

Speaker 1 ([00:04:51](#)):

It's just the four of us tonight. I don't know. That's a good question. Neither have I see if, I didn't know

Speaker 2 ([00:05:00](#)):

If commissioner sell. Well just think.

Speaker 3 ([00:05:10](#)):

Craig says you might be safe. Okay. I leave today. No, he said he wasn't sure but Okay. Craig.

Speaker 1 ([00:05:20](#)):

Craig

Speaker 3 ([00:05:21](#)):

Handbook

Speaker 1 ([00:05:23](#)):

Pretty small. Okay. Okay. Thank you. Alright then are the rest of us ready? Yep. Alright. Good evening and welcome to the February 11th, 2025 Lawrence City Commission meeting. I'd like to start with the introductions to the rules of the meeting, please, Sherry.

Speaker 4 ([00:05:42](#)):

Thank you Mayor, and good evening everyone. Please silence your cell phones to minimize distractions. During the meeting when the mayor calls for public comment, please approach the podium to indicate you wish to speak. Virtual participants should use the raise hand function to indicate they wish to speak. When prompted, select join as panelist. There will be a brief delay as your role changes. Once your name is called, please unmute and turn on your camera. To provide your comments, please state your name and zip code. Before speaking. The city reserves the right to turn videos off or mute participants and all comments will be limited to three minutes. The primary format for accessing or participating in this meeting is in person at City Hall. Virtual access to view or participate in the meeting cannot be guaranteed. The chat function will not be monitored. If you have any trouble, the meeting can be viewed on the city's YouTube channel and cable channel 25. Thank you, mayor.

Speaker 1 ([00:06:46](#)):

Okay. Thank you Sherry. Alright. The first item on the agenda is to approve the agenda. The city commission reserves the right to amend, supplement, or reorder the agenda during the meeting. Is there a motion to approve the agenda as is

Speaker 3 ([00:06:58](#)):

Move to approve the agenda.

Speaker 1 ([00:06:59](#)):

Second. Motion to approve the agenda by Fin Dice. Seconded by Littlejohn. All in favor say aye. Aye. Motion passes four zero. Next item on the agenda is the consent agenda. Items on the consent agenda are considered under one motion and approved by one motion. Members of the governing body may remove items for separate discussions if desired. Members of the public may remove items identified as quasi-

judicial for separate discussion if desired, members of the public will be limited to three minutes for comments on those items. Okay. Any desire to remove anything from the consent agenda?

Speaker 3 ([00:07:36](#)):

No.

Speaker 1 ([00:07:37](#)):

Alright. Very well then. Is there a motion?

Speaker 3 ([00:07:41](#)):

I don't think there's any clause. Yeah,

Speaker 1 ([00:07:42](#)):

Don't think so. Move to approve the consent agenda.

Speaker 3 ([00:07:45](#)):

Second.

Speaker 1 ([00:07:46](#)):

Motion to approve the consent agenda by Finkel Dye. Seconded by Littlejohn. All in favor say aye. Aye. Motion passes four zero. All right, so the next item on our agenda is the regular agenda item, which is to consider items related to development of the Q 39 barbecue restaurant in a portion of the former Lawrence Journal World Production Facility at 6 39 New Hampshire.

Speaker 5 ([00:08:18](#)):

Good evening commissioners. Brandon McGuire, assistant city manager. I'll be presenting this item and I know we have members of the development team in attendance as well as consultants of the city on Zoom and in the audience. So together we will all be available to answer any questions you have after a brief presentation. The item before you is a development incentive request from Q 39 barbecue for a community improvement district and industrial revenue bond for a sales tax abatement on eligible construction costs. The principal amount requested for the IRB is \$5 million Development incentive applications are usually submitted on consent agenda. This request is presented this evening on regular agenda because the applicant requested immediate consideration of the IRB circumstances with the development of change since they committed to the project prompting the request for an immediate consideration and I'll leave it to the applicant to explain more about those circumstances in the project.

([00:09:22](#)):

The project at 6 39 New Hampshire Street is an example of an adaptive reuse in an older downtown building that has been unused or underutilized for years development of the building as expected to encourage redevelopment of additional vacant buildings in the immediate vicinity. The requested community improvement district or CID would establish a 2% sales tax over 22 years to reimburse a portion of the developer's costs as presented. This part of the request would go through our typical analysis and negotiation process before returning to the governing body for a decision at a future meeting. So the action on that piece of the agenda report is simply to accept the application and refer to staff. As with most of our development requests, incident requests, third party costs incurred by the city for any analysis or preparation of legal documents such as in this case for the issuance of IRBs are paid for by the developer through a funding agreement with the city. That item is also on your agenda for consideration this evening. Again, as I said, our consultants from Baker, Tilly and Gilmore and Bell are in attendance

and I believe the development team would like to provide some comments to the commission before discussion.

Speaker 1 ([00:10:40](#)):

Okay, thank you. Who would like to start first? Patrick.

Speaker 6 ([00:10:51](#)):

Thank you Mayor Aver. Commissioners. Good evening. My name is Patrick Watkins. I'm an attorney here in town. I am here with our development team and with me is, I should clarify first that I am here on behalf of R-K-M-K-U-L-L-C. That is the property owner of record that is the applicant for this incentive request. Q 39 is the eventual tenant. There will be a traditional landlord tenant relationship between the applicant and the eventual user of this property, which is of course Q 39. As Brandon noted with me tonight is Kelly McGee. She's the owner of Q 39. She's also the owner of R-K-M-K-U-L-L-C. She's a developer here. Her team includes Andrew esi. Kirk Ridgeway is here on the phone. We also have Curtis Ramsey. He is a coordinator of the project. I'm really pleased to be here this moment in time. It really represents a lot of work, a tremendous amount of work and a series of accomplishments to get to this point.

([00:11:52](#)):

The incentive application on its own is a recognition of a substantial and challenging investment in downtown Lawrence. As a community, we do so much to plan and protect downtown Lawrence and to be at the table right now with a group that is ready to invest at this location is a tremendous accomplishment, tremendous opportunity for the community. It's also a success story for our economic development policy. We hold ourselves out as a community to potential partners for the right types of projects, and this is just that it is the right type of project. The economic development policy is working and tonight is a celebration of that achievement. This project is a starting block for what the community can hope to see in the journal world building. It's the largest unused building in the downtown district. It's been vacant for over 10 years. The impact that a vacancy has on the downtown corridor cannot be overstated.

([00:12:57](#)):

To have an investor already doing the work to get this building into usable shape is worthy of celebrating. But let's talk about the project being proposed here. What's left of the journal world building is probably easiest described as more burden than benefit. It's 70,000 square feet of industrial newspaper printing plant. It's the elephant in downtown Lawrence. This is a property that several developers have tried to develop in the last 10 years. It's been reimaged as a conference center. We've seen a proposal for a grocery store. We've seen a proposal for an entertainment venue. Each of those groups was under contract. Each of those groups spent good money trying to do due diligence to find a way to develop this property. Each of those groups fell out of contract. It is very difficult to develop this property. What remains from the building is not particularly helpful.

([00:13:56](#)):

It needs new roofs, new entries, new access, the full range of mechanical, electrical, plumbing systems. If they're in place, they need replacement. All forms of city infrastructure require new connections to upgrade. The work is intensive. The costs of redeveloping this site are exceptionally high. It's easy to say that redeveloping this site would've been less expensive if we could scrape the property and just start fresh. It's that sort of development project. Of course, our preservation requirements would require quite a bit more than that. And we did go through a design review process where we spent about 90 days asking for permission to paint the building. But we're not allowed to just start fresh here. We've got a building to work around, but like every other project that's being considered for this site, we've got some economic tools that we can apply to it. The city's economic development policy was passed in 2019.

(00:14:53):

It's an important document for our community. It gives an important message to the world. If you're interested in investing in Lawrence, here are the things that are important to us, important enough to us as a community that we'll consider partnering with you. It's a statement that we publish openly on our city's website. It's a policy that's relied upon by businesses and investors. Looking at Lawrence, it's a policy that keeps Lawrence relevant in northeast Kansas. Among our peer cities who use economic incentive tools far more aggressively than we do, it's a policy that helps shape the growth of our community. You all know what it says. Downtown development, infill development. These are both emphasized among other things. Affordable housing, sustainable building, manufacturing jobs, protecting neighborhoods. This policy has been invoked on every major development and downtown in recent memory, it's a critical document. Without the policy, a lot of downtown redevelopment just wouldn't be possible.

(00:15:57):

This project meets the city's requirements for two incentives sought in this application. The IRB and the CID. The IRB is commonly sought in part because the city's investment is really so minor. Most downtown developments seek to retain a portion of their incremental property taxes or their incremental sales taxes. You've heard of Tiffs and TDD and nras. A lot of these larger downtown projects will use that get the increment of those property or sales tax rebated back to the development. We've intentionally stayed away from those. We think that property taxes can stay with the city. We think that sales taxes can stay with the city and county in this project after construction. So people have suggested that these incentives should not be utilized for restaurants and I would have to agree that restaurants are not indicated in our economic development policy. They're not included, but it does not exclude developments that have a restaurant.

(00:16:55):

As an end user. This project qualifies for incentives because it's a major investment and a dilapidated downtown building, it qualifies because this building would not develop without the incentives. It qualifies because it's capable of stimulating more development at the general world building. If other restaurants chose to make the same sort of investment in an old dilapidated downtown building, they qualify, they should apply. It makes sense, but this is not about a restaurant. This is about a developer taking a huge risk on a very hard to develop property that we don't have a better option for. So what's at stake tonight for the city? You've heard and seen the report on it. The city's portion of sales tax on construction materials is about \$30,000. That is the ask of the city. Tonight, the state of Kansas stands ready to approve its portion of sales taxes, which is far more substantial.

(00:17:52):

And as a reminder, these are sales taxes on the construction project that the city will only receive if the project moves forward. In return for the economic incentives, the city will add a very productive property to its sales tax and property tax base. And just the first year following the construction, you can expect property taxes on its own to more than double what the city's investment in the IRB would be. Sales taxes generated by Q 39 are notorious beyond economic value. There is something greater. This approval is the start of a development of the much larger journal world building. This is an anchor for a building that absolutely must have an anchor. It secures a top rated regional operator making every part of the development easier. It'll add 8,000 square feet of usable commercial space to the downtown district. Substantial amount of usable space just to be able to compete with our other commercial districts in Lawrence, which are expanding.

(00:18:54):

It's a signal to other developers, other stakeholders, investors in the journal world building that the city will live up to its policies and criteria in the economic development documents. And I have to say this, what are the consequences of denying the incentive application? The project stops. We are at a point

where we have to have partnership with the city. A negative vote means that Q 39 will go back to the drawing board on what happens to this property. A negative vote means that the building will continue to seek an investor that's willing to make an investment in downtown Lawrence. A negative vote means that there'll be no expansion of the sales tax or property tax basis from Q 39. A negative vote means is a signal to businesses and investors that you've really got to get these things in line first. It's not okay to start early.

(00:19:44):

Even if you want to get opened early, this project is ready to be a success story. Q 39 is ready to come to Lawrence. Kelly McGee has a few comments for you and obviously we're happy to answer any questions. We certainly don't desire to be in a position where we've started a project and come to you asking for help, but everyone that has ever looked at this building in recent memory would've required incentives for the redevelopment of it. The fact that we got started early, the fact that eventually there isn't a restaurant as an end user of this development, to me, it's not a factor in the economic development policy. I think we should fall back on that document and rely on what these commissioners passed in 2019 when deciding how our downtown's going to be developed. I'll let Kelly say a few words and we can be available to talk.

Speaker 1 (00:20:39):

Thank you pet.

Speaker 7 (00:20:43):

Hi, good evening. Thank you all for your time and your consideration. My name is Kelly McGee and I am the owner of both RKM properties as well as Q3 nine restaurants. I have spent the last 10 years as a restaurateur and not as a property developer. However, my love for Lawrence, my family, my parents both attended and graduated from KU. I did as well in the eighties and my children were all been graduating and going through the years since 2013 and I have one of my sons here this evening who is in law school there. So I love Lawrence, I love the community and when the initial opportunity to be part of a bigger development looked like it was dimming, I thought I would love to be part of building this community and making a stab at this. And it was kind of a courageous move because I don't have a lot of experience in that and property development is not for the faint of heart and there's a lot of things I, I've done a lot of old homes, but that's a whole different ballgame as you all know.

(00:21:45):

So I'm asking from most restaurants have a very high fail rate and we opened the first Q 39 in 2014 and with my late husband, we built this together. He had the culinary skills and the passion for the specific restaurant business and I have had a career of business development, so I liked challenging new things and restaurants continuously provide that. We were very fortunate. We opened in the 39th street area in Kansas City and a strip center was actually very dead. It was a very dead zone along that area and just our opening there, our traffic revitalized that entire strip center and has been provided quite a bit. There was an existing community improvement district there and provided a lot of improvements for that entire corridor in Kansas City. My hope is to provide the same here in this area. So being the first in this particular part of the development is very challenging and probably a little more than I expected and I am really asking for the city's help because I'm willing to make this substantial investment personally. So if I'm happy to answer any questions or anything else.

Speaker 1 (00:22:59):

Sure. If we have questions, we'll round 'em up after we're finished up. Thank you very much. Okay. And then anyone from staff have anything prepared or just here for any questions we might have?

Speaker 5 (00:23:18):

Yeah, that's the end of our presentation. Very good much turn it back to the commission for discussion.

Speaker 1 ([00:23:28](#)):

Alright, so you going to go ahead and open this up to public? You

Speaker 3 ([00:23:32](#)):

Have questions first? Oh,

Speaker 1 ([00:23:33](#)):

You want to go questions course? Yeah, please.

Speaker 3 ([00:23:35](#)):

Either way. Just yeah, please. Brandon or someone from staff and maybe it's Patrick, but can you talk a little bit about what kind of work has been done? Like I'm thinking wado and is that work related just to this building or related to the, just to this part of the LJ world building or the whole building?

Speaker 6 ([00:24:02](#)):

Sure. These all new infrastructure, so we've got to tap into the sewer line in the back and we've been informed that the sewer line was relined 20 years ago and that we can attach into what is there. There might be a future relocation of that sewer line around and outside of that larger journal world building at some point, depending on who might come next, we know that there are other parties looking at the Massachusetts side of this building and they're actively engaged in that consideration on whether the sewer line gets relocated. The water line comes off of New Hampshire Street, it's been upsized to a two inch line. There's a \$50,000 impact fee for that. So we get connected to the water line, but presumably water will be supplied to each individual parcel as they develop electrical. I think we're sorting out electrical for a good portion of the rest of the property.

([00:25:02](#)):

Right now it's on the north end of the development. All of it's stacked at the end of the alley. It requires new transformers. We've negotiated a private easement to get a line down the alley to the Q 39 location. It's taken quite a bit of work to just sort out some of the electrical. You can imagine an old industrial plant with its 70-year-old electrical infrastructure. It has a lot of power. That's unfortunately not our problem. It's getting it to the individual parcels from the north end of the property. Gas line doesn't look to be as intensive as a utility to sort out, but data, everything else will be kind of supplied without too much difficulty. Sanitary sewer and electrical are the trouble someones

Speaker 3 ([00:25:51](#)):

And is that alley off Massachusetts Street? Is that a private alley or a public alley?

Speaker 6 ([00:25:56](#)):

The city has an easement for the use of the alley, so it is still in private property, but there's an expansive rights that have been granted to the city to use that. And obviously this is one of the very few places where the alley doesn't go straight through the block. We've tried to kind of work with that strange L-shaped alley and activate a storefront on the west side of the property. Does that help answer that?

Speaker 3 ([00:26:23](#)):

Yes, thank you. And brand, do we know how much they've paid in fees on?



Speaker 5 ([00:26:30](#)):

Yes, I've got that number. So the commercial edition permit fee was \$14,290 and the system development charges for the two inch meter that Patrick referenced was \$52,491.

Speaker 1 ([00:26:50](#)):

Okay, so to that point, does that \$52,000 upscale service charge, will that alleviate the service charge associated with any additional connections upstream or will they all require an upscale and a \$52,000 charge to the sewer line, presuming there'll be others north of here?

Speaker 5 ([00:27:15](#)):

That's a good question. I don't know the answer to that off the top of my head. Patrick, have you had that conversation with our,

Speaker 1 ([00:27:20](#)):

I think that's water

Speaker 6 ([00:27:21](#)):

Distribution, so that's not even

Speaker 1 ([00:27:22](#)):

Oh, so the \$52,000 that was a service line to the building, so that will serve the whole building. Will that be enough to serve the whole building? That's what

Speaker 6 ([00:27:30](#)):

I'm, no, I think there's an expectation that other parcels will pull their own line in and they'll have their own impact fee.

Speaker 1 ([00:27:36](#)):

Okay. And then how about the sewage line too? That's one thing when he brought that up, did you have to upsize any of the sewage discharge systems at all yet?

Speaker 6 ([00:27:45](#)):

Well, within our parcel, absolutely. I mean, we have a grease interceptor that we have to put in. I mean frankly, there wasn't really any sewer lines in our portion of the property, so we're going to tap into an existing sewer line that's in the alley.

Speaker 1 ([00:27:59](#)):

So it was kind of weak on that part. So you already did all that work. You've already done the subsurface infrastructure work in the building?

Speaker 6 ([00:28:05](#)):

No, but we've planned it all and it's been a topic of a great deal of discussion and very good. Thank you. Dave Kronan and I are buddies now. Yeah,

Speaker 5 ([00:28:14](#)):

Yeah. There is a challenging sewer line in other parts of the property.

Speaker 1 ([00:28:22](#)):

Any other questions for the presenters or the city staff?

Speaker 8 ([00:28:25](#)):

I have one. Patrick. How old is the, I guess the building and the complex itself, the Lawrence TR Journal World Building. I know you said it's been unoccupied for about two years, but I just was wondering the age of the building just to give context to how much work it would take to go ahead and rehab it, renovate it.

Speaker 6 ([00:28:44](#)):

Sure. Our portion of the building was built at multiple times. There's actually two different levels within it. I've gone back on aerial maps to see if I could find out and I'm not sure how old it is. I mean, I think we do know that there was a portion added on mass. That's the most recent portion when they started printing the USA today, they added a big Mass Street frontage and then portions of the rest of the building were built over time.

([00:29:11](#)):

I'm betting, I used to be a delivery boy for the journal world, so I used to pick up the paper at this distribution dock. You could go there and they'd have it there. They also made me collect the subscription fee for my fees, which I still hold against them on a personal level. I just want to bring that up. But a big problem with developing this site is that you've got multi-tiered level in the inside and you have a huge loading dock out front. We can see from the design of the outside of the building that even the canopy that is built over the loading dock was built at multiple different times. We have a party wall with the Blue Cross Blue Shield building. We have a party wall with the rest of the property. We share some space on the back end with the alley. I mean, so there is a little bit more than meets the eye on this rectangular building. The fact that it's two tiered inside has actually created a bit of a designed paradox or conundrum I would say for the designers who have really had to work hard to figure out how they're going to move people throughout the building. Does that help?

Speaker 1 ([00:30:15](#)):

I think I saw there's some plates inside the building. I know there's fifties and sixties. They kind of did one section and then right away like 10 years later they did another section around there if I remember correctly. But yeah, probably 60 to 70 years old, I think that's right.

Speaker 9 ([00:30:31](#)):

Yeah. I have a question. Could somebody talk about the jobs 88 jobs that was spoken of in the staff report? What kind of jobs are those? What do they pay?

Speaker 6 ([00:30:43](#)):

Jerry, you want to join me up here?

Speaker 9 ([00:30:45](#)):

The 88 jobs

Speaker 6 ([00:30:47](#)):



In our application for incentives, we filled in that there's a couple of managerial jobs. There's obviously a chef job. I think Kelly can talk about their hiring practices, but it was based upon what we know about the numbers of their other operations. Obviously there's a few different types of jobs, right? There's hosts hostesses, there's waiters, there's food runners and dish runners, and then there's the chefs and kitchen staff f

Speaker 7 ([00:31:13](#)):

Sure. So our current restaurants employ about 150 people each, and there's about 12 of those in managerial positions. And then the rest we have about, I would say 40 full-time people and the rest are part-time and it's usually by design because that's how they want to work. And so we have the heart of the house, the back of the house, people who do the cooking and produce our food. And then we have the front of the house, which is typically servicing guests and customers. We believe the Lawrence operation, we don't know we can scale it up or down whenever you start something. We've planted about 80% of our current existing operation being at a hundred percent. So we have 12 right now. I think I'll have 10 managers full-time salaries that are highly competitive with the restaurant industry. So they average of 60 to 65,000 and up for those salaries. And then our front of the house tipped people will have, they average 25 to \$40 an hour when they work and then the back of the house are average about \$20 an hour. So just to give you a range of their well compensated because it's a demanding job. We are busy restaurant and we want to be the best and we want our people to be the best.

Speaker 9 ([00:32:32](#)):

Thank you

Speaker 7 ([00:32:32](#)):

Answered.

Speaker 9 ([00:32:33](#)):

Yep.

Speaker 3 ([00:32:37](#)):

Dunno who's best to answer this, but I know one of the questions is, I know we're not voting on the CID tonight, but the CID being A one property CID, is there, is that typical any? I don't know if anyone wants to answer that or

Speaker 6 ([00:32:57](#)):

Go ahead. Yeah, it's a bit unusual, right? We could perhaps choose to charge more and maybe get the same effect. But in this case, from our perspective, we do have two different entities here. We have a developer who is spending a great deal of money and investment to try and just get this place usable and then we have a traditional lease with the tenant. We think it's appropriate. We think it's obviously everything is by the books with Q 39. We think it's easier to track to make sure that this money flows back to repay the developer. It's a major cost. It's sort of like making sure that you're paying your mortgage to pay back, what major investment is there just to get the place usable. So we did analyze that. We looked at it and we fully understand that it's a bit unusual that it's only one property. With that said, the rest of this property will develop at some point. We believe that Q 39 being there will cause more development. It would not be impossible to expand the district if you have an operating district, it's that much easier for other people to say, you know what, if they're able to have the district, maybe we could rewrite this to include more properties and expand it for other people's use. I think it could be at least a beta or an example of how it can work.

(00:34:30):

I think ideally you have multiple tenants or multiple revenue sources that are going back to the CID, but in this case it made sense to us.

Speaker 3 (00:34:39):

Okay. I guess you made a good point though. I am not sure I've been involved with the expansion of A CID, but you don't have to have, if the rest of the billing came in, you wouldn't have to be a second CID. It could be the expansion of ones and so contiguous.

Speaker 6 (00:34:52):

Well, I think Kevin May be able to answer that better than I could, but to me there's obviously some way this is an agreement. We could rewrite the agreement at some level, but Kevin is the city's bond council. I think he would know the answer.

Speaker 3 (00:35:07):

I dunno if Kevin,

Speaker 4 (00:35:08):

He's joining now.

Speaker 3 (00:35:09):

Okay, Kevin, go ahead then.

Speaker 10 (00:35:25):

Thanks Commissioner. Yeah, hi, Kevin wimpy with Gilmore Bell. Thanks for accommodating me virtually here this evening. As I was switching over, I think the question was about expansion of A CID and how that could be accomplished. And commissioner, the rules under the statute are the same whether you are forming a district or expanding one is that you have to have a valid petition signed by at least 55% of the property owners. So certainly we could accommodate adding an adjacent parcel to A CID during the term of the initial CID under those rules.

Speaker 3 (00:35:58):

Excellent. Thank you.

Speaker 1 (00:36:04):

So clearly, does that mean that they can add it without additional processes notification or do we then have to go through the same process of communicating with 55% or can we just add them on? Did you get your answer?

Speaker 3 (00:36:21):

Well, I'll let Kevin answer that,

Speaker 1 (00:36:22):

Paul, that's a good question. I mean that's what I'm trying to figure out, Evan.

Speaker 10 (00:36:28):

Sure, mayor, happy to clarify. So yeah, it would be, the statute requires for forming a CID, the submittal of a petition by 55% of the property owners within the district here. Obviously we have a hundred percent because it's the single oral and then the resolution calling a public hearing on the imposition of that CID sales tax. There's notices that go out via mail and also publication of that resolution at a subsequent meeting of public hearings held and then consideration of an ordinance levying that CID sales tax. That entire process would have to be repeated with regard to the expanded CID. Should that come to pass?

Speaker 1 ([00:37:07](#)):

That's exactly what I need to know. Thank you.

Speaker 10 ([00:37:10](#)):

You bet.

Speaker 1 ([00:37:14](#)):

Any other questions? Okay, we have more later we can talk. Okay. How about public comment on this?

Speaker 11 ([00:37:27](#)):

Good evening. Andrew Holt, executive director of Downtown Lawrence Inc. And a resident of downtown mayor, commissioners and city staff. Appreciate your time. I just want to say that our downtown is doing well. It's a destination, it's a tourism spot, one of the top ones in the state and in the region. But downtown ecosystems are fragile and ours is fragile also. And one of the greatest risks that we face right now is vacant buildings and dead spots. And the Q 39 project addresses that risk and challenge in a profound way. This will be a vibrant restaurant, a place of activity, and I think it will also serve as a catalyst for further development, not only in that area but in the rest of downtown. I also think that it will provide, as Patrick said, the added commercial property dollars that this city needs and is in the master plan.

([00:38:33](#)):

So it's a good project. I also would like to say that Q 39 has shown a strong interest in downtown Lawrence and that needs to be valued even when the original developer withdrew Q 39 stayed the course and really wants to continue with this project in downtown, they've also become engaged in the community since the announcement of the project. They have had numerous popups at downtown events and continue to show interest to do that until the restaurant is opened. Also, the president of Q 39 has become a member of our board of directors and he did not ask me to speak tonight. I'm speaking on my own. So I think that Q 39 has shown good faith towards downtown Lawrence and I think that that needs to be valued. Then finally, I would just say that this is the type of project, it's going to be a vital dynamic restaurant in a place where nothing has been for 10 years. And these are the type of projects that communities do that have thriving downtowns as opposed to communities whose downtowns continue to struggle. Thank you. Thank you, Andrew.

Speaker 12 ([00:40:06](#)):

Hello, my name is Percy Mann. I'm a resident of Lawrence. My zip code is 6 6 0 4 9. And if I may, how much time do I have? Three minutes.

Speaker 1 ([00:40:13](#)):

Three minutes.

Speaker 12 ([00:40:13](#)):

Thank you. Thank you for having me here tonight. I did submit public comment online as well. I'd like to summarize what I submitted via email for everyone present here. And then I've got a couple of responses, time permitting based on what I heard earlier. So recognizing that I enjoy barbecue and I'm looking forward to having another dining option here in town. I don't believe that the citizens of Lawrence should subsidize this particular project. From what I can tell, it doesn't really align very well with the prosperity and economic security goals of the city's strategic plan. And I also believe that it represents an unnecessary risk for the taxpayers of Lawrence. The strategic plan talks about various key indicators. I'm going to list a few of them here that I think this project does not align well with. First PS PE S3, which talks about target industry employment growth, talks about industries like creative and professional services, research and biomedical computers, electronics and information technology, advanced materials and green manufacturing.

(00:41:12):

PE S seven talks about increasing the area median household income. PE S two talks about the percent of residents who are satisfied or very satisfied with Lawrence as a place to work. And lastly, P as one talks about the percent of businesses that are satisfied or very satisfied with Lawrence as a place to work. I don't believe that a food service business or Q 39 in particular aligns well with these goals. Firstly, restaurants are clearly not one of the target industries in PEs three. Secondly, the median annual earnings for food preparers and servers are slightly above 30,000. Do we believe that this moves us towards our target household income of around 54,000? And also note, I heard some salary ranges given earlier. I did a quick search on Google and the open positions that I see with Q 39 at the moment all seem to pay under \$20 an hour.

(00:41:58):

So not sure where the disconnect is, but it's also not clear that food service work in general leads to high job satisfaction. And when I look at resources online like Indeed and Glassdoor, they suggest that Q 39 employees in particular might not be highly satisfied. The other thing that I'm concerned about is I note that the project is being proposed by Rkm Properties LLC, which is a new Kansas entity. It is not the same entity that owns the existing Q 39 and Overland Park that is, sorry, RKM properties is the one in Overland Park. R-K-M-K-U is the one that's proposing this project. What happens if this restaurant does fail? What is the city's liability? Will we be holding a \$5 million bond to an improved building that's really only useful for restaurant use and what do we do with it at that point? So that would be a concern that I'd have. So yeah, that sort of summarizes what I had sent in earlier. And then I think the only thing I'd like to add, if I have time sales tax expansion that assumes that bringing this new restaurant to town will actually increase overall economic activity. If I understand correctly, baker Tilly's analysis isn't planning to examine whether that would actually be the case.

Speaker 4 (00:43:11):

I

Speaker 12 (00:43:11):

Thank you. Thank

Speaker 4 (00:43:12):

You.

Speaker 13 (00:43:22):

Excuse me. Mayor Dever, vice Mayor Finkel, members of the City Commission, I'm here this evening to speak about the redevelopment of the existing Lawrence properties and the city's role in supporting and

encouraging such development. R-K-M-K-U-L-L-C-A limited liability and entity related to Q 39. Barbecue restaurant is pursuing establishment of a restaurant operation in that portion of the former Lawrence Journal world production facility identified as 639 New Hampshire in Lawrence, Kansas. Q 39 is a Kansas City based restaurant, and this would be its first venture outside of the KC Metro. They have a reputation for providing a quality experience and are a well-regarded business. Operation. Q 39 had originally planned to develop a portion of the building as part of a larger redevelopment project of the entire former LJ world property in partnership with 3D development of Kansas City, Missouri operating as a primary developer. That plan contemplated that the primary developer would secure incentives such as those that are being sought in Q 30 nine's.

(00:44:25):

Request 3D development ultimately disengaged from the LJ world redevelopment and is no longer involved. Their departure from the project has resulted in additional costs, not originally anticipated by Q 39 and spurred this request for incentives. That would be more a typical request from the lead developer on such a project. The city has spoken of redevelopment of downtown properties as a priority. The LJ world building is one that has proven difficult to redevelop and is languished for many years failing to generate any real economic activity in that important gateway location on the north end of our downtown. It's my hope that the city commission will support redevelopment of properties like the LJ World Production Facility so they can once again generate economic activity that increases steady revenues and provides additional spark for downtown Lawrence. Thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening and thank you for your service to the community. Thank you.

Speaker 14 (00:45:27):

Hello, Steve Jacob Lawrence City Commission candidate. I am in general against tax abatements or as I call it corporate welfare. And this project is extortion. It was not the taxpayer's fault that their funding fell through and they need this money. We already have destination restaurants nearby like seven 15 Mass Street Fish House who are not doing this on the public dime is not fair. And frankly, it's not capitalism. We cannot tax abate our way to prosperity and I have not heard. They're just hoping that we get development there in this environment with the high taxes that's already coming from downtown. That's pretty questionable. Thank you.

Speaker 15 (00:46:27):

Thank you.

Speaker 1 (00:46:33):

Any other public comment in the room? Seeing none. Are there any commenters online?

Speaker 4 (00:46:41):

We do have a few. Mayor.

Speaker 1 (00:46:43):

Okay.

Speaker 4 (00:46:45):

Vince Bryant.

Speaker 16 (00:46:51):

Good evening. My name is Vince Bryant from 3D Development. I'm sure why my camera's not working, but it's on. Thank you for giving me some time to speak here. I've been referenced a couple times. We are the latest developer to attempt to redevelop this whole 70,000 square foot area. It proved very challenging as I think Pat said very well. These really are shells of buildings that require all new mechanicals systems, new roofing, stairs and other locations, elevators, things like that throughout this whole project. So it's a challenging project. I think it's a very challenging time in the restaurant industry. There are labor shortages. It's hard for full service restaurants to succeed. We were very excited to work with Q 39 to come to Lawrence to be an anchor for this project. I think it's been accurately said as well that we anticipated all these incentives for the whole project that now unfortunately Kelly is having to step into and ask for the same incentives to make the project viable being in the developer role.

(00:48:16):

And I would also say that downtown, especially this project, certainly as an entertainment hub, if there are other entertainment options, is competing with some university funding and other hospitality options up on the hill as you know. And then ultimately being vacant for 10 years, having multiple developers look at the site and have challenges to figure it out. And then I would just say my last point is that the sales tax portion is accretive, right? It's in addition to the sales tax that would normally be generated. So this is an additional 2% sales tax on top of the sales tax. So it seems like a win to attract this quality type of operation and business and concept to Lawrence where many out of town restaurants have failed and they aren't spending a million dollars to open this restaurant. They're spending significant amounts of money to open this restaurant, make an investment in Lawrence. And with Kelly's ties to the university and the history of her family's ties to university, you couldn't ask for a better company to come to downtown. Lawrence.

Speaker 1 (00:49:36):

Thank you. Thank you very much.

Speaker 4 (00:49:46):

Chris Flowers. Chris Flowers.

Speaker 17 (00:49:58):

Hi, this is Chris Flowers. Just some thoughts I had the wages. My question is when they gave that, I think it was 25 to \$40 an hour for front of house or whatever, how much of those that money is their actual wage and how much are they basing off of tips? I'd like to know that they talked about what people average, but I don't think they said Well, I mean maybe I'm assuming though also the back of the house. Do they share in tips? I would like further clarification about how much of this expected money that they're going to be paying the workers is based on tips and how much they're actually paying themselves cells.

(00:50:48):

Also, does the city no longer have guidelines about not giving money to businesses that aren't unique and compete with current businesses? Because I thought back when they did the Lawrence Brewery that one of its issues was that would be competing with current breweries and that it only achieved two out of the three. And the one it didn't achieve was that it would be competing with a local business. So I'm just wondering, do we still have any kind of recommendation that we don't give money to outside businesses to come in and open a business that's going to compete with local businesses? How much money did Beamers get? How much did ski all these other barbecue places And not just barbecue places, they will also be competing with already established downtown restaurants. Just because someone eats at the barbecue place doesn't mean they would've eaten at another barbecue place downtown.



(00:52:01):

It could be they see that location. It's new, Hey, I'll go check this out. But I don't think it's fair for the already established local restaurants to have to compete with the business that the cities helping fund to run against them. That's the problem with corporate welfare is that the city is picking winners and losers and the winner you're picking, I don't think they're actually local. I mean you're going to be potentially putting a local business out of downtown or local business out of a local restaurant, out of business to bring in an outsider. I'm against that. Oh yeah. It's going to raise property values. I thought part of the problem with Lawrence currently is housing costs. Will raising property values increase rent in the area? I don't want my property values to raise because I'll start paying more in rent. How will this benefit renters if they live in the area and now they have to start paying 50 to a hundred dollars for a month?

Speaker 1 (00:53:05):

Your time's up. Thanks Chris. Appreciate it.

Speaker 17 (00:53:07):

Okay, thank you.

Speaker 4 (00:53:09):

That's all the comments, mayor.

Speaker 1 (00:53:11):

Alright, great. Thank you. I had another question that came up when Mr. Bryant was speaking. We talked about this change in the program from a large scale project to a small scale project and identified these incentives as being a part of that larger project. And I think I understand that being the case, but there's costs associated with your facility. And then I guess my question is are there costs associated with the greater project that would've been absorbed by the greater project, but you are having to absorb based on this compartmentalization of the project. So specifically structural changes or electrical upgrades or water or sewer infrastructure upgrades. Were those part of this plan, bigger project that you're having to absorb now? Or are there truly some costs that you didn't anticipate handling for the restaurant that would've been absorbed by the larger development? That's kind of what I'm trying to understand.

Speaker 6 (00:54:18):

Yeah, absolutely. To be clear though, I want to make this clear. I mean, we will be going through a third party review on the CID.

(00:54:28):

The same thing would've happened to a master developer and we'd be looking at apples and oranges between those two, right? That's a range of different costs associated with a large scale development versus this one. But yeah, absolutely. We've had to take on, I think one of the ways to characterize this project is to say that it does clear the way, one, we've got this incentive obligation. We've got to run the incentive application, which we wouldn't have had to do otherwise. We've got to straighten out electrical, which is going to be straightening it out for everyone else. They will get the benefit of a pre-negotiated private easement. They will have the benefit of somebody else clearing the path on with the landowner, the Simons family who they were willing parties in that electrical easement, but it was not an easy process to get a private electrical easement negotiated and completed.

(00:55:19):

It has not been easy to work through the complexities of the electrical system with Egy. No one will have to go through the burdens that this group has. No one will have to go through the burdens of analyzing,

paying engineers for stormwater studies for, excuse me, sanitary sewer studies to figure out exactly how much capacity is there. So the planning side of things, certainly the burden is on Q 39 to clear the way I think every future property owner within this larger journal world development building gets the benefit of those structurally. Yes, we have two party walls that we'll be working through. Future owners won't have the same burden. That's not the only party walls within this development though. There are more mechanically, same thing. I mean we're going to be essentially showing a blueprint of how these individual old industrial buildings will be able to be developed. One of the real complexities is how do we get access in and out, maintain enough space for a requirements, but also usable space for our patrons, usable space for our back of house. I mean, this can be translated directly over to the spot that's being looked at on mass. So a lot of planning I think is the major burden, the larger perspective on infrastructure that's shared. I would say electrical is the biggest followed by sanitary sewer. Okay.

Speaker 1 ([00:56:50](#)):

Anything else to add? I think that's what I needed. Thank you. Okay. Any other questions, commissioners or comments about what we have to consider tonight? Specifically? There's a resolution related to the \$5 million worth of IRBs, but also a separate discussion about the CID. So I'd welcome any comments or discussion at this time. I

Speaker 3 ([00:57:19](#)):

Guess I'll start and say that, I mean I think a lot of the comments have been made tonight. I support, I mean I think that economic development policy was meant for this sort of redevelopment in downtown and the general world building is the prime example of that. It's long been vacant and it's a very costly building to redo. But we've also talked about, obviously early on, I guess there was a plan long before I was on the commission about tearing it down and making it a conference center or something. But since then we've been talking about keeping it in place and reinvigorating it. So I mean, I think if this came in as a full development, I think it would be an easy decision to say it supports the ED policy, the property taxes that would come from it. As Andrew said, the clearing of vacant, I mean filling a vacant building at the north end of downtown would be huge. I do think it's a little awkward because we're calling into this the Q 39 request and it's just one part of the building.

([00:58:53](#)):

And I think that has drawn attention obviously because of that part of it. But any developer would've come in to do this work. I do see that there was a lot of benefit to the rest of the project, and I do think it's going to fill the rest of it now. I would like to see, I mean, I do think we have people poking around at other parts of it. It would be nice to have them all here at once, but they're not. And so I think to me, this meets our guidelines. It meets our goals. I mean, the IOB itself is \$30,000 to us. The CID is a tax on themselves. I did have a question about that, about taxing themselves, but they answered that question for me, which is you have a separate LLC, I mean just like you would with a developer and a tenant. And if one day this, if Q 39 closed, there would still be an owner of the building who would still need attendant and those would go on. So I could see that makes sense to me the separation of the two. So I guess I would like to see more come out of the general world building, but I think in general, I think I certainly support trying to redevelop this and using our policy to do so.

Speaker 8 ([01:00:22](#)):

Okay. Yeah, I would agree. Just kind of jotted down some notes on here just in learning a little bit more. And from the conversation it would be rehabbing a historic property downtown that is about learning from the mayor here, 60 to seven years old, unoccupied for 10 years. I've on a private and amateur scale, been a part of some redevelopment and of that type. And I can't even imagine commercially what it would take to go ahead and do that. So that would definitely be a benefit. The fact that it's concerning sales tax

instead of property tax I think is definitely a benefit in my mind as well. And this is not in totally unfamiliar because last year I think, or a year before, I can't remember what turn holla came before us. And there's no way that project would've got off the ground without any sort of incentives.

(01:01:22):

And that's another historic property that was probably going to be eventually used for recreation or entertainment or some sort of restaurant business that without any sort of incentive would not happen. And that's also a historic building. So just the jobs being brought to the community as well and hopefully jump starting some more economic development around in the area and the possible, if it could be an expansion of the CID to go ahead and bring some more benefit as well. And just last of all, through this process and through the efforts of Q 39 and doing some of the things with infrastructure as well, that we get a rehab commercial property downtown to support downtown to help us have a thriving downtown through their efforts, which is if we're all, I mean, we currently and always say that we want to support a thriving, go towards a thriving downtown, and I think this goes a long way towards it. So I long windedly, that's my support for it.

Speaker 1 (01:02:39):

So you would support both the IRBs and the CID or the moving forward with moving forward with the CID just prior and approving the IRBs before the assessment of the CID, but for analysis? Yeah.

Speaker 8 (01:02:54):

Yes.

Speaker 1 (01:02:55):

Okay, good.

Speaker 9 (01:02:57):

So we're going to divide the vote up or

Speaker 1 (01:02:58):

No, I didn't know. I just want to make sure I understood because there are two different issues in my mind that I'm struggling with, and so I just wanted to bring that up.

Speaker 9 (01:03:05):

Yeah. Well, I won't be able to support this tonight. I just don't think it falls within our economic policy, economic development policy. I think of all the other businesses, many businesses downtown that have redeveloped their properties and put a significant amount of money into it without any consideration. I just don't think that it meets that. So I won't be voting for it tonight.

Speaker 1 (01:03:30):

And you wouldn't be in favor of A CID either

Speaker 9 (01:03:33):

The to move forward with CIDI would be okay with that. Okay. I mean, that's their own,

Speaker 1 (01:03:38):

I want to make sure I was okay with that. Yeah. Thank you. Okay. So I guess what

Speaker 3 ([01:03:46](#)):

About the, I guess the other, would the CID information make any difference to you, commissioner Lawson? I guess if we deferred the io, I mean the IOB until we consider the CID and get that analysis?

Speaker 9 ([01:04:12](#)):

No, I don't think it will.

Speaker 3 ([01:04:13](#)):

Okay. Yeah.

Speaker 1 ([01:04:16](#)):

Okay. Well, I want to echo what most of the others have stated here related to the enormous effort to improve an old building. I know what it's like familiar with the process and I know it's expensive, and I was really impressed and surprised that you took this endeavor on without the larger area. I feel compelled to bring up the fact that this feels piecemeal to me. And I am generally in favor of the idea of using these tools to help aid the redevelopment of larger scale properties, especially aging indoor historic ones. I want to help support any development and growth of our aging infrastructure. And I think you guys are helping to pay for some of that. So thank you. I also am not quite sure I want to move forward with the IRBs without looking first at the CID, because in my opinion, the CID analysis or the but for analysis will help firm up my opinion on whether or not this is a good investment for the city spending \$36,000, whatever is.

([01:05:29](#)):

And I guess part of that also is are we then also committing other entities, forego another 125 or \$130,000 worth of taxes? So for me, that's kind of the bigger question I want to understand because that's what we are implicitly approving, is we want to give you all this money, or excuse me, we want to give you this assistance in acquiring all this money and in return we're foregoing some tax dollars. But other entities will also have to forego those dollars as well, more than likely. So for me, I would like to see some sort of analysis on this. It does feel pushed in and rushed to me in that I was surprised to see these come along. And again, no offense, I completely understand it, but for me to analyze something from an economic and whole city assessment, I feel like I really want to understand how this formula is going to work from a CID perspective as well.

([01:06:28](#)):

And then lastly, I would really want to support and pursue a larger scale project. I want to encourage anyone listening that we want to do something bigger, not small. We want to spend the money and time on all this effort on a larger project, not a portion of a larger project. And I really feel it's odd that a single entity had to bear the burden of this larger development. And I feel for you, and I appreciate the money and time you spent on the project, but for me, I feel like we're just taking one bite of the apple and taking instead of taking our opportunity to do more. And I don't know what we can do to facilitate a larger scale bite of the apple at this case, but if we can help facilitate in this interim time a larger area for both A CID and also an IRB extension for any improvements, that would be helpful.

([01:07:21](#)):

But initially, I know we can only talk about the \$5 million, but I want to look at a bigger picture project because this is going to be sitting there without any incentive to move forward if we take this singular approach. And I just want to make sure we all look at this and if there's anything we can do to try to bring this package back together with whoever owns and operates these properties to make it a bigger deal for the community and for downtown, and to use these dollars and these efforts to develop downtown on a greater scale. So for me, I think I would be willing to move forward with the CID analysis and then

potential approval of the IRBs at that point. When that's done, I understand you're not going to be moving forward with any construction in the interim time. So this is really not an influence. And I was worried about impacting your construction costs and timeframe because the CID assessment needs to be done. So I would like to defer any decision on the IRBs until that time. That's how I feel. Okay.

Speaker 3 ([01:08:32](#)):

Any Brandon Craig, any concern with that process? I don't,

Speaker 18 ([01:08:37](#)):

No. I think I heard a consensus was looking for a motion probably. Yep,

Speaker 1 ([01:08:43](#)):

Sure. Please. We need help here because we're breaking apart our regular agenda item number one.

Speaker 6 ([01:08:49](#)):

Sure. I'm just curious about our fifth commissioner. I mean, did we know that we had absence tonight? No. Are we getting the benefit of,

Speaker 1 ([01:08:56](#)):

I apologize for that. And that's one of the reasons I feel like this is important. I think we need everyone here to weigh in on this if it's going to move anywhere.

Speaker 6 ([01:09:04](#)):

Are you suggesting that you'd not take a vote tonight?

Speaker 1 ([01:09:08](#)):

I'm suggesting that if we could break down the movement on the CID assessment and then orgo a decision on the IRBs until such time as the CID review is back,

Speaker 6 ([01:09:20](#)):

So a third party review and you would reconsider the IRB at that time after the third party, just

Speaker 1 ([01:09:27](#)):

De follow the IRB deferred the decision on irb. Unless you want us to deny at this point in time, I don't know. Or at least to have a, I don't know if it's going to go because we only have an even number here.

Speaker 6 ([01:09:41](#)):

I am following that. Yeah. I think our position is clear. This is a \$36,000 ask on a 5 million project. I think if an IRB is not approved tonight, what makes us think that A CID would be approved for a much larger ask later in the project,

Speaker 1 ([01:10:04](#)):

But for analysis.

Speaker 6 ([01:10:05](#)):

Yeah. Well you guys are entitled to make your decisions about this. I think our position is quite clear. I would hate to see a denial of an IRB without a full commission though.

Speaker 1 ([01:10:17](#)):

Sure. Thank you. One of the reasons I was contemplating this discussion, so what do we guys can, I mean, well again, I would, if you want a motion to approve this or not, then we can do that.

Speaker 3 ([01:10:31](#)):

No, I mean I think it's clear where the voted goes, so I'd rather have them go together and move forward with it than take a vote so I can make a motion.

Speaker 8 ([01:10:42](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 3 ([01:10:46](#)):

I would, well let me ask this before I make the motion. The part that's authorized to see manager execute a funding agreement that goes along with the CID, we need that, correct?

Speaker 18 ([01:10:59](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 3 ([01:11:00](#)):

Okay. And then the other part is just receiving the application. Right. And the third party would be de, okay, I got my motion now. Wide move that we received an application for economic development incentives for the development and refer it to staff. In addition, authorized see manager to execute a funding agreement with all KM K-U-L-L-C, the limited liability entity created by Q 39 to develop and own and operate the business. And I moved to deferred consideration resolution number 7 5 7 3 to be brought back when we consider the CID adoption after the analysis.

Speaker 8 ([01:11:44](#)):

Second.

Speaker 1 ([01:11:46](#)):

Okay. That's a motion by Commissioner Finkel. Excuse me. Vice Mayor Finkel Dye, seconded by Littlejohn. All in favor say aye.

Speaker 9 ([01:11:53](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([01:11:54](#)):

Those opposed. Motion passes four zero. And I appreciate the input from everybody tonight and I want to make sure we understand where we're going with this and hopefully they'll be coming back in a very short period of time. So thank you. Thank you. Next item on the agenda is our work session item and it's to receive public parking study.

Speaker 18 ([01:12:42](#)):



Brad, share that to Zoom at the same time please. Alright,

Speaker 16 ([01:12:45](#)):

I'll give that a shot.

Speaker 15 ([01:12:54](#)):

Yeah, green button at the bottom.

Speaker 19 ([01:13:04](#)):

Sizzly. Only one person can share at a time.

Speaker 15 ([01:13:08](#)):

I think that's you.

Speaker 19 ([01:13:17](#)):

Oh,

Speaker 14 ([01:13:17](#)):

Here we go. Okay, cool.

Speaker 19 ([01:13:37](#)):

All right. See if I can switch my slides here. One second. Maybe you could help me with flipping this to where when I share from the beginning it gives me my presentation side.

Speaker 16 ([01:14:01](#)):

Oh, there's only one monitor.

Speaker 19 ([01:14:04](#)):

Alright. You wrote this right? Yeah. Nothing to it. Right. Alright, thank you. Good evening, mayor and commissioners. My name is Brad Harold, parking manager for the City of Lawrence. Tonight I'm joined by Eric Haggett with Walker Consultants. He helped with this project and we're going to jump into, there's a substantial amount of information on this slide, so I'm going to breeze past a few of these in order to, for time's sake to make sure that we have more time and context on the others. So when we talk about parking goals, we're talking about the downtown and how we need to set fees and rates to a rate that really inhibits or encourages parking behavior in our downtown district while also reaching our community's goals and needs in the commercial district. So here's a table of contents. As we're overviews everything we're going to discuss today, we will jump right into our system review. So what is the parking fund? The parking plan plays a vital role in maintaining parking operations for the city, relying entirely from revenues, from garages, lots, meters, and citations. This funding is essential to cover the cost of maintaining parking facilities, enforce rules and regulations, and also delivering excellent customer service to our visitors and the community.

([01:15:25](#)):

So this is a little screenshot of how the parking enterprise fund keeps things moving. So as we continue to invest in our infrastructure and modernizing our parking technologies, parking revenues are anticipated to grow, and as they grow, it allows us to reinvest those dollars directly back into our downtown and the success of our downtown with programs like our ambassador program and our future neighborhood

permitting program to make our downtown be one of the more desired destinations for visitors in Kansas. So a quick overview of our parking facilities. We have on street parking and off street parking. The total spaces in our downtown district is 2,602.

(01:16:09):

Overview of our current parking fees and rates. Our two hour meters are a dollar an hour, that's our short-term duration. 10 hour meters are 20 cents an hour, and our meter and overtime violations are \$10. As for permits, garages are \$20 a month, reserve spaces are \$75 a month. And I would also like to add that we have a dedicated downtown part-time employee permit that's \$6 and 25 cents per month in lot 16 near Rhode Island. Some of the peer cities that we examined, of course we had to have some of our friends from Kansas, Olathe, Overland Park, Manhattan, but we also wanted to include municipalities with a similar medium house income and population that also had that university component. So Ames, Iowa, Champaign, Illinois, and Columbia, Missouri.

(01:16:59):

So in comparison of our parking rates and fees to similar cities in the region, we wanted to assess our competitiveness and fairness on current pricing. So a little bit of help for this graph. The bottom of each bar is the beginning of their cost, and then the very top would be the max of their cost. So as you can see on monthly garage permits here, we are very low on that scale when compared to other municipalities. And that trend continues into our next slide. You can see our off street daily maximum is very low when compared to others. And for our overtime parking violations, they are also on the lower end of that scale, residential parking permits in peer cities. So this part of our rate analysis is really to outline just the scale of what other municipalities might charge for permits. And so you can see here Manhattan is at three permits at \$15.

(01:17:53):

Champaign Illinois has no minimum on their number, but they're very much more expensive, ranging from 360 to 675 and Columbia Missouri is three permits at no additional cost. So that just wanted to show the scale of what other municipalities do, anywhere from \$0 all the way up to \$675 for a neighborhood permitting program, historic system performance. So as you can see from this graph here, we're going from 2022 to 2024. Parking revenues have been up and down a little bit during that timeframe, but the total parking expenses has continued to rise, and that's primarily because of our continued investment in our parking facilities and garages. Maintenance on these garages is very expensive in 2022, that number from the parking fund is around 230,000 and that number doubled by 2024. As we continue with, and those aren't all just large capital projects. They can arrange anything from elevator maintenance, ongoing cleaning, maintenance, all of the things that we need just to keep our garages safe, welcoming and things like that.

(01:19:01):

Parking reserve fund. So there's some flexibility on how the parking reserve fund is spent. City policy requires 60 days of operating expense with a goal of 90, so that would've been 550 K based on 2024 operating expenses. However, parking service would like to maintain a closer balance to 120 days just to be on the safe side at 740 k based on 2024 operating expenses. And that's primarily because of the large cost of this infrastructure. Parking garages are a very expensive asset for the community, very important for our downtown district. And in the event that we had some unforeseen maintenance that came up in a short order, it would be great if we didn't have to dip into a major impact into our reserve fund to do those procedures. So in 2024, our parking reserve fund balance was approximately 1.8 million. And we have a couple different ideas that I can discuss later on in the slides that what we could potentially use that to spend down on to help our parking operation, annual parking activity.

(01:20:03):

So 1.1 million hours paid in our mobile payment apps really showcases what that technology brought to our community. It is our most recent numbers on Massachusetts Street indicate that over 52% of people pay with the app in lieu of the coin. So that's a huge thing that we brought to the community. And also on the other side of that 1200 permits sold each year really support the long-term parking needs. So we've got a variety of needs in our community. We need short-term, we need paid parking, but we also need that long-term parking that goes directly to assisting our downtown employees, our downtown residents, and just downtown long-term Parkers, our downtown ambassador program. So this is funded and staffed completely by parking enforcement and one dedicated volunteer. So anytime I can give a shout out to our friend Walt, I would like to do that. But as you can see by these numbers, it really just showcases our commitment to the success of our downtown.

(01:21:02):

The cleanliness of our downtown and the welcomingness of our downtown 23,000 gallons of trash is a really large number, but I feel like more importantly on this graphic here is the 412 individuals helped during that time. So these are one-on-one interactions with our parking staff. People that have worked downtown for a long time can help point people, directionally can help them give him advice that, Hey, there's a good spot to go grab lunch. Here's a good spot to go shopping. And I think those right there, just helping our community and assisting in the welcomingness of our community downtown garage deferred maintenance. So in 2017, the city hired Walker consultants to assess the physical condition of our garages and do a 10 year asset management plan for each facility. Since 2017, we've completed a number of major projects, mostly with waterproofing at the Riverfront Garage and also the New Hampshire garage in 2024.

(01:21:53):

We also enclosed the first tower at the New Hampshire garage, which is a huge improvement to limiting the consistent maintenance needed on the rails and the walkways on each one of those. And weather pending, I know we might have some snow, I didn't want to say the S word, but we are charting to start another project on another stairwell hopefully in the coming weeks here to enclose another one of those. Even with accounting for all those projects and many more that were not outlined in the study, it still estimated that we have \$4.3 million in deferred maintenance in the parking garages that's needed over the next 10 years. Parking fund, financial outlook. So status quo would be no additional rate increases from the parking operation. This did incorporate the decriminalization of parking anticipating to lead to a little bit greater payment compliance. But unfortunately the parking fund net income will be insufficient to cover the necessary garage repairs over the next 10 years. So here is a graph to kind of outline that. As you can see the total parking revenues and total parking expenses, that line is dangerously close there. It really doesn't allow for much fluctuation in our operation. And as we continue to invest in our parking garages, parking lots and technology, you can see that fun balance continue down all the way to dangerous numbers within about five years here.

(01:23:21):

System enhancements as we explored. So we cast a pretty wide net when we did this. I wanted to make sure there was nothing that we, no stone, we left unturned. We want to make sure that there was any options out there would've fit well for our community. I wanted to bring 'em here for you for discussion. So based on the medium rates of peer cities, in most cases, that suggests that we are well below the cost of some of our peers. A rate increase on Massachusetts Street was not explored at this time. I feel like at a dollar an hour with our population and having a feel for our downtown district, I felt like we're okay right now at that rate. Extended enforcement hours. This is something I've heard multiple times throughout my career with the city. And we did evaluate extending enforcement hours from 6:00 PM to 9:00 PM There is the assumption that we will need additional part-time parking control officer to extend that service level past our general operating hours, currently residential parking permit.

(01:24:17):

So we assumed about 3000 properties near downtown and surrounding the university would be impacted maximum permits of three to four per property, and that would be with an annual permit cost of \$10 per permit. Once again, that assumed additional full-time parking patrol officer or some type of an enforcement contract would be needed along with that administrative support. Startup costs for an RPP program are extensive. That would include a license plate recognition vehicle for enforcement to do that enforcement safely. And more than 700 signs and early numbers that we received back on those signs are somewhere between 150 to \$200 per sign. And that's with my team doing the install, which obviously we don't really have the capacity to do a large scale. It would be a phased approach, progressive pricing on street. So we evaluated progressive pricing on Massachusetts Street and the 100 blocks for those unfamiliar with what progressive pricing is, it's basically time-based parking.

(01:25:22):

So the longer a person stays in that stall, the more expensive the parking gets. And so there's many benefits from that for people that frequently park downtown for long-term needs. There is less of an incentive to be there during that whole day. And for visitors to our community that might need an extra hour, there is that flexibility that remains there, whether those are in the app or paid on our new meter infrastructure. And so this was one of the areas where we could invest some of that reserve fund money to invest in credit card enabled meters on street on the Massachusetts N 100 blocks. It's kind of a modern approach to these. I don't feel like kiosk stations in our downtown district, the way it's aligned really going to fit well for our community. But I believe this would work very well from that. And so that our rates would stay the same on mass. They would be a dollar for those first two hours the way they are currently. And then after two hours it would increase \$1 every hour after that. So a four hour stay under this recommendation would cost \$7.

(01:26:26):

So net income of these system enhancements. So everything I have outlined here for you on a later slide, I will show what those protections are, but they are just these now there's some other things that we evaluated and we can discuss those further as well. But everything here is going to be on that last graph. So just to outline a few of course permits, this would bring us up to a little bit more of our peer city standard. Also meter violations, \$10 to \$15 when we talk about changing parking behavior from our rates and our fee structures, this is really important. So historically before we had \$10 parking violations, we issued \$5 parking violations. During that time we issued a hundred thousand parking violations a year, which is a very large number. The increase to \$10 citations decreased that number to 60,000 issued each year. So that's when we talk about encouraging compliance, encouraging good parking behavior and benefiting our downtown. We feel like a similar decrease would happen with this increase as well to encourage that good parking behavior, long-term parks, parking, those long-term needs. Then neighborhood permitting program, the startup cost for it is estimated around 200,000 with annually about \$12,000 in income. So if you're running a well ran RPP program, it just doesn't cost the city money to do other than that initial upfront cost,

(01:27:52):

Eliminating free parking. So we evaluated turning some of our two hour free and 10 hour spaces to paid parking. It would require some new meter technology and other things that could be considered, we could consider reducing some of the free parking and still maintaining affordable options for our downtown visitors. Right now, about 51 to 52% of our parking in downtown is free for the first two hours. Just to give you an idea of the magnitude of how much free parking we currently offer. It was recommended if we were going to go down that direction that some of our Vermont garage, maybe Riverfront Garage, maintain that free parking just because of use in the area.

(01:28:30):

Just some housekeeping stuff here, changing a few metered duration in our parking lots to be better utilized. And I also wanted to outline what our current offers are for downtown part-time employees.

That's 6 25 per month. That's the permit here that's outlined event rates. So with the progressive price meters, if we wanted to consider a future event rate price, flat rate, we could do that. I don't know if that's right for our community right now, but as we modernize our technology is something that could be there, especially if we're to invest in those progressive rates on mass fixed LPR enforcement in our garages. Our friends at the University of Kansas have started to implement that and I think there's been some reviews. So I don't think we're ready to go down quite that direction. But I certainly think it was something that we should have considered and we would need to do more evaluation on our parking garages to see if they're even capable of accommodating that technology garage and kiosk ad revenue.

(01:29:33):

So Lancaster, Pennsylvania generate around 15 to \$20,000 annually when doing some advertising in their parking garages and lots. I feel like it also just kind of helps the feel of the space when you see it's kind of welcoming and this is something that we could consider in our facilities as well. And with all of that, the graph that I had showed you on the first page, this is what this financial outlook looks like. As you can see the parking reserve fund, or excuse me, parking fund revenues and expenses, that's a lot healthier line moving forward. And that green checkered line, which is our projected reserve fund balance, this really just allows the parking division to continue to invest in our parking facilities and our parking garage, parking facilities and parking lots, excuse me. And really just continue to push forward the message that we have and what we're trying to accomplish with parking and parking enforcement are downtown. And that's to create a self welcoming and self-sufficient fund moving forward. So with that, I will answer any questions that you might have.

Speaker 1 (01:30:39):

Thanks, Brad. Can you refresh my memory and then add a comment to what I'm going to ask you? So first thing is I want to touch base on when we went to the technological version where you could pay meters via app and kind of the timeframe for that and what those costs were. I know there's not really much hard costs, but with kiosks or maybe as well. And then also what would be the process of us moving away from meters, just signing and then going with kiosks for larger runs of side roads and alleviating the meter collection and process and just going straight app and kiosk. So those are the two things.

Speaker 19 (01:31:20):

Yeah, so we did our large technology advancement in 2021, I believe it was actually kind of supposed to start in the 2020. And of course we had a pandemic that through a little wrench in those things. So as it relates to the parking mobile payment apps, there was no cost to the city to implement those other than just us working through the contract obligations and things like that. The kiosk stations was our most expensive revenue. I think it was around like 365,000 for 21 machines. The thing that we run into in our community is our rates are still relatively low. So when we discussed the idea of taking out large runs of meters to replace them with kiosk stations, there is a service charge associated with each kiosk and it's \$52 plus the maintenance fees plus everything that might go if a printer goes bad, we've got to replace that. So in some of our more remote areas where I think it would make a lot of sense for us to take out large runs, I'm not so sure that our cost recovery would be to a point where we would even be able to pay for the infrastructure itself

(01:32:27):

To be ran. So areas like our riverfront garage, we have two of those Kiosk stations, one of them really doesn't bring forth the revenue to pay for its monthly subscription.

Speaker 1 (01:32:35):

And then well that's kind of I was getting at is if we could pick areas where there's no meters in order, I guess addressing your expansion of parking in ways to kind of manage people's behavior downtown expanses or areas or blocks that we currently have no meters and may actually be residential per se, but the city could manage behavior along those areas with these kiosks and no meters and just signage. And I see a lot of communities small and larger go into these processes all across the country. I cannot park in almost any town for free anywhere when I'm traveling anywhere within a perimeter of the downtown area or if it's a high area for tourism. They're metering residential streets in that you have to pay through a kiosk and they're not using meters at all mostly. So most modern systems I'm seeing across the country are moving away from meters completely straight up kiosks, identifying with signs and striping and then leaving it at that. So I didn't know if that could be a natural progression for us.

Speaker 19 ([01:33:40](#)):

Absolutely. So we've already actually implemented some of our first app only zones. They're on a little bit more of the remote areas in between the parks on West seventh in the 300 block. That's an area that historically had long-term meters that we took out and made app only also on South Park near the community building, there's a small section of those that we took out and those do not have a kiosk associated with them. They're app only a lot of communities.

Speaker 1 ([01:34:04](#)):

I have a ticket from that one from, okay,

Speaker 19 ([01:34:06](#)):

Well I can educate you on that.

Speaker 1 ([01:34:08](#)):

I didn't have the app, sorry.

Speaker 19 ([01:34:10](#)):

And so I think that's really what it goes down to. It goes down to us educating, there's a lot of communities that have went almost completely apt base, and that's really where you don't have the labor cost of collecting meters, you don't have the maintenance of it, you don't have the batteries. There's a lot of things associated with single space meters. But the difference in our community, I think, than some of the ones that you're discussing is with our angled parking on Massachusetts Street, the only way for our parking enforcement staff to safely enforce those, we have to type in the license plate. And in Kansas, those license plates are on the back. So right now, that physical meter does help our enforcement staff look at the back of it and see if maybe this person has paid in the app and then we go behind the vehicle. But if we went to a kiosk based system, that means we would need to type in every single plate manually.

Speaker 1 ([01:35:03](#)):

I'm talking about more on Side Street specifically.

Speaker 19 ([01:35:05](#)):

Absolutely, absolutely. And I think if our rates were at a point where they could support the cost of those kiosk stations, I think that'd be a great initiative. It also clean up our streetscape as well in the downtown district.

Speaker 1 ([01:35:17](#)):



That's part of the eyesore and the way things look. Absolutely. Aging infrastructure and again, the time and energy associated with collecting those quarters. Dime Nichols. Yes. Sorry,

Speaker 9 ([01:35:30](#)):

I have a question. Talk about neighborhood resident permit parking. Could you give me an idea how you would determine what neighborhoods that would be enforced on?

Speaker 19 ([01:35:40](#)):

Yeah, so right now the way that most municipalities evaluated is they try to search for the problem. Right now, what I think we're going to try to do is search out a pilot program in our community so we can evaluate that with our license, with our current license plate recognition vehicles just to get occupancy of an area. And then from there, when we identify a suitable neighborhood for this pilot, then we can do that communication with them, offer the permits at free, no cost, and then we can allow us the opportunity to determine what's going to work best for our residents and our community. And I think that would be our initial step. And then it's going to go into a broader implementation. And what most municipalities do is they require up to 60% I believe, and there's some variations in this. 60% of the people in a particular neighborhood have to be in favor or request the neighborhood permitting program.

([01:36:30](#)):

Then an evaluation occurs from city staff, and once that evaluation occurs and we identify that there is limited capacity for occupancy, then we can start the initiation of a neighborhood permitting program. So I can't really pick out which ones are going to meet that threshold right now. I think it's pretty safe to assume that a lot of the neighborhoods surrounding the University of Kansas are going to meet that threshold if the residents that currently live in that area are requesting that service. Other areas that might impact is just to our downtown corridors. I think that's both east and west. It's going to depend on, depending on lots of, as these redevelopments occur in our downtown, which obviously are great, that does extend additional people into those neighborhoods. So I would think from the Rhode Island corridor to Connecticut would also be a viable place that potentially could be a neighborhood permitting program.

Speaker 15 ([01:37:23](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 3 ([01:37:26](#)):

Question on the time of operation. I mean, we've certainly heard a lot about extending later in the night. Just curious about nine o'clock versus like eight o'clock. And then what about the front end? I've also, I mean I woke downtown and I mean 9:30 AM we look pretty open most places. It's not until about 10 30, 11 that it starts to fill up. I just wonder for cost reasons, is there a reason not to look like at 10 30 to eight as opposed to nine 30 to nine or?

Speaker 19 ([01:37:59](#)):

Yeah, that's a great question, but as we've added more residential components in the downtown, one of the factors that really help us with starting at nine 30 is if we were starting at say 11, those residential areas, all of that parking can be filled up with residents. If they know that they're going to leave in the morning or going to leave by 11 to go out for lunch, then those places would be full. I see with us starting the nine 30 on Massachusetts Street, yeah, it might not look like that's necessary.

Speaker 1 ([01:38:28](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 19 ([01:38:28](#)):

So

Speaker 1 ([01:38:29](#)):

You've already analyzed, sorry. So you've analyzed it on a Sunday or a day of enforcement. You've looked at the usage and it's different than it is during a

Speaker 19 ([01:38:36](#)):

Right. And I think our enforcement hours are what's encouraging that. I think if we were not enforcing Massachusetts Street starting at 9:30 AM that a lot of the residents that currently live above those downtown businesses would be parked on mass until that time, which eventually would start to have that negative impact, at least for our morning crowds. So yeah, that's kind of an interesting dynamic that's often overlooked, but part of our operation for sure.

Speaker 3 ([01:38:59](#)):

And what about the, why nine o'clock at night versus eight o'clock? Just to keep the turnover? I mean,

Speaker 19 ([01:39:06](#)):

Yeah, just do that number out there. Honestly, there's a lot of flexibility with this and that's why this is not a formal request or anything like that. I think there's opportunity for us to consider that. Maybe it's just seven, so it doesn't have to be nine, it doesn't have to be seven. It can be anything that you guys think might work good for there and that we can dive in and analyze those in greater detail if that's your suggestion.

Speaker 1 ([01:39:29](#)):

And you would probably have cost benefit analysis on that probably.

Speaker 19 ([01:39:32](#)):

Yeah, our friends with Walker helped with a lot of that cost recovery options, and so depending on what direction we're giving, we can really communicate with them and make adjustments to those revenue projections that you saw here tonight. It's nine.

Speaker 1 ([01:39:48](#)):

I know you

Speaker 8 ([01:39:48](#)):

Missed. Oh no. Yeah, I was just curious if you were aware or if you probably can't answer this right now regarding the neighborhood resident permit parking, if any grants would apply to that or anything of the sort just to go ahead and get us off the ground or,

Speaker 19 ([01:40:04](#)):

I think it's really challenging for parking and parking enforcement in general to take grants. I'm also not the most well-versed in grants. I know we won a community grant for an art project in New Hampshire garage, but I don't know how maybe a neighborhood permitting program would get that type of grant. I will say that just for the commission here, we did allocate \$50,000 in parking revenue for parking expenses for our pilot program. So we have some money to get us off the ground with signs and the

implementation of that. So that's for this year. And then I think in the 2026 budget, we can plan a lot more extensive cost for the program or what we envision the program to be at that time.

Speaker 3 ([01:40:48](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 8 ([01:40:49](#)):

I was just curious. Thank you

Speaker 3 ([01:40:52](#)):

That, remind me of the question I was going to ask about the resident parking. Did you analyze, I mean I know you gave us some information on the cost of the permit. Any analysis on the cost of the violation, the ticket? Would it be the same \$15 or would be something different?

Speaker 19 ([01:41:10](#)):

I think that's something we can probably identify. I think we would have to weigh a lot of factors where, I don't know if the \$15 citation is really going to be deter people parking near the university where they historically get a \$25 ticket or a compounding price ticket. So this was all part of a rate analysis and that's why this is so minimal. There's a lot of the bones in creating a residential permitting program from the ground has a lot more things that need to occur for us to feel comfortable. I would think a citation closer to a \$25 to \$30, maybe even compounding if you continue to park in the same zone with a potential of after three violations of vehicle is removed from the premises, something along those lines. We don't want to encourage the attempt to park in those areas as much as just resolve the problem as quick as possible and open that up for the residents that live in that area.

Speaker 3 ([01:42:08](#)):

I do know in the University of Wyoming, when my daughter went to school, there was around the university, if you lived there, you paid \$1 a month for a permit and you got, I think you could get full four or five visitor parking things. So when we came to visit, they would hand us that week of park, but then the ticket was like \$50. They weren't really charging, but they were discouraging people from parking in the neighborhoods close to the university.

Speaker 19 ([01:42:41](#)):

And I think as we continued to redevelop as we got an internal working group that's starting to work on the evaluation and occupancy, stuff like that, I think that's all part of future discussion. Obviously a program pilot or not is going to come back before you for the official, what that looks like.

Speaker 1 ([01:43:02](#)):

Is there a more efficient way of reading these neighborhood or these residential parallel parking where they're too close together or you can't get a tag, there's not a front and rear tag. I know people use stickers or some sort of decal on properly mounted, but are there any more RFID tags or anything like that that trucks could just do quickly and save on the labor and time associated with

Speaker 19 ([01:43:25](#)):

This? That's why as part of that recommendation, a license plate recognition vehicle, they're actually very, very impressive what they can read doing with parallel cars regardless to how close they are. So there's a few variants from that that might have a wide bump out along the license plate, but for the most part, they

do a phenomenal job regardless of how close you're parked on reading that license plate. And that's that safety factor,

Speaker 1 ([01:43:49](#)):

It'll be tied to the license plate, then you'll tie the tech.

Speaker 19 ([01:43:52](#)):

Yeah, everything will be the same e permit that we currently have in the downtown district. So there's no physical stickers or anything like that on the window.

Speaker 1 ([01:44:00](#)):

Great. Okay. Thank you. Any other questions, Brad? Alright. Thank you very much. Thank you. Any public comment on this item?

Speaker 3 ([01:44:18](#)):

Andrew's not going to say anything. Not going to say anything about poking downtown. Actually, man, I don't want

Speaker 11 ([01:44:29](#)):

Andrew Hold. Executive director DLI would just say that as far as downtown parking and the efforts to turnover traffic or turnover cars and created more vital downtown, I mean, I've sat in many workshops and I think that our organization understands that most of the people understand it as we work through this process. I think the biggest thing would be actually the employees who are a backbone of all of our businesses downtown to make sure that it's affordable for them to park downtown, to come to work, and also that it's safe for them to do the same. So I think right now, not everybody would agree with me, but I think our parking situation downtown is reasonable and it is, it's well run and it's reasonable.

Speaker 1 ([01:45:26](#)):

Thank you. Thank you. That's great. Thank you. Any other public comment in the room? Okay, seeing none any online, we do have

Speaker 15 ([01:46:08](#)):

Chris Flowers.

Speaker 4 ([01:46:16](#)):

Chris Flowers.

Speaker 17 ([01:46:20](#)):

Hi, this is Chris Flowers. I don't have a problem with most of this. I am skeptical about residential permit parking. I'm not a real big fan of that. And oh, before I get to that, I did want to say when it comes to paying for parking downtown, I prefer to use coins and cash and not everyone has a credit or debit card. So I think I would like to see both forms if possible because not everyone's going to prefer to pay with a card and not everyone's going to prefer to pay with coins. And not everyone has a card. So that's why I think we need at least the cash option. But when it comes to residential permits, the idea of permits being free, that is not fair at all. Why should us taxpayers pay for street parking that we can't even use? I mean, if residents are going to use streets as their own personal parking space, they have to pay for that use. And

I know a KU student and he forego getting a parking permit this year, and I think it was over a hundred dollars a semester. And there's a lot of students who don't want to pay a large amount. KU is charging and that's why they're parking in the nearby neighborhoods. But my problem is if we tell these students, Hey, you need to go start paying to park on ku, I don't think that's fair for, it's basically neighborhoods controlling who gets to come park in their neighborhoods.

(01:48:12):

The option is that the KU students have to start paying hundreds of year for parking. Why should the neighborhoods get free parking? That just does not seem fair at all to me. And also, can some of these permits, do you have to live there? What if you're willing to pay to park there? I'm thinking some of those parking spaces in nearby neighborhoods to ku. I think some of those students would be willing to pay 25 or \$50 a year to park there. So why should residents in that neighborhood get to park for free and also four or five visitor passes? Why should there be visitor passes? Why can't there just be the set number for however many want a parking permit and then have the rest just be street parking and visitors, find a parking space just like non visitors. Let's say I'm running and I'm going door to door campaigning. Why do I need someone like a residence invite to come park there?

Speaker 1 (01:49:26):

Thanks Chris.

Speaker 17 (01:49:27):

I don't think that's fair. Thank you.

Speaker 1 (01:49:28):

Okay,

Speaker 4 (01:49:29):

Thomas, if you're wanting to provide comments, you're going to have to accept the invitation to be promoted to I'm going to try it one more time. Thomas Dugger. Thomas, you can go ahead and unmute and provide your comments. I am going to move on to the next one, mayor.

Speaker 15 (01:50:29):

Okay.

Speaker 4 (01:50:38):

Steven Watts.

Speaker 20 (01:50:42):

Hi. Thank you. Let's see. Every time that thing comes up, it messes with the notes. Yeah, how refreshing it is and was when we get a city staff person who's energized and excited about the work that they're doing, then every time Mr. Harold comes and makes a presentation about parking matters in our town. Exactly. I'm not feeling like I'm hustled. I'm not feeling like I'm getting sold a bill of goods. I'm not getting pitched anything. It's just great that this man brings this solid information about parking and presents it in a way that is easily digestible. He's well researched, he's not afraid of doing extra work in order to acquire extra data that helps you all make decisions. And I mean, it is great. He's a great asset to the team and yet it does appear he's not getting a market rate pay for the kind of work that he is doing. Let's try to look into that man. And relative to visitor passes. Oh, I hear exactly what Mayor Deaver is talking about. It's the exact same thing at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois, you only get so

many visitor passes. When your associates want to come over to your very congested parking area, you can acquire more. It's a really harmless, easy system. So let's see how it works. Thanks. Thanks Steve.

Speaker 4 ([01:52:28](#)):

That's all comments,

Speaker 9 ([01:52:29](#)):

Mayor. Okay. I'd like to ask one more question, Brad. Brad, could you let us know where do we go from here? What's the next steps?

Speaker 19 ([01:52:40](#)):

Yeah, I just really wanted to gauge your interest on what I've recommended this evening. As we're going into the 2026 budget. Obviously we're not going to implement anything prior to then just general guidance if there's anything that you found challenging that I had mentioned here, if there's anything that you maybe that was not part of the presentation that you think we should consider. Just general guidance is all as hoping for today. So that way when I come to the city commission with my budget proposal, it's not the first time that you're seeing this recommendation. Got it.

Speaker 9 ([01:53:10](#)):

Sure.

Speaker 1 ([01:53:13](#)):

Thanks. Any other questions?

Speaker 3 ([01:53:15](#)):

Well, I guess I'd make a few comments on that. I do think, I mean some of the things, I mean generally speaking, I think I support most everything in there. I do think looking at some extended hours makes sense and appreciate your answer on the early morning part. And I do agree that no changes on Mass Street. I mean, I think that that makes sense. Increasing the fine, I think makes sense. I understand the long-term permits and some of those, I could see that being beneficial to revenue in general. I'm a big fan of the ambassador program. I think that's working well and I think we should continue to fund that as part of the operation.

([01:54:11](#)):

Personally, I like the advertising. I hope we see that in other places. And I hope you do look at that. Like you said, we've mentioned this before, but the paint you did in the New Hampshire garage just brightens the place up. And I agree with you that I'd want the advertising to be bright and chewy and so forth, but I think that could really not only bring us some revenue, but also add some color and so forth to that. And obviously we're a fan of the residential permitting process and we want that to move forward. And I think pushing that forward I think would be something we'd like to see in the next budget

Speaker 8 ([01:54:54](#)):

For sure. Yeah, I would agree. I think it's been well stated that we were very curious about the residential parking aspect of it. And I'm a fan of the ads on the kiosk in the garages as well, especially considering coming from Parks and Rec where that's been bandaid about quite a bit is a revenue generation tool. I think that would be useful to us. And also with what Andrew said earlier, just making sure that whatever we end up going with, what work well for the people that work downtown all the time, most of the time, and making sure that we have safe spots for them as well. So I know you're doing an outstanding job, but



I just want to make sure that we're keeping on top of it and maintain that excellence as well. But other than that, everything as vice mayor fin, I said, it looks pretty reasonable to me.

Speaker 1 ([01:55:54](#)):

Yeah. One thing I want to make sure we kind of focus on and have a conversation in the future about is parking garages and the operation and maintenance costs of those garages over time. I think we're reflecting on that every year, and I think we talked about four and a half million dollars budget over the next 10 years. I think we need to identify some sort of fund additional revenue to put into a fund to have on hand to pay for those o and m, specifically preventative maintenance and then deferred maintenance as well, because we're going to be talking about building more garages and they'll be newer and they'll finally need time to be repaired. And as we're doing it with these other garages, we can use that money to help upgrade any new garages we build in the future. But parking needs to be cohesive just on the street, doesn't mean it can't affect the cost and pay for the garages, which are more cost effective for us over time, I think. So I want to make sure we either adjust the fees, make sure that they're putting money into a reserve account to pay for these other big structures, and then also toying with changes in our technology so we can have a more fluid process and less eyesore maintenance as well. So those are kind of my goals. Thanks.

Speaker 9 ([01:57:12](#)):

Yeah, I appreciate the thoughtfulness. I see in how you evaluated the pricing across the board. Threading the needle of what happens on Massachusetts Street is so important as well as our off streets, but at the same time, you thread the needle on trying to figure out pricing, and I do appreciate that very much. Looking at the outlook for the next 10 years, I think it is on your last slide, it does look like, I mean, if the projections are accurate that the reserve fund balance would be pretty healthy to address maybe some of those long-term maintenance issues, which I appreciate that.

Speaker 1 ([01:57:57](#)):

Okay. That's it. Thank you very much for the input and the information. Okay, the next item on the agenda are commission items. Anybody have any items want to bring up this evening? Nope. Okay. Next item is the city manager's report.

Speaker 18 ([01:58:15](#)):

Thanks, mayor. Three items on here. One is the future agenda items report. The other two are just giving you updates on some things that have happened. One is the municipal services and Operation Design and Construction standards. We do this periodically update these standards. They're quite detailed, but this is what design professionals that want to interact with the city, build infrastructure, make improvements in our community. These are the new standards that they would follow. So there's some understanding of this is how things are built and we have some reliability and consistency across our infrastructure. They update them with technological standards and other things that help us stay modern, but also reflect trends in the industry. The other item is just an update for you. As you know, we had a community partnership visit and some interaction with the community and we received a report and are working on an implementation. And we expect in the next few weeks that we would be reporting that back out here to you and to the community with updates. We just want to let you know that it's in process.

Speaker 1 ([01:59:25](#)):

Okay,

Speaker 18 ([01:59:25](#)):

Good. Happy to answer any questions.

Speaker 1 ([01:59:29](#)):

Any questions for the city manager? Okay, same. None. We'll move on to our commission calendar. This is a public comment. Public comment on this issue. Sorry, sir. Please,

Speaker 3 ([01:59:42](#)):

On the city manager,

Speaker 1 ([01:59:42](#)):

On the city manager's report or general public comment. Okay. All right.

Speaker 4 ([01:59:55](#)):

We do have one

Speaker 1 ([01:59:56](#)):

City managers report, public comments online.

Speaker 4 ([02:00:00](#)):

Steven Watts.

Speaker 20 ([02:00:05](#)):

It's semi encouraging that something is happening with the Department of Justice meeting that went on in August. And let's go over what specifically is written if it didn't get destroyed. When I came over here into this land, I'm sorry. Chief Lockhart said at the end of the meeting that he wanted the community to hold him accountable for the department to accomplish some of these tasks over the next six months. And if they don't, to reach out to local news reporters. Well, that was a waste of time. We're going to implement ideas from this and I don't want you to feel like your time was wasted. Lockhart said, let's see how this works. One of the F.

([02:01:06](#)):

It is just disappointing the way this note is written. I mean, if you look at it, what committee? The department received a report from the DOJ in December. We will be working with our committee that helped plan the initial event to draft and implementation plan. Please what committee and who it was and is on that committee. Why is this stuff always so secret? If it's our good friends over at the naacp, let them stand up and say that they are a part of this and also plan. Hopefully this will be complete by the end of March. Why are we spending all this time hoping? Why aren't there any of these shalls? The reports shall be completed by this date and shall contain this and that information. It's absolutely incredible. And come on, why waste everybody's time if these things are just community exercises for publicity and propaganda? My fingers are crossed that something comes out of it, but we don't know who's involved in who this committee is. It's ever so secret. But thank you that we now have a report that's a beginning. Aloha.

Speaker 1 ([02:02:45](#)):

Thank you Steve. And that was it. Okay. Very good. Next item is the commission calendar. There's a few items on here. Don't know if anybody has any questions or issues on ribbon cuttings or anything like that. Okay. I guess we'll go ahead and end our live broadcast at this time and we'll give anyone who needs to

This transcript was exported on Feb 12, 2025 - view latest version [here](#).

leave the room a minute to do so. Before we start with open public comment. I, okay. We'll go ahead and start with public comment in the room.