner Tornga mentioned the Lutheran Church provided donations and it was a good community project.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

1. DOWNTOWN PARKING AUTHORIZATIONS

Mayor Bujalski explained the procedure for this agenda item with the staff presentation then Commission questions, staff would present all three items to be voted on at once and all questions would be asked at once after which she would open the item to public comment; however, this is not a "public hearing". The public comment would be closed; the Commission would make final comments and then have motions on all three items individually.

Director of Housing and Economic Development Bob Ironsmith recognized the team members; himself, Director of Planning and Development Greg Rice, Public Works & Utilities Section Engineer Marcello Tavernari, Interim Finance Director Jeff Streder and noted Jennifer Jewel and Jean Kury assisted.

Mr. Ironsmith provided an outline of the PowerPoint presentation. There would also be a Wayfinding presentation, a paid and free map, and financial recommendations with three scenarios with Scenario "C" being recommended.

Mr. Ironsmith proceeded with the PowerPoint presentation with the following highlights and comments.

Parking Presentations /Studies

Numerous presentations have been made in Commission meetings and workshops.

The Downtown Parking Advisory Committee has spent a year and a half studying this issue with numerous meetings to review the various aspects and solutions.

The Community Redevelopment Agency Advisory Committee has been dealing with this issue since 2005 if not earlier.

A base parking study was done by HHI in 2009 and a more recent one was done by Walker last year.

Mr. Ironsmith referred to a slide he calls the "tumbleweed" depicting the downtown in the early 1980's as a desolate town, not walker friendly, harsh and sterile and only served to move cars through the traffic lanes. Much credit is given to the Downtown Merchants' Association for their investment and festivals. The City has made incremental comprehensive infrastructure improvements over the years to get to where we are today.

City of Dunedin Downtown Public Parking (At Risk) – Page 4

Mr. Ironsmith referred to the slide depicting what is happening downtown noting the at risk parking:

The Victoria Place location that was being counted on for overflow special event parking is gone.

The Keller/Douglas lot is coming before the Commission soon for a mixed-use project with a parking garage which staff is recommending the City be a partner. That lease supplied the City with 90 parking spaces.

The Gateway lot just had the groundbreaking event.

The lots shown in blue, highlighted in red are lots the City considers at risk lots; they are leased except for the one at Highland and Loudon the City owns can all go away.

32 spaces at 1715 Edgewater Drive/Bushnell Property has no immediate or near future plans.

41 spaces at the Douglas/Main Street/Ocean Optics lot is extremely fragile; most days and nights it is filled and has had significant interest as the economic development market continues to pick up.

67 spaces at Scotland/Douglas/Dunedin Station Square

73 to 75 spaces at First United Methodist Church is a partnership and wayfinding can make this a better area.

10 spaces at 510 Main Street/previously a laundromat are fragile and could go toward some development.

150 spaces approximately at Highland/Louden/First Baptist/City owned lot could be the frontrunner of a structure or partnership in the future.

There has been much more interest in potential development for sites; therefore, those lots are fragile and once they begin to go away, it will put the City in a serious deficit position.

The Walker study recommended 350 to 400 permanent parking spaces, not at risk.

Future Possible Leases

39 spaces at 228 Main Street are coming to the Commission for consideration of a lease.

75 spaces at the Mease Materials Management Building are being considered for a lease arrangement.

Mr. Ironsmith commented regarding the need to be creative to bring on parking stock at a very economical price that will serve the downtown for employees, visitors and residents.

Declining Parking Stock

Mr. Ironsmith referred to a graph provided showing the trend of declining parking stock:

- 1,031 parking supply stock in February 2014
- 931 with the loss of Victoria Place development
- 821 with the loss of the Gateway development
- 731 with the loss of the Keller Lot

Overall Parking Operational Expenses

Not including any staff personnel for parking management.

Only costs for putting a plan together.

\$466,000 for operations recurring costs per year to include

- Maintenance at \$500 per space adding up to approximately \$134,000

- Liability, insurance

- Upkeep

- Capital

- \$90,000 for Enforcement

- \$64,000 for Existing Parking Lease the CRA is paying now for parking supply

- \$95,000 for the New Parking Leases mentioned.

- \$115,000 if the BP money is allocated for leases to be discussed tonight in regard to the partnership

Commissioner Gracy clarified with Mr. Ironsmith the Enforcement would be coming out of the General Fund; this is a CRA/General Fund/BP Money type of initiative. In year 4 when BP runs out it would be \$90,000 General Fund and the rest CRA. It is all tax revenue except for the BP award.

Mr. Ironsmith advised the issue of Parking Management has been researched extensively by Mr. Rice who will speak to the problems identified and the solutions sought.

Parking Management System

Mr. Rice reviewed the discussions a couple of years ago about the concerns for the larger 2 acre and above lots staff thought were going to disappear and the follow up with the work done prior to that by the Dunedin Downtown Merchants' Association (DDMA) and others in the downtown who knew there was a parking problem. He explained Mr. Ironsmith and he wanted to bring forward how they could see the economy turning and the real estate market becoming hot and the potential for losing those 2 acre and above lots where it would be easier to go with vertical parking, some of which has come true and there is still some pressure on other locations.

Mr. Rice explained staff did not want the City or this Commission to reach a point of saying they did not plan properly for the development occurring; therefore, the reason for staff pushing over the past couple of years to:

- 1) Provide the turnover necessary for healthy businesses, restaurants and shops in the downtown.
- 2) Consider how to provide for the future of the parking stock and hopefully move away from the uncertainty of leases lots most of which have opt out clauses for 90 days.

Mr. Rice explained he wants to spend the next year focusing on education from the book *The High Cost of Free Parking* by Donald Shoop a professor at UCLA the foremost authority on parking in the United States. He read from the back cover:

Mr. Shoop goes on to say and that is what has happened since this book came out ten years ago, the new knowledge and case studies show it does not have to be this way. Mr. Shoop proposes new avenues to manage parking in three simple ways:

- Charge fair market prices for curb parking

- Use the revenue to fund enhanced public services in the metered neighborhoods

- Remove zoning requirements for off street parking

Mr. Rice explained staff is proposing working toward those goals; however, for tonight they are emphasizing the need for paid parking in order to achieve:

- The turnover desired

- Stop people from cruising around looking for parking spaces in congested areas.

- Use a portion of the revenue to fund vertical parking structures which are the most efficient land use possible for parking, especially when centrally located, easy to find and use and they do not waste a lot of land.

- At this time everything on the map in blue indicates underutilized land use that with parking structures properly located could become developed and add to the beauty and enhance the viability and ambiance of the downtown.

Mr. Rice related a significant conclusion for him in regard to planning:

"For any planning regulation we should ask not only who will benefit from it, but also who will pay for it. With free parking everyone seems to benefit and no one seems to pay. So the cost of parking requirements has not been an issue for planners, but when we compare the cost of parking with other costs in the transportation system we can see that the parking supply is probably worth more than all the motor vehicles in the United States. Drivers pay almost nothing to park the subsidy is staggering about the size of the Medicare or National Defense budgets. A cost of somewhere between \$127 Billion and \$374 Billion a year for off street parking has shifted into higher prices for everything else. This cost disappears from site when drivers park free, but it does not cease to exist, instead free parking increases the demand for driving which in turn increases the subsidy necessary to meet peak parking demand and minimum parking requirements are truly a great planning disaster, perhaps the greatest of all time."

Mr. Rice commented in moving forward staff will be looking at the three aspects of this book. He explained in regard to the question from Commissioner Gracy about Chapter 105, it is a temporary move to bring a little more in line with parking requirements, but he will be on a mission to eliminate all parking requirements in the downtown both minimum and maximum. He explained it needs to be viewed as a district and acknowledged it would be from the point of view of the Form Based Code.

Mr. Ironsmith referred to the PowerPoint:

Four Pillars of Parking

Wayfinding

Parking Turnover

Parking Stock

Parking Bank

8 Spokes of the Parking Management System

Land Development Code – Revised and Done

Parking Bank - Done

Increase Parking Stock is being worked on and will be discussed with the partnership 940-966 Douglas.

Public/Private Partnership Increase Parking - Two leases will be considered for moving forward.

Communication is a year-long endeavor until there is direction to move forward with a paid type management system.

Wayfinding and efficiencies will be covered in this presentation.

Paid Parking Implementation - This element refers to moving forward with pay stations with some paid parking and some free parking to be discussed in this presentation

Enforcement element refers to getting people to park in the right locations.

Critical Path Schedule – Progress to date

Land Development Code – Completed

Parking Bank – Completed

A business or property owner has the ability to purchase a parking space for \$8,000.

Current balance is \$20,000.

Increase Parking through Lease Agreements

228 Main Street will be presented tonight.

Mease Materials lot is under consideration.

Development Agreement - Increase Parking

940 -966 Douglas is scheduled to go before the Local Planning Agency is a partnership providing for apartments, retail and parking garage in one location.

Communication

A year-long endeavor that needs to be stepped up with more information to employees, visitors, tourists and residents.

Some assistance will be needed to step up this initiative.

Wayfinding

The presentation tonight will indicate the deficiencies and identify the needs including consultant assistance to move forward.

Paid Parking Implementation

There will be more discussion on this element in tonight's presentation.

This will cover the costs of \$466,000 to manage and operate the system.

Seed money is needed to take advantage of opportunities in land, structure or partnership.

Enforcement

Sheriff's Proposal is for 2 part time workers at approximately \$90,000 plus \$35,000 to purchase the equipment.

The recommendation is to step up the enforcement aspect sooner, in the spring in order to determine where people are displaced to and what is happening. More discussion will come in this presentation.

City Manager DiSpirito clarified regarding enforcement:

For consideration of the Commission his proposed recommendation envisions this would be a period of time when citations are not given, but education is given with flyers.

The flyers would first thank people for visiting the downtown, not discouraging them but noting if they have been here for more than three hours there are long-term parking locations and provide a map where on their next trip they can stay long term for free.

This is a hybrid plan being proposed, a combination that gives people choice between paying or no according to location facilitated by effective wayfinding.

He suggests the education period be a longer rather than a shorter time as it is important to inform actual visitors who might not be tuned into the websites or receive a utility bill with notices or read the local paper through direct experience be educated without penalty and to give plenty of notice regarding the "hot spot" areas where there would ultimately be enforcements and eventually citations to allow for the turnover and more importantly educate visitors would have choice and long term parking would continue to be available.

Wayfinding

Mr. Ironsmith referred to a slide noting the various parking spaces that are small, fragmented and difficult to find and inefficient which makes wayfinding so important. This does not offer certainty to the consumer and that is why the parking structure is so important in that the consumer can be confident they will find a spot. This one element is quite complicated.

Mr. Tavernari reviewed this portion of the PowerPoint presentation with the following highlights and comments.

Wayfinding Signage

Phase 1: Initial analysis complete

Conclusion:

Public parking is hard to find and can be confusing; too much information can be confusing; therefore, we need to:

- Remove some signs

- Make signs uniform

- Install new signs for parking

The PowerPoint includes several photographs of examples of different types of signs all for parking.

The Plan would:

- Remove some signs
- Make signs uniform create new signs
- Provide uniform specifications for future signs
- Organize Parking: Free/Paid/Temporary
- Create Branding/Artistic signage
- Create signage priority/hierarchy of information
- Create gateway entrance points
- Create uniform standards for all business signage
- Give guidance on future parking garage
 - Electronic
 - Lighted sign options
- Look at option on Pavement Markings

Mr. Ironsmith continued:

Next Steps:

- Community Redevelopment Agency Advisory Committee Presentation (January 2016)
- Downtown Parking Advisory Committee Presentation (January 2016)
- Community Redevelopment Agency Presentation (January 2016)
- Explore artistic elements with the Arts and Culture Committee
- Move forward with a Consultant

Commissioner Gracy inquired whether Dunedin's branding logo is something that could be explored in terms of being incorporated in this plan. Mr. Ironsmith stated absolutely.

Mr. Ironsmith continued:

Proposed Hybrid Program Free/Paid Parking

The attempt is to provide complimentary parking on the west, central and east parts of downtown.

Of the 1,071 total parking stock supply 56% would be paid; 44% complimentary.

44% would be 357 spaces off street in various parking locations and 110 spaces on street.

Mr. Ironsmith advised:

The goal of an overall parking management system is to increase parking stock.

This can be done with the parking garage at 940/966 Douglas Avenue with 215 spaces.

- 195 spaces in the garage

- 20 surfaces spaces

- 120 new leased surface lot parking spaces at 228 Main Street

- Wayfinding improvements

- Communication that is a year-long initiative

Paid/Free areas

Enforcement implemented sooner than later to gather data.

Interim Finance Director Streder referred to the PowerPoint and provided the following information and comments:

The information in the financial models is very complicated with many moving parts.

On September 17th staff brought to the Commission what they felt was a self contained financial plan that used BP money to put the City in a position to be able to afford to pay for a garage, 2 leases, wayfinding, consultant work, all catalyzed by BP money eventually shifting over to CRA funds. There was a certain set of information at that time.

Now there is a different set of information. The developer has come to the City with a project that is built in way to have 40 more spaces. On September 17th the number of spaces was 176 public spaces in the garage; now it is more about 195 spaces. This means amortizing a higher level of construction costs. On September 17th the City was looking to use BP money to buy down the annual rent. The annual rent required to amortize the construction cost of the previous garage was \$210,733; now the annual rent required to buy down the garage with the 40 added spaces is \$257,430. This means more of a cash infusion up front just to get to the same annual rent aimed for on September 17th. This also affects maintenance for more spaces; also affecting the amount of BP money needed in the first three years and the annual ongoing cost to the CRA in years 4 – 20.

The estimates being used for the two lease opportunities turned out to be low as there was not the benefit of a conversation with the owners at that time which has taken place since then providing more refined numbers. The combined annual lease cost is significantly higher than the placeholder number established on September 17th. Those two leases combined increased approximately \$35,000 in the out years which means the City needed to look for something to reduce by \$35,000 in order to keep the CRA burden at a similar level.

Mr. Ironsmith explained the 228 Main St. location is \$24,000 and will increase \$1,000 each year.

Mr. Streder continued:

On September 17th the total annual cost of the financial model was approximately \$283,000.

With the staff recommendations Scenario "C" is to have those annual costs at \$312,000.

Staff looks at the added 40 spaces as a positive and agreed with the developer.

Depending upon whether the Commission priority is to have the least amount of BP money involved in the model or have the highest annual ongoing costs the general business terms for the garage would be negotiated very differently. This is why there are three full models in the staffing representing opposite sides of the spectrum in terms low BP money, high BP money, high annual cost, low annual cost and something in the middle with Scenario "B".

As far as the business terms the Commission is able to manipulate, they are only:

The level at which to buy the rent down to

The amount of the upfront buy down to propose which is related to what the City would buy the rent down to

The amount to be received for the City land and whether to receive that in a lump sum or over time

Staff Recommends Scenario "C"

General Business Terms Negotiated for Garage Development Agreement:

The City leases all 215 public spaces.

The developer proposed the City lease only 195 spaces in the garage but maintain all 215 because the developer would not make revenue off the 20 spaces on the street; there would have to be a lower cost for the land.

The developer also proposed the \$200,000 all up front being credited to the buy down and not getting it over time – not credit; however, that tends to put pressure on the annual costs going up.

City buys down \$257,430 annual lease stream to \$115,000 annually for 17 years.

The reason for having a rent payment for only 17 years is to align the term with the remaining term of the CRA; hence the need for the buy down.

2.5% escalator per year applied to starting maintenance costs which are true of all three scenarios which are not negotiable. What is negotiable is the maintenance for the on-street spaces reduced from \$500 per space to \$250.

City is paid the maximum agreed upon \$400,000 over time for the Monroe lot property in the form of a land credit. The City would be receiving back a credit of \$32,211.

Another proposal was \$200,000 over time meaning the City would have received only \$16,105 credit over time.

General Business Terms for New Lease Opportunities:

\$45,000 Years 1 & 2; Year 3 \$62,424 increasing @ 2% per year for the Mease Materials property (85 new parking spaces)

In September the place holder of \$25,000 was used for both leases for a total of \$50,000.

\$24,000 annual rent for the first year; increasing \$1,000 per year thereafter for a 5-year term for the 228 Main Street property (41 new parking spaces); at the end of 5 years a lease would start at \$30,000

\$105,000 estimated for site preparation on both properties; including demolition of an existing structure on the Mease Materials property.

Mr. Streder referred to the tables in the PowerPoint and explained:

The lowest rent the City can buy the rent down to using the pool of funds received from BP of \$2,929,946.00. The total amount of BP Funding in Scenario "C" comes close to exhausting it all.

Now with what has been learned about Wayfinding the amount in the model is more than what it was on September 17th

Three years of maintenance costs.

With all those things the largest buy down the City could do is \$1,974,674.

Enforcement in all models is paid for through the General Fund because that is not an eligible CRA expense.

The City would be getting 120 new spaces from the two new leases and netting 100 new spaces at the Keller site from the garage; currently 90 exist at the Keller site.

Table 2 represents years 4 – 20 when it is shifted over to the CRA

These are the annual ongoing costs.

The outer years the annual costs of the two new leases increases to \$95,000.

The City has brought down the garage lease to a fixed \$115,000 staying the same throughout the term of 20 years.

The median cost for maintenance was used observed between 4 and 20 at \$134,957 per year. The credit back for the land annually lowers the amount for the CRA to \$312,746.

As pointed out earlier the CRA already pays \$81,000 currently on existing leases; however, the lease at Keller would go away that is \$17,000 leaving \$64,000 for the CRA to pick up. This brings the total cost with enforcement to the \$466,000 per year.

Table 3 represents how the incremental new revenue from 5 major projects that are known to be happening in the CRA and will be completed shortly can cover the annual expenses. There is not a lot of room there, even using all the BP money and having the largest buy down and getting it to the level of \$115,000 for the CRA; however, staff is recommending this scenario because:

It results in the lowest annual ongoing costs.

It maximizes the possibility that some of this incremental revenue from the 5 major projects might be available in the future to fund other capital needs in the downtown.

Public Input

Mr. Ironsmith reviewed the Authorization Points as outlined in the staffing:

Authorization Point #1

Approve a complimentary/free – paid parking map.

This is needed for the City Attorney to prepare a Paid Parking Ordinance.

Locate the paid versus free in order to go out for the Request for Qualifications (RFQ)/Request for Proposals (RFP) for the multi space meters.

One thing that can be done fairly quickly is the Enforcement aspect and develop an agreement relative to the map and then go forward with the other steps.

The map recommended by staff includes 56% paid parking; 44% complimentary/free, that is 467 spaces of the 1,071 parking stock.

Authorization Point #2

Staff recommends all BP funds go toward this Parking Management Initiative which is the parking structure, the leases, the enforcement and the wayfinding. This minimizes ongoing annual expenses and preserves future CRA dollars to go toward capital improvements and allows seed money to begin other initiatives that might be needed.

Authorization Point #3

Authorization by the Commission for staff to prepare a draft RFP/RFQ to get an idea of what is involved in a multi space meter type vendor. It is important they be leased as part of that pilot program for the first year so that if the City decides not to continue on; it is a pilot. Also staff wants that lease amount applied to the initial purchase price.

Mr. Ironsmith referred to an image of a multi space meter on the street for an idea of what they would look like within the landscape.

In summary Mr. Ironsmith stated with the key authorizations the City can get 220 net new parking spaces, get comprehensive Wayfinding started and preserve future CRA revenue for ongoing and future projects.

Commission Questions

Eliminating Downtown Parking Requirements:

Mayor Bujalski inquired regarding the statement of being on a mission to get rid of all parking requirements.

Mr. Rice explained the downtown needs to be considered a district. Parking requirements in general have done more damage than good. The market should be the determining factor with the person who built the building being the one who decides how much parking goes there. He noted one of the greatest planners used to say we build buildings in a park, now we build buildings in a parking lot and it does not have to be that way.

Mayor Bujalski clarified with Mr. Rice the developer could choose not to provide parking.

Mr. Rice explained the concept of a developer wanting to provide sufficient parking in order not to fail.

Mayor Bujalski expressed concern for the concept of not having any guidelines; however, understands there are situations in which nothing can be done in terms of parking and then they pay into the parking band and stated there have to be some guidelines as to the City's expectations. She noted that is not a concept being voted on tonight.

Mr. Rice commented there are many case studies where it is working very well.

Commissioner Kynes commented the Commission will be learning more and more about Shoop's book and she certainly does not understand this entire vision; therefore, she suggested not taking this out of context. She thinks everyone agrees the purpose here comes from the belief of the need for a parking management plan otherwise there would be no discussion.

Pilot Program:

Mayor Bujalski noted in terms of the equipment leasing for the paid parking nothing in the staffing calls this a pilot program.

Mr. Ironsmith reviewed a pilot program was discussed in September.

Mayor Bujalski agreed there was discussion regarding that recommendation from Walker to have a pilot program and then reevaluate; however, here understanding of the vote is that this is not a pilot program.

Mr. Ironsmith clarified staff is recommending a pilot program for one year leasing the equipment and then evaluate what has taken place – the name was not in the staff that was the intent.

City Manager DiSpirito stated that staff believed that was previously established in September and he believed that to be the discussion and consensus.

Mayor Bujalski recalled what was discussed was adding a paid element to this plan and there was no discussion of a pilot program.

Vice-Mayor Livingston commented the plan did call for a pilot program.

Mayor Bujalski stated not what was presented in September.

Commissioner Kynes commented it called for a hybrid and the terminology was a pilot program.

Mayor Bujalski reiterated that is not what was voted on and the plan the Commission received was no paid parking; there was no pilot program mentioned and she is trying to determine. She noted she has been finding these little things throughout the staffing where she hears someone say something, but that is not what has been presented. She wants to be sure to be clear as to what the Commission is voting on.

City Manager DiSpirito provided the following information:

There are two different things, paid or not paid is one question; the pilot program is simply a period of time within which there would be an evaluation or ultimately make permanent or not.

Staff did not want to go over all of the material that led to the decision/direction the Commission provided staff back in September. Staff felt this was to move the discussion forward to those things staff was requested and given direction.

The pilot referenced and discussed previously and staff felt there was consensus from the Commission that looking at it in a pilot program or 1-year evaluation period made sense. An example is the discussion of leasing versus purchasing for that purpose and the 1-year lease presented is for the opportunity after a year to evaluate whether to go permanent or not based on the results of the program.

Mayor Bujalski asked if City Manager DiSpirito was saying at the end of the year, if implemented October 1, 2016, before October 1, 2017 there will be an evaluation to determine whether to move forward with paid parking. City Manager DiSpirito noted whether to make it permanent.

Mayor Bujalski stated that is not what was discussed in September and that is not what was voted on. The motion was very clear.

City Manager DiSpirito commented the time period is separate from whether to have paid or not paid; that was to bring back a plan that proposed; the direction staff got was to bring back a plan that contained a revenue stream; previously, it was discussed what that would entail a period of time in which to evaluate and when there was the discussion of leasing them for 1 year where any monies toward that lease could be applied, as put in the RFP, could be applied to the ultimate purchase price. There would be that year and there were charts with the "pilot" on it; staff said at the end of the year the Commission would decide whether in fact this would be permanent; the equipment could be purchased at that time with the credit applied or decide to go in a different direction at the pleasure of the Commission.

Mayor Bujalski stated those were options provided the Commission at the June Workshop when the Commission asked for a plan to come back. She assumed the plan would outline what it is and nowhere in the staffing does it say "pilot".

City Manager DiSpirito stated the staff did not want to revisit everything in the interest of the amount of material they had.

Mayor Bujalski commented that is a big piece of information to revisit, to say this is a pilot program and for everyone to calm down and we will reevaluate it in 1 year. That is a very different scenario than saying we are permanently doing paid parking. She feels that needed to be said out loud. She verified that it is a pilot program then.

Douglas Avenue Parking – Free/Paid:

Mayor Bujalski noted another change not pointed out in the staffing was Walker recommending a pilot and also the parking facility on Douglas is free and now the map provided that has changed twice and now it was paid.

Mr. Ironsmith explained that is a surface lot and the other thing in the Walker study was that the First Baptist site was paid and now that is recommended to be free, so that is how it is evolved.

Mayor Bujalski noted the following:

Walker does not have the Mease Materials site that is now also paid.

Mr. Ironsmith noted also the 228 Main Street because things have been evolving.

In looking at the map the amount of free parking is reduced from originally proposed by Walker. Her question is whether anyone has looked at what was told to the Commission, the City is to promote people going there, keeping it free and having it paid on the street in the hot spot parking lots promotes people to go to the free garage and to have long term parking there. Now there is going to be a charge.

Mr. Ironsmith stated a tiered rate situation can also do that. The infrastructure costs for a garage is approximately \$6 Million with maintenance costs of \$135,000 which is significant type capital. Everything has evolved as information continues to come in and staff refines things; it has been very fluid. Staff analyzed the percentage of free versus paid.

Mayor Bujalski asked if the analysis included the number of employees who will need parking and the effect of this change: Mr. Ironsmith stated the thinking is that more than 400 spaces for employees in a switch situation, it will be adequate which is why staff wants to do a free enforcement with just warnings as City Manager DiSpirito mentioned. Also, for consideration would be some type of employee registration/hangtag.

Mr. Rice noted also the request is for the map to be a living document which will require flexibility until it is seen how everything evolves in attempting to get the right people in the right places.

Use of Revenue:

Mayor Bujalski inquired would it not be better to start smaller and then move up versus seeing it was a mistake and then going back down. She noted the request is to invest \$2.9 Million in the residents' money into this garage and then also charge them to park there, which was never the plan. The plan was to contribute this money.

Mr. Rice explained the BP money only lasts a few years in order to buy down the lease; there will be 17 years after that staff is recommending the City take the paid money from the garage to continue paying the \$6 Million. The staff believes it was the right thing to do.

Mayor Bujalski expressed concern that she was hearing two different stories between staffing a. She wants to be clear what the parking revenue will be used for.

City Manager DiSpirito explained:

The BP money would cover the first 3 years as staff said; all expenses of the garage.

The balance is a 20 year expense for the City.

The hope is the projects coming on line, approximately 5 that are either underway or about to get underway, the additional property tax, the value on the property and money coming into the CRA would hopefully cover or pick up the lease once the BP money is used in those first 3 years.

The majority of the money collected, not just in the garage per say but in the rest of the recommended areas, the hot spots would be applied and this is part of what was discussed in September by the Commission was to look not just to this initial garage that is just a piece of the puzzle and not the overall solution, because it is known from previous analysis, other consultant reports and the understanding of how many spaces could go away that many could go away and there is a need to convert over time as many of the lease spaces that are subject to disappear in 90 days to permanent spaces as much as possible.

Getting a revenue stream from the collection would go to additional parking structures or leases or acquisition. The attempt is to consolidate the land use as much as possible with garages. That would be the ultimate use and gets the City down the path to fixing the problem the consultants have identified and confirmed by staff.

Currently the vast majority of spaces are leased that could go away in 90 days. He explained he wanted to point out all of this goes to long term solutions and not just short term solutions.

Mayor Bujalski reiterated it needs to be clear what the ultimate goal for the revenue is.

City Manager DiSpirito responded to great degree, not exclusively because it cannot be predicted what the amount of money the CRA will have 3 years in. Some of these projects may stall; there might be a double dip recession and the revenues available in the model you would like to cover might not all be there, so this also provides a hedge against some of those expenses which are leases. That is why he does not think his answer is inconsistent with staff.

Mr. Rice noted this will be a very heavy burden on the CRA and staff would like to continue with other projects including beautification projects and if some of that revenue offsets what has to come out of the CRA, is that a bad thing.

Mayor Bujalski referred to the spreadsheet for Scenario "C" the CRA is completely made whole with the funding of the new projects coming into the city, the new development. Mr. Streder clarified that is based on the projects; those are only projections. Mayor Bujalski noted the Commission is being asked to make decisions based on those projections; therefore, she assumes staff is relatively confident in those projections. Assuming that it is showing the CRA revenues remaining unchanged and providing everything continues to grow. She is hearing it will be a big burden on the CRA, but the spreadsheet is telling her something different.

Mayor Bujalski reiterated the spreadsheet says all the costs, everything presented today with the new tax base being created by those 5 projects coming in.

Mr. Ironsmith stated there is absolutely no seed money for any second type initiative to increase parking stock. Mayor Bujalski stated that is different. Mr. Ironsmith stated there is also a strong weight on the CRA to do other beautification projects. Mayor Bujalski asked how that is true if the CRA funding is not being cut at all; how is it a big burden. Mr. Ironsmith explained regarding close to \$500,000 to run the system each year, which is a significant cost. Mayor Bujalski noted it is covered with the new development coming in.

Commissioner Kynes commented she believes the pay down is a significant way to allow for beautification efforts to continue in the Downtown, but there are other things that need to be attended to for example, undergrounding and wiping out the CRA ability to continue with these projects. What is being attempted here is a very careful balance and she repeated she truly believes by having the parking management system and paid having the paid component it is bridging to a better future and better land use for a second vertical parking structure and that is what she believes has been discussed since she thought 2004; however, someone said it was 2005. Nevertheless that is 10 to 11 years. This is her understanding.

Mr. Ironsmith responded a balance is what is being attempted, no question about it. He commented the spreadsheet is thin with little margin. There is \$15,000 left with the CRA trying to cover it if all the projections follow through.

Commissioner Kynes inquired if there are not incentives for each project and Mr. Ironsmith stated yes, noted the Gateway was incentivized with the Land Dedication Ordinances for 12 years. She clarified with Mr. Ironsmith there are other impacts on the CRA Fund.

Mayor Bujalski noted the Land Dedication Ordinance was included in the spreadsheet.

Commissioner Gracy commented she wanted to make sure that was a key assumption that the LDO, because even moving forward that incentivize process for the LDO in the Downtown was changed and she will hold staff to the fact that has to be paid and that is her concern moving forward with projects which she welcomes if they meet the City codes, architectural styles and so forth. That LDO, she is watching like a hawk.

Mayor Bujalski explained she is hearing statements that are different from what she has heard before or she hears statements that are saying something different than what has been in the staffing. She wants to be sure she completely understands what she is voting on.

Commissioner Gracy noted she found in the Walker study on page 45 where it talks about the pilot area for reference. Mayor Bujalski reiterated though it is not in the staffing anywhere being called a pilot to come back and be voted on at a later time; she was aware of it in the Walker study.

BREAK 9:10 P.M TO 9:17 P.M.

Mayor Bujalski commented regarding the importance of citizen input throughout the year and the use of tools like Dunedin TV, the website and social media to engage residents and keep them informed and let them know where they can come to be heard. She stated Dunedin is a strong community that works together to get things done. She thanked everyone for caring about the community and taking the time to let the City and Commission know their vision.

Mayor Bujalski reviewed the three items to be voted on:

Approval of the hybrid paid/free parking map

Approval of using all the BP money received towards parking garage and surface lot leases and their improvements

Direction to staff regarding a bid document for pay stations

She explained any public comment should be directed toward those votes with the understanding her job is to manage the meetings productively while giving residents every opportunity to express themselves. She asked for patience during the process and she will do her best to keep the conversation on task, but will give residents latitude so they feel they have been heard. Speakers will be allowed 3 minutes to discuss the items and she will use a silent timer so that it will not disturb the speaker, but would help her to keep the public input flowing.

Public Input

Gregory Brady of 580 Skinner Boulevard (support) stated he has lived this issue in many ways, everything that has been discussed are solutions that he has been a part of. He made the following comments and points.

He has been a resident of Dunedin for 40 years and has had a business more than 20 years in the same location downtown where he is landlocked and he has lived with customers who cannot get to him, cannot park near him and events cause a problem.

This has not been a problem that we have only been discussing respectfully sense 2005, it goes way farther back. He sat on the DTAC committee in 1988 that started the CRA; he was here from the very beginning.

The problem today is a problem that they wanted to have and that is a successful vibrant downtown that we all enjoy.

There are employees parking on the street as well as trail users and trolley users all day long.

They have found in this study over and over that new revenue is needed to build future parking structures and handle what we have now and hopefully make some of those leases permanent.

Residents do not like taxes being raised, but that is going to be an evitable unless some really hard decisions are made and that is to put in some revenue stations, not meters in the downtown; all other avenues have been exhausted looking for revenue resources and streams.

25 years ago, he formed with other businesses the Downtown Dunedin Merchants' Association and they have worked collaboratively with the City government; they are all volunteers, there is no paid staff and he has sat in on every parking task force or committee because he wants the knowledge to know what is going on and be a part of the decision-making. He hopes that residents and concerned business owners that have not been a part of this process have learned that they need to know what is going on in their community.

They have done what they can do as a downtown parking committee to reach out to the Dunedin Council of Organizations (DCO) which has more organizations present at every meeting than any other organization in the city including homeowners. They have

reached out to residential groups including Edgewater Arms, Monroe Park, Chamber of Commerce, the Merchants' Association; all others have endorsed this.

There were parking meters up until the late 1980's and there are pictures to prove that, they were not needed or used and they were removed; they are needed now for a revenue stream and parking control and management.

Jim Riley of 2220 Watrous Drive in Fairway Estates (oppose) expressed his feeling the Commission did not want to listen to the residents of his community talk about paid parking. He stated the commission is going to do what they want and they do not care about the residents. He stated the Commission has heard all the arguments that it is going to destroy downtown and people are going to stop coming, all the arguments for and against. He commented there is an election coming next November and then the residents will have their say.

Larri Gerson of 1310 Overcash Drive (oppose) made the following points:

This issue should come to a vote to the residents to see what they want to do and should be the first decisions and thoughts by the Commission and not on the items slated to be voted on tonight which she feels should be tabled.

She thinks the Commission still does not understand what the Finance people and the City Manager have said and there needs to be more discussion.

The citizens should have vote and there is an election coming up and she is concerned it will have an effect on that vote if the residents do not have their say and she really likes everyone on the Commission and she thinks a citizen vote would give the Commission a more informed decision.

There has been no discussion regarding handicap parking spaces, even in the previous discussion of the new development on Skinner, there was discussion regarding parking spaces, but not on the number of handicap spaces, which handicap people do not have to pay for according to the law.

She has concerns regarding staff members saying they are adamant about a mission because that is not taking into account what the citizens want and noted the author of the book was writing about larger cities that have transportation which was voted down in Pinellas County, so part of his theory does not apply.

Her other concern was about passes for Dunedin residents or reduced rates which was not discussed and should be part of the package; as a resident if she has to pay she will not come to the downtown anymore and enforcement can be a problem and if people get a ticket they are not coming.

Jim Graham of 1231 Royal Oak Drive (support) stated he also has a business in downtown which over the years has really improved and grown and is doing very well, the problem they have had is parking and it has always been a problem for the past 10 to 15 years. He thinks what is being considered are ones that need to be moved forward. He stated that in looking at how to handle parking one of the critical items is how to save the existing parking that is in jeopardy. By beginning a pilot program and starting to pay that would start an income stream to help pay for future growth and parking such as the parking garage is an option he feels should be considered in the forward with for the downtown. He agreed with the problem of

people using the trail and the trolley and parking all day, so there does need to be some type of enforcement to make those spaces available three or four times during the day. He also suggests consideration for employee and volunteer parking that is available and free.

Robert Dippong of 1751 Hickory Gate Drive North (oppose) stated he is not against the paid parking and he is not against the garage; however, made the following points:

He is opposed because of his financial background to the vagueness of some of these numbers, especially the revenue numbers because even with the blue sheet provided there are not good estimates when speaking about spending \$1,000 a day for the next 20 years and yet taking action without really knowing what kind of revenue can be produced, their rates are not known and what the city residents would pay is not known.

He looks to see both sides of the equation revenue and expense and determine whether this makes sense and there is really only the cost side of this proposal, and everyone is saying those numbers discussed in June cannot really be relied upon.

If the revenue does not come through there will not be talk about a second garage, there will be talk about how to survive with the first garage. There would have to be 300 people a day at \$5.00 to even reach some of the estimates.

Regarding wayfinding if the object is to get people to the parking lots that should be the concern, he is not sure there is a need for any \$20,000 consultant to do that when talking about moving people two to three streets. He researched some cities like Beverly Hills that has blue parking signs with a "P" on them and an arrow, so if that is good enough for them and Vail and Aspen he is not sure why Dunedin has to reinvent a sign that everyone understands the meaning that parking is over here.

Parking is not even on the website yet, he went to Dunedin Wines the Blues and they had a map of Dunedin but with no parking marked on it, he went to the City's website and there is nothing there.

The basic things have not been done to get people to these parking lots and there are things that should be done today and things to be done in two weeks and given those things it is premature to move forward even though he does support the paid parking, the basic things have not been done that could have been done through the years. To him it looks like we have to approve the plan to see what is in it and he does not want to do that.

Dennis McGreen of 1689 Hamilton Court (oppose) a resident for about 2 ½ years made the following comments:

He and his wife moved to this terrific town and you could just drive downtown to park wherever you wanted and he would take a walk to the pier and almost all the time go to a restaurant or bar, get some ice cream or something, but now there is a new philosophy to shop and then get out. That is what some people are saying we want you to come to our town park your car, pay for it and your time will be limited to a couple of hours. He finds it a big change. Now the talk is all about turnover, park and leave and he feels that it's a mistake. He does not believe in paid parking or turnover parking.

He sees the development and he is not sure the developers are paying their fair share for the parking when they are generating the need.

Looking at the map there are few spots where it is free and that is a big change so if he wants to come downtown for any length of time he has to look for free parking or pay to park and keep moving his car if he wants to stay for any length of time and that is not practical. He asked if those red spaces on the map are going to be in competition with employees as well.

He agrees with having a referendum on this issue as he suspects most of the people here are against paid parking and that half of the people who left thought the discussion was going to go on for 5 hours before they had the opportunity to speak, otherwise he thinks the Commission would have heard from a lot more people.

Lynn Wargo of the Dunedin Chamber at 301 Main Street (support) thanked the Commission, the Parking Committee and all those who have attended night after night to talk during this process. Dunedin has some passionate people who are vocal about what they want to happen with this city. She made the following comments.

Throughout this process she knows it has changed quite a bit, but what has been seen is a lot of creativity that has been expressed and a lot of different options listening to residents, business owners, employees, volunteers and visitors and she knows the City is trying to develop a plan that suits as many people as possible.

With the construction of Victoria Place and plans for the Keller property, and the Gateway groundbreaking the city is entering into that place everyone knew it would be a few years ago losing a lot of the parking that is depended upon on a daily basis and that those parking options need to be replaced to keep Dunedin accessible to everyone who wants to use its amenities.

The increase of the 100 spaces at the Kokolakis project is a step in the right direction, but we see that the loss of the other parking from the other projects is creating a lot of consternation and that a lot of the other lots are very vulnerable.

What they like that has been discussed with this proposed parking management system is that it encourages turnover in the most desirable spaces in the downtown and while everyone does not like or want that for those who are there particularly those who are operating a business or organization they need that.

The plan allows for the users of the trolley, the trail and employees to park at some of the lots that are a little further away and allows for those who want to use it the most or be the closest to derive the benefit and they had the opportunity to support it.

What she feels is very important is that this proposal presented though the numbers need to be worked out and verified, there are thousands of visitors who come to the downtown and this gives them the opportunity to help provide the parking needed, those are not the people who are paying taxes but they are coming in and supporting the businesses and they can now also contribute to this situation and the solutions.

As residents, business owners, downtown employees and those of us who use the downtown frequently there will still be the no-cost parking and it will be available relatively conveniently and extremely convenient for those who can spend a few dollars.

Many felt that a paid parking component for Dunedin would be its demise; they do not think that is going to happen. While no one wants to pay for parking they are pleased that staff

has come up with some different methods to allow for much of it to continue being complementary; however, no parking in the downtown or the community is free because someone owns that land, created the parking space and pays to insure it and maintain the spaces that everyone is enjoying presently and not contributing towards any of it.

Parking availability is needed in the downtown particularly with these large projects on the horizon and eliminating what everyone has become used to using, but there has to be the revenue to support the additional land purchases for parking structures. Making sure that there is adequate parking availability for those doing business or living in Dunedin is what is important. We need a parking management plan or system and the revenue to ensure in the future Dunedin remains one of the most desirable cities to live and do business in the Tampa Bay area.

Cathy Greenwood of 2239 Watrous Drive (oppose) read from the following prepared statement.

At the September 17th City Commission meeting, we were thrilled and proud to see that the City Staff was presenting an excellent plan to address our parking issues without including a paid parking component. After hearing glowing comments from citizens, public input was ended and the Commissioners started their comments leading to a vote. Just before midnight, a Commissioner started a motion to approve the staff recommendation per the agenda item staffing, and our hopes soared. However, suddenly two other Commissioners asked the Commissioner if she would be willing to amend her motion to add a "Paid Parking System" to the motion. After a discussion back and forth, she agreed to do this. We were devastated.

Because of the way that the motion was made which added a "Paid Parking System" in addition to approving the staff recommendation per the agenda item staffing, this made the agenda item not properly "noticed." This means that the public was simply not properly informed on what would be discussed and voted on prior to that meeting.

I request that the issue of "Paid Parking" be:

1. Properly staffed (including the total capital and operating cost and revenue projections of this system),
2. Placed on a future agenda,
3. Properly "noticed" by posting the agenda and all staffing concerning this issue on the Town website and otherwise by City policy,
4. Allowing public input at the Commission Meeting, and then
5. Voted on this issue by the City Commission.

The matter of "Paid Parking" should be properly "noticed" and the public should be heard on this issue in a Commission meeting before any vote is taken on implementing a "Paid Parking System" in the downtown.

There are other factors that will play out in the short term that will significantly increase revenues in the city, bringing us closer to funding a parking garage in the near future:

1. The Blue Jays negotiations: we will know the results this year. No matter what the outcome, Dunedin will benefit and increase revenues. If the Blue Jays leave, we

will have back a large and valuable piece of property and the Penny for Pinellas monies that now go to them.

2. Tax revenues will increase: from rising property values as well as from the record millage rate increase of 17%, instituted this year.
3. Revenues will be generated from current developments in progress, including Victoria Place, Gateway, and Dunedin Commons.
4. The Commission voted that a \$5 Million surplus would be added to the already full city contingency fund. There is a potential revenue source that we already have.

Parking meters should be a last step in the program. Other options should be put in place first. Let us proceed in thoughtful and reflective steps to develop a solution over time that works best for Delightful Dunedin to do what the City Mission Statement tells us we should do enhance the Quality of Life in Dunedin, not denigrate it.

Joe Kokolakis of 134 Buena Vista Drive (support) a 30 year resident made the following comments.

He has never been more proud to be living in this City as today. He was sitting next to a woman who was considering moving here from Vero Beach so rented a home for a month and she decided to come to the Commission meeting where she felt it best illustrates the community and it started with great presentation on diversity and then the children on the environment and sustainability and she saw all the people who are passionate about this town and preserving its integrity and listened to a staff report so thorough and visionary that it is counter intuitive.

In his experience typically the municipality or city is trying to shift a burden from the taxpayer to the business owners and implement something like paid parking downtown in order to ensure the people who do not benefit directly from the parking are not paying for it. As a resident and someone not in downtown he would in some ways be outraged that his tax dollars were going to subsidize all these little piece meal parking lots that staff is forced to rent.

He finds it unusual that so many residents are speaking against parking stations downtown and feel they would prefer to subsidize the parking downtown with their taxes. Personally he feels paid parking is important for parking management and to ensure turnover that businesses need.

Overall he thinks it remarkable the Commission is so progressive in considering this and the dialogue both in support and opposed are speaking respectfully and staff has done a remarkable job and is proud of their professionalism. He thinks it is inevitable in this city and is necessary and is in support.

John Medciros of 2365 Mangrum Drive (oppose) asked for clarification regarding the development on Douglas that is going to remove 90 spaces and add back approximately 180 new if that includes where those residents will park or will they have separate parking. He made the following comments.

If the parking spaces are lost to the residents, the city is not gaining anything and still be out of the money advanced to subsidize the developer. Mayor Bujalski stated the city will be gaining spaces.

He is not a businessman here; however, he has been coming to Dunedin for over 30 years; his family moved here many years ago and he has always enjoyed it and has been a full time resident for over 8 years.

The reason he moved here was the fact that Dunedin was not overdeveloped and it seems to him to be a self-defeating path by creating all of this development within a very short and limited time without any management, without any growth management. He noted the increased population and increased cars in the city and commented regarding the increased traffic.

He stated there is \$1.9 Million going out from the BP money and at the end of the term the City will be in debt for another \$6 Million; if he heard correctly, the City cannot even afford to pay that. He feels there should be a return on the money and commented it is going to cost more to provide parking than it would to not do anything. He noted the millage rate going up that should be enough for the city.

He agrees there should be a survey and referendum.

Patti Coleman of 748 Broadway (oppose) stated she has had a business downtown for the past 14 years and has lived in Dunedin for over 44 years. She has seen this city come a long way. It is also a long road that has led us to this point. She applauded the City, the Merchants and the Chamber of Commerce for creating and sustaining a fabulous destination for locals and tourists. She is asking the Commission to tread carefully this important decision. She made the following points.

Clearly there is a need for a long-term parking solution for the downtown.

There is no need to rush into paid parking.

When there is a transition she does not recommend paid parking until there is a garage in place.

She would like to see three hour limited parking so the residents and tourists have the opportunity to get used to what is going to happen in the future.

Matthew Stevens of 1250 Palm Boulevard (oppose) applauded City Manager DiSpirito and staff for all the efforts so far to develop a comprehensive parking management plan. His understanding is that this has been a lingering issue that has been going on for decades. A lot of people have been spending an exhaustive amount of time and energy and effort and it is clear that this is a polarizing issue that will continue to polarize this town. He made the following points.

What he has seen in his short time here is the city dealing with issues that range from cultural/social aspects that people are concerned it is going to disrupt the quaintness as well as the financial aspect of the merchants saying there is a need to turn things over and control a limited resource of parking. He also recognizes what was discussed and the December vote.

He asks the Commission to be open to the interpretation to paid parking to include strict enforcement and ticketing based on signs limiting the time of parking in an area. If this is agreeable he believes:

That the work that has been done with the parking management plan can still move forward, but it would include a near-term process to solely use enforcement of improved signage and the paid parking areas as described.

In following this approach the map would be unaffected as discussed; improved signage would still be needed.

The RFP could still be posted but shelved and used in market research.

Most importantly the Commission would be able to use that time only for the strict enforcement whether that is determined to be for six months or whatever time period, use the Sheriff's Department strict ticketing and enforcement to determine the economic and cultural aspects and impacts that concern so many of the merchants and the voting citizens.

This would allow for an analysis pause to determine at that point in time if the existing management plan that has been implemented to include the enforcement is adequate to meet the visitor's requirements, the Commission requirements, the citizens requirements and if it is not at that point in time then move forward to the second phase which would be including the pay stations or metered parking, but there would be that analysis at that point in time to present to everyone.

Diana Gennaro of 1160 Palm Boulevard (oppose) thanked all the Commissioners who met with them. He made the following comments.

On almost any given night he and his wife and their dog can be found in the downtown, they patronize the local taverns, shops and restaurants and take in the sights and sounds of the city to walk their dog and enjoy the sunsets. The quaint downtown is the main reason why he and his wife chose to purchase a home in Dunedin three years ago. Whenever they come into town he does not worry about having change for a parking meter or a smart phone which he does not own as a means for paying for parking. The downtown is about to change and they are both upset and disappointed.

Even after attending both parking meetings in June and September 17th and speaking individually with all the Commissioners, they still believe that paid parking is not needed at this time and the downtown. They have listened with open minds to the reasons for paid parking.

They have joined a group that will continue to address paid parking in the downtown, they have concerns and question on how Dunedin got into this parking mess in the first place and how the issue was presented to the residents. The present Commissioners have told them the issue began in 2005 and ask if more could not have been done over the years.

He questions why the urgency now to do everything before some major decision is made for example the Blue Jays staying. They have asked the Commissioners to delay the start of paid parking and try new signage and parking enforcement and to wait and see if there is a need for two garages; however, that was not acceptable.

Creative solutions without a paid parking component were presented to Commissioners by city staff in September.

He has said that the majority of residents do not want paid parking, another form of tax on top of the 17% millage increase that was just passed by this Commission.

He was asked an interesting question outside and by one of the Commissioners, who will pay for paid parking; his question is who will pay to use Main Street, the public library, or anything; everyone does so there is no need for another tax.

John Pauwels of 1480 San Charles (opposed) stated he has been a resident of Dunedin for over 49 years and most of what he intended to say has already been said by other parties tonight. He commented everyone must remember that Dunedin is a small city and not a metropolis; therefore, must utilize its own assets existing in town. He thinks this parking situation has been discussed for over 15 years that he can recall and it is still at square one and it has to move forward.

John Shastal of 1650 Santa Anna (opposed) explained how they came to live in Dunedin two years ago because of its being a quiet little town after having lived in Chicago. They liked the open spaces. Almost everything on his side has been said. He became aware of this problem about two hours before the meeting and he went around to seven other households in his area and out of them there was only one who is not against this paid parking idea, but were noncommittal about it and raised some of the ideas that have been brought forward by the merchants. He stated it is a very complex problem and the idea of paid parking brings them down being retired and on a fixed income things might not be quite as accessible for them. He retired as the result of a condition with his feet and his wife has a disability, but neither has a handicap parking sticker and they cannot walk a long way.

Manny Koutsourais of 2142 Andrews Court (opposed), former Mayor of Dunedin stated he has been a resident for 50 years. He made the following comments.

Some history includes that in the 1950s and 1960s at 4:00 p.m. you could shoot a cannon down Main Street and never hit anyone in the downtown area; parking was horizontal and meters were present. In the early 1960s the meters were removed to help stimulate business for the downtown area. In the late 1980s and early 1990s redevelopment with the help of the CRA funds the city was able to implement new and innovative ideas to stimulate downtown redevelopment.

As everyone knows the old saying "if it ain't broke don't fix it" and another is "two wrongs don't make a right". He asked if downtown is broke; he thinks everyone knows it is not. Everyone who asks where you are from and you say Dunedin and they comment on what a beautiful downtown. If you drive around looking for a place to rent to start a business you can't find one and if you do you can't afford it. Obviously the downtown is not broke. There is a great following from a tourist standpoint as well as a citizen standpoint.

It is not wrong to look for more parking, which is the responsibility the City has towards the citizens and the business community many of whom are citizens along with the tourists who visit.

He believes at this time it is wrong to implement paid parking; there is no question that parking needs to be addressed and had the City Commission of the late 1980's and early 1990's known what was going to happen to the downtown area he can assure it would have been addressed.

His opinion is to get started immediately and find a way to build a parking garage aside from what the Kokolakis project will provide. City property is available at the old Baptist Church property and he thinks the City can do five things to get going:

1. Do a study showing the size and scope of the garage.
2. Find out how many spaces can be accommodated.
3. Determine the cost of the project and estimate accurately the annual revenue that can be generated by the parking garage.
4. Then based on those figures obtain a revenue bond issue at a reasonable interest rate over long period of time and get the revenues to pay for it.
5. Build the garage and then if wanted consider paid parking in the downtown area.

Don't risk going backwards instead of forward and promoting the community. Do not discourage citizens from wanting to enjoy Dunedin. He reminded the Commission their responsibilities do not start and stop with special interest groups, their responsibility is for the overall benefit of all of the citizens.

Scott Rehm of 1450 Chukar Ridge stated he is a businessman in real estate and has been in the community for 50 years; his dad was also a previous mayor many years ago and he thinks that he had some of the foresight including helping save Caladesi Island. He made the following comments.

He thinks it is important not to be so shortsighted to lose sight of the beautiful gift within the community, but in order to do it there has to be a logical thought and fiscal responsibility to take care of the future.

He has heard so much opposition about paid parking in the community yet they talk about having a parking garage, but unless money is shown to be coming in the City will never achieve the bonds necessary to fund a parking garage.

Some kind of infrastructure needs to be put in place now to be looking forward to taking care of the future, if we continue to put our heads in the sand and think that it is just going to way or will take care of itself or tell a private property owner that we should be allowed to park on their property for free because it has been here for so long is unfair. Everyone has a right to enjoy the ownership of property and he thinks the private property owners who have lease agreements on their properties are being held hostage because they wish to do something to develop their properties.

There needs to be some foresight to see that if we do not fix this problem, identify the problem and do something about it now in five years from now it will be a problem for future Commissions.

He is not wild about paying for parking that he understands in order to have this beautiful community something needs to be done to protect it for the future.

A parking garage or two might be needed, but a funding source needs to be developed now in order to make that happen.

Seeing and hearing no one else wishing to speak Mayor Bujalski moved back to the Commission.

Commission Comments

Commissioner Tornga:

We just heard a comment about how we have to be looking off into the future and we do. We have known about this for a significant period of time. We know we have parking areas that are going to be lost and could be lost and if so it is not going to be pretty. They will be turning dirt soon in the Gateway area, which is reality. There is another property at 940-966 Douglas and that property owner is going to develop something on that property, there are 90 spaces there and the City has an option to put additional spots in there and when that property owner no longer wishes to lease that area he has the right to no longer honor the lease and can build whatever he wishes as long as it meets the City standards.

The goal for us is to move forward. One of the comments was made that our downtown represents Dunedin; it also affects our property values even if you are not in the downtown, a great and wonderful downtown is good for all residents. On the other side it boils down to the question that he had asked previously and he wished that it had been discussed in the open first before getting to this point, who should pay for parking. We have a parking system and this is a parking plan for that specific area. We did talk about wishing to secure adequate parking for this area that is being lost, someone has to pay for it, and it was already defined who it was going to be and in this particular case it is going to be the user, there will not be additional taxes and so forth; that decision was made by the Commission previously based on input they receive not only from staff.

We need to also improve the utilization of the parking areas as they exist today. There are people who park and leave their cars all day and turnover is needed, we are talking about a plan today that provides two kinds of parking; charged parking and complimentary parking. There is no way to regulate supply and demand other than through some system of enforcement whether taking baby steps or big steps.

The question still comes down to who is going to pay for this and it could be argued for billing the merchants center, but he needs someone to figure out how to do that; is the entire city going to be taxed for this; there are people who do not come downtown and some on severely restricted incomes. There has to be parking in the downtown.

He is concerned about the financial presentation which he is not particularly pleased with as he would have liked to see more detail for example with the garage/lease being separated out and a financial break out starting from the top to bottom and then make a decision based on that.

The Commission is at a position where they have to make a responsible decision about this parking and cannot wait much longer. He does not think there is going to be the luxury of waiting and reiterated those two spots are going to be worked on and the loss of one more spot in the city it will seriously be felt and also possibly not hear delightful downtown Dunedin anymore, the City will struggle to support it when both projects are underway.

He is frustrated to a small degree, he will go with the decision this Commission has made, which was to ask for a paid parking solution to the area here, he is still supportive of that. He is not particularly pleased with leasing as the City will not own anything in the end. As someone pointed out that garage is going to be there after 20 years.

There were some financial numbers that were hard to realize or discuss.

The parking committee has done a lot of work on this and these are the folks who will be directly affected by these decisions; he will not be directly affected since he doesn't have a

business in the downtown, but they will be and they are ready to support this because they know there has to be an income stream.

He is feeling comfortable about what has taken place and he wished a lot of these things had been done earlier; he is not supportive of paying \$20,000 for a consultant to tell us where we need to go in a few streets. He wished that an existing ordinance had been followed and brought this before the Board of Finance who would have really done some financial consideration with Interim Finance Director Stredler.

As far as the solution in this scenario, he has always from a business point considered that cash is always king. We have targeted fund balances for the year 2016, there is a General Fund and he does not agree with all of the fund balance concept or with the reserve concept that was agreed to put into effect, the General Fund remained at 15% so he would be in favor of not Scenario "C", but for Scenario "A". There is no difference in value that can be ascertained.

The question continues who should be paying the CRA or who and the payment rate can be increased, still owe the money, deal with it and figure it out later, but go forward in order to at least give the developer a program to use and in fact get a parking garage going in that area is needed and the loss of that parking does not work for the city.

The City is showing 12% and it should be at 15%, the difference is about \$800,000, almost the exact difference between the 2 equations provided \$2.2 Million or \$2.9 Million. He would respectfully suggest taking the BP money which was never really discussed with citizen input; nevertheless it is in the General Fund right now. This he thinks will benefit not only the entire city, but allow the downtown to accept visitors and without it he thinks there will be big problems very soon.

Commissioner Gracy:

Commissioner Tornga's comments are pretty much in line with where she stands on this issue from 16 weeks ago.

To those opposed or just heard about this, she apologized and understood their frustration as she is, but at the same time she is hopeful because what this Commission is doing and what many citizens have alluded to is that they are taking the fortitude to move this plan that is a robust and expensive plan forward.

Her concern is that it is being made into a zero sum issue and they (the Commission) see and feel the passion here in Dunedin and in her opinion that should galvanize them using the questions of those opposed to paid parking in a proactive way and get through the hard details and make sure staff is being challenged at every step, making sure of the same thing as the Downtown Parking Committee did, challenge, challenge and continue to challenge.

Flexibility is needed within the plan, but it needs to be protective meaning protecting the General Fund and the tax dollars that would affect every property owner in the city; this is what she cannot get away from because she feels that is highly inequitable to use tax dollars to continue to subsidize parking that not every person in the city will use.

The accessibility or handicap component was addressed with her in November and she spoke with the lady who asked her about it on September 17th and that is protected by

State Statute so that has been considered and should be an overwhelmingly protective piece of the plan.

In regard to the zero sum issue she is okay with moving this forward because it has free or complimentary piece in addition to the revenue needed to be able to build an \$8 Million to \$10 Million structure.

She does not want to talk about revenue and parking meters, but given all the information she has studied since being elected to this Commission, for a long time knew it was coming and if this is the Commission that does it, then good for them. It is a hard decision and complex but given all the information she is making the very best decision she can in terms of enhancement of quality of life and to make sure of being efficient with tax dollars and most of all equitable with them.

There were some great comments tonight.

She spoke extensively with Mr. Ironsmith on the resident discount and the simple point is you cannot get to a residential discount until you figure out what is being discounted; therefore, moving forward with an RFP process might show what that is and the median range needed for pricing.

A trial period is very important, the communication right now is only scraping the surface of what needs to be put out to the public and residents, she hears and understands being upset about just learning about this, but now be engaged and there needs to be some kind of citizen engagement tool which should be discussed at another meeting, but she will not let that go.

She is also somewhat frustrated with the "four pillars" and that approach might have been better previously so that it was not so overly complex and not lead to these monster meetings with frustrated citizens. She wants to be sure all the concerns and questions are addressed. She stated that it is time to move forward and she is still supportive of the parking management system.

Commissioner Kynes

Stated her colleagues at this point have spoken very well.

Some of the citizens she spoke with going forward said "now am I going to say I am for a paid component issue; however, I cannot give you a better solution"; these are residents that she has spoken with.

Change is hard it is painful and it is difficult; however, what is imperative is vision and that means passionate meetings where people feel passionate and they have the right to speak their mind and they have the right to always feel that they are part of the challenge and the solutions. She reiterated change is difficult, hard and painful, but vision is imperative and has been an integral part of Dunedin's history and it will continue to make us who we are, it is vision.

Vice-Mayor Livingston

Stated his agreement with many of his colleague's comments.

He agreed it is a complex issue and he appreciates both sides of the argument. The argument primarily on the opposed side has been an emotional one, but unfortunately the decisions have to be based on fact.

What the Commission has factually to make decisions from is 10 years of working on a solution and a consultant's parking study that clearly laid out roads to success as far as the parking plan.

What he heard tonight from most of the citizens and that everyone could agree on is that it is very important to roll something out, but a parking plan initiative is needed and also it needs to be done now. He can appreciate the concern and wanted to take pause to reflect and evaluate the direction, but that does further delay success in his opinion.

He thinks that with the initiative that was brought forward on September 17th, the partnership on the Douglas site does not solve the parking problem but it is a good interim step to get things further down the road.

In talking with many citizens he thinks everyone agrees that there will be a need for a second parking garage and the question is how to get there and the answer to that is a revenue stream and that is paid parking. It does two things, it helps to establish firm numbers in terms of revenue and expense and it gives something to bond against and leverage debt and most bond holders want at least two years' worth of revenue demonstrated before accepting a revenue bond so this gives an effective way to inexpensively leverage debt.

He implored everyone to not let this divide us, to work together on this plan, roll out this parking plan and see where things are. He referred to the discussion about this being a pilot plan so let's see a year from now where things are, but also have everyone willing to make change and listen to one another.

Mayor Bujalski:

Thanked everyone for coming out tonight which is truly important to the Commission. She also thanked the Parking Committee and staff for all the work they put into this issue. There are pieces of this plan important to the future of our downtown and if it was not for the hard work of the Parking Committee there would not be all these options today.

Something that truly stands out to her is the sheer number of residents, not only here tonight, but that had been heard from on this issue and their passion and tenacity. In her 10 years being with the City she has never seen an issue this highly addressed and there have been some pretty big ones. She believes they need to take that very heavily into account.

City staff, the experts the Commission relies on clearly recommended back in September to move forward with an incremental approach. They showed very clearly on spreadsheets that the City can afford everything in this plan today including the garage on Douglas without having an additional revenue source at this stage. The incremental approach allowed for beginning enforcement, to do parking behavior modification and education for at least a year, that year would allow residents the time to get used to thinking about where they are going to park and figure out what is important to them when they come into the downtown. It would also allow for staff to monitor the data and see what changes are needed. It is also known that in the unfortunate circumstance that the Blue Jays should leave the city, the financial situation will be very different and the available monies and value of that land will be a very different situation.

She thinks that multiple options of funding and making a valued decision on multiple options instead of just narrowly looking at one is always in the best interest of the community.

She feels she and her colleagues are on the same page going toward the same goal for parking. She thinks they all understand and agree that we need to replace at the risk parking through various strategies and determine the best way to pay for. So their vision is the same. It really is how the plan is put into place that has come into question and given the volume of resident input the Commission now has, she feels the unsaid message here is that we need to do a better job bringing our residents along with us with such a major policy change.

Paid parking has already been voted on, but she thinks that the City can implement more thoughtful transition before going there and she thinks the residents deserve that. It is very clear the residents are not on board yet. Given that the residents are getting ready to invest over \$3 Million of their money, not the City's into a parking management plan they certainly should be partners in this process.

City staff recommended a phased approach. The communities that have done this process have said to do a phased cautious approach. Clearly Dunedin's residents want a phased approach. To be really successful in what is being done and being responsive to the community should we not at least do a comprehensive education and enforcement. All that would be required is to postpone that RFP for one year and working with residents. It is not taking anything away from the rest of the plan, it is still implementing everything and in one year the sky is not going to fall in.

She asked her colleagues if we have to err on the side of caution and move just a little slower, don't the residents deserve that.

Proposed Hybrid Program Free/Paid Parking Map

Commissioner Tornga commented regarding the importance of flexibility in this plan. He noted he has seen this materialize over time all the way up to 24 hours ago. He suggested staff really needs to look at this.

Mayor Bujalski responded she asked the same question about that area and noted the plan has changed twice during the week with no discussion.

Commissioner Gracy commented to that point, if there are changes, different iterations of this map, she noted the one she is looking at on the I-pad is different from the one being presented and asked wouldn't the financials have changed behind that.

Mayor Bujalski stated yes and that is her concern as well and she would like to have comparisons with changes, pre-changes and post changes; she cannot vote in favor of the map. She advised the consideration could be postponed, and have some further dialogue on it and further numbers run, individually the Commissioners can give their questions to City Manager DiSpirito and he can bring back the answers.

City Manager DiSpirito explained:

The purpose of the map and requesting the Commission look at; and he likes the word fluid, they would like feedback, it is not that staff is saying this is the way it has to be, this is a proposal.

Ultimately this map would be an attachment to the RFP which will be done in a draft for review and comment by the Commission before it goes out, the map is a portion of that RFP, so that is the opportunity for the Commission to further refine what makes sense to them and what does not.

Part of the confusion which he apologizes for was that there was a mistake on one of the versions where it showed the First Baptist lot part paid and part free, that was not meant to happen.

With respect to down by the park, that was a consideration for a handful of spaces many of which are handicap spaces that were never proposed to be charged and the others are the ones adjacent to the playground and the thought was for young families and the nature of the use, it is usually quite different from the other spaces in the area that tend to be more commerce, people coming to restaurants and so forth; however, anything can be abused.

Interim Finance Director Stredler explained:

The financial model presented tonight, the staff recommendation and the financial models in the staffing do not include any revenue from paid parking.

The only area where revenue was addressed was in response to the questions on the blue sheet and that is why he used a range, because he knew there would be changes with small numbers of spaces shifting. That is why he explained the revenue to come from paid parking to be estimated in a range between \$400,000 and \$500,000.

Vice-Mayor Livingston noted it was stated before that this is a fluid document, so there is nothing written in stone in terms of paid or unpaid. He thinks the plan is that when it rolls out it will evolve. He thinks Commissioner Tornga's comment is valid.

Commissioner Tornga suggested that needs to be part of the motion with the understanding that it is not predetermined and it is not something that cannot be changed.

Mayor Bujalski suggested the motion could be "in concept". Commissioner Kynes agreed with proposed conceptual.

Mayor Bujalski commented staff will be going prepare a draft RFP which will include many elements and noted there was no discussion regarding discounts in this parking software and so forth that is another conversation. Staff needs to know how many meters to order and to do that they have to know where the paid parking is going to be.

Commissioner Tornga noted also the Commission has not asked if the Parking Committee has seen this plan.

Mayor Bujalski stated she would like Walker to take another look because it has changed and is different from their original proposal. City Manager DiSpirito advised staff has had that conversation and they are apprised of the Keller lot becoming a proposed garage and of the other proposed additional lots.

Mayor Bujalski reiterated her concerns for voting with so many unknowns.

MOTION: Motion was made by Commissioner Gracy and seconded by Commissioner Kynes to extend the meeting past 11:00 p.m.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Kynes commented it is a good idea; it is a fluid document and addresses the issue of communication and input and the language "proposed concept" handles the issue and that it will not become fully approved until attached to the RFP.

City Manager DiSpirito advised the consultant indicated it is typical of implementations in other cities that there is tweaking even after the RFP goes out and continued refinement, but generally not seed changes, just ranges. It is the job of the vendor responding to an RFP and contracted by the City to work with the City to reflect any changed desire by the Commission to make changes.

Mayor Bujalski reiterated her concern that the garage. Also, the intent is to promote use of the garage and if this is a pilot and looking at the revenues, she would not charge in that garage, but start small if paid parking passes and move up versus going all out and maybe having to move back.

Commissioner Kynes suggested long term that could be looked at for a discounted price for the people being talked about for those who want to use the trolley or bicyclists. She noted the Pinellas Trail has added a wonderful heart to the City and we want them to come and park and travel to surrounding locations. She feels these are points still in discussion, but a proposed concept for paid parking.

MOTION: Motion was made by Commissioner Kynes and seconded by Vice-Mayor Livingston to approve the map showing hybrid paid and free parking areas in concept.

Commissioner Tornga commented he would like in all the things just discussed apply to that in the concept of predetermination, the concept of fluidity, the concept of getting additional information and so forth as this is reviewed stands, so someone does not come back and say you made the decision.

Commissioner Kynes agreed.

VOTE: Motion carried with Commissioners Gracy, Tornga, Livingston, Kynes and Mayor Bujalski voting aye. Voting nay: None.

Authorization to allocate all available BP funds toward elements of the Parking Management System to keep future CRA lease payments lower.

Commissioner Tornga stated he would respectfully hope to go with Scenario "A". He noted there is no difference that he can understand. He is not talking about a different way of financing; although he would like to see that. He would like to keep the City in the cash as best we can, it can go in the General Fund and take Reserve Funds up to where they need to be comfortably and draw from that if necessary. He is not in support of depleting that entire fund for this project. He does not see how that would make a difference and if someone can tell him how that might be he would be interested in listening.

Commissioner Gracy agrees with Commissioner Tornga and would like to go with Scenario "A" for the fact that there are other projects and issues she thinks some more money might go to. This is a very expensive and robust plan and all of the City's "eggs" are being put in the downtown. She cannot support a full Scenario "C" vote.

Interim Finance Director Stredler explained the major differences between Scenarios "A" and "C":

One is the resulting annual ongoing costs for Scenario "C" is \$312,000; the resulting annual ongoing costs for Scenario "A" is almost \$380,000 which is more than the CRA will have during the period the incentives are on.

Vice-Mayor Livingston noted the ongoing debt service to that is \$150,000 as opposed to \$115,000 and the City does not get to take full advantage of the land credit. That is a difference of \$200,000.

Commissioner Tornga commented the Commission was not in the negotiation and the challenge would be that he would hope to get part of it reinstated as far as the land.

Commissioner Kynes stated her understanding is if by allocating that amount, which she is not saying there are no other needs in the city. She did point out the City just spent \$10 Million over the last few years on stormwater and drainage. She thinks it important to preserve the CRA funds for a way to continue its efforts; she has talked about undergrounding so it is not all beautification. She conflicted on that and she really feels when talking about the downtown and people say the Commission does not care about anywhere else, that is not true. She stated that every organism needs a living breathing heart and our downtown is that and it pumps the blood to the rest of the city; therefore, she is conflicted if a lesser amount could be found, but she does think it is best not to over subscribe to the point of not being able to continue other efforts.

Mayor Bujalski commented she thinks staff has basically taken the recommendation from September and tweaked it to make the numbers work this time with the new information. She would be supportive of Scenario "C". She thinks the reason for the BP money was to support tourism, so she feels this is staying true to the spirit of why the money was received and the investment. She suggested by breaking it apart, then the residents should be asked what they want to do with the rest and there are many projects it could be used for; therefore, she feels it is all or nothing.

Commissioner Tornga responded the proposal he would have is the reason for getting into the position. It was not just because of the oil spill, there were economic issues going on and the reason the City was awarded money was being able to show damages in particular funds. He stated if the \$800,000 or the amount left over it will take the reserves up comfortably into the 15%. He agrees with the 15% for the General Fund. He noted there could still be the flexibility of not doing that at a later date if the Commission wishes.

Vice-Mayor Livingston noted in looking at the difference between the two scenarios it would be spending \$700,000 more to go to Scenario "C" and asked if it would cost more to go to Scenario "A". In looking at the numbers basically the carrying costs of Scenario "A" versus Scenario "C" is an extra \$35,000 per year and that multiplied by 17 years that is \$595,000; coupled with the fact the City would not be able to take advantage of the full land credit of \$400,000, the City would only get \$200,000.

City Attorney Trask advised if that is looking at the scenario of \$200,000 or the appraised value, the appraisal came in to today he recalled at \$390,000; therefore, if that comes into play as the way it is negotiated out there is very little difference, \$10,000.

Vice-Mayor Livingston stated even if the numbers were equal and referred to Commissioner Kynes comments regarding pressure on the CRA going forward, by investing a little more in Scenario "C" that burden is lessened by \$35,000 a year and/or the future parking needs.

Commissioner Tornga commented cash is king and no one knows if this plan is going to work exactly this way, so it would give some flexibility.

Mayor Bujalski noted she would like to take staff recommendations.

MOTION: Motion was made by Vice-Mayor Livingston and seconded by Commissioner Gracy to approve the authorization to allocate all available BP funds toward elements of the Parking Management System to keep future CRA lease payments lower, Scenario "C" as recommended by staff as the funding element.

VOTE: Motion carried 3-2 with Commissioners Kynes, Livingston and Mayor Bujalski voting aye. Voting nay: Commissioners Gracy and Tornga.

Authorization per previous Commission direction, to prepare a draft Request for Proposal for Pay Station vendor that would go out to bid in early spring 2016.

Commissioner Kynes reiterated going out for RFP or RFQ provides time for fluidity and to continue to review some very big and complex components that are nuanced and continue to discuss with public input.

MOTION: Motion was made by Commissioner Kynes and seconded by Commissioner Gracy to approve the authorization, per Commission Direction, to prepare a draft Request for Proposal (RFP) or Request for Quotes (RFQ) for a Pay Station vendor that would go out to bid in early spring, 2016.

Mayor Bujalski stated she could not support the motion because it is an October 1 start date and she does not think that is nearly enough time for education for the public. Clearly from what has been seen today it would not be appropriate as she would hope the residents would have more time.

Commissioner Tornga supported the position stated by Mayor Bujalski; however, he thinks he will support the motion because it gives the opportunity to see what this will really be and give the residents that same opportunity. He does agree that this whole concept about education needs to begin; including the signage and wayfinding. The merchants need to be supported by clearing the area and utilizing the parking spaces and there are other ways of doing that.

VOTE: Motion carried 4-1 with Commissioners Tornga, Livingston, Gracy and Kynes voting aye. Voting nay: Mayor Bujalski

BREAK AT 11:24 TO 11:33

NEW BUSINESS

1. BIDS/CONTRACTS/AGREEMENTS

a. DOWNTOWN PARKING LOT LEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF DUNEDIN AND JUSTICE PLAZA INC.– 228 MAIN STREET

Commissioner Gracy advised although she will not benefit from any lease terms she has a conflict of interest and will not be voting on this item. The property is owned by her father-in-law. City Attorney Trask reminded her she must fill out a Conflict of Interest form with 15 days of the meeting. Commissioner Gracy then left the dais.