

City of Columbia

701 East Broadway, Columbia, Missouri 65201



Agenda Item Number: B 350-14

Department Source: Public Works

To: City Council

From: City Manager & Staff

Council Meeting Date: November 17, 2014

Re: Amend Chapter 14 - On-Street Parking Enforcement Hours

Documents Included With This Agenda Item

Council memo, Resolution/Ordinance

Supporting documentation includes: Excerpts from 9/2/14 Council meeting minutes

Executive Summary

Staff proposes to amend Chapter 14 of the City Codes as it relates to on-street parking enforcement hours. With the FY15 budget, Council passed Ordinance 022211 authorizing parking enforcement between the hours of 8:00 AM - 7:00 PM, effective January 1, 2015.

At the October 20, 2014 Council meeting, a motion was passed to amend this ordinance by changing the hours for on-street parking enforcement to 9:00 AM - 7:00 PM, as recommended by the Parking Task Force.

Discussion

As part of the FY15 budget, staff proposed to change on-street parking enforcement hours, currently set at 8:00 AM - 6:00 PM, on any day except Sunday and public holidays, to 9:00 AM - 7:00 PM, as recommended by the Parking Task Force. During the budget meetings, Council requested an amendment to this council bill (B237-14) to set the parking enforcement hours at 8:00 AM - 7:00 PM, due to some council members indicating that enforcement should continue to begin at 8:00 AM. Excerpts from the September 2, 2014 Council meeting are attached.

At the October 20, 2014 Council meeting, Mr. Thomas indicated that he was informed by the CID, that they were unhappy with the extended parking enforcement hours as authorized by Council, and requested that Council adopt the Parking Task Force's recommendation establishing parking enforcement from 9:00 AM - 7:00 PM. Council directed staff to bring back an amendment to the ordinance with this change.

Fiscal Impact

Short-Term Impact: None

Long-Term Impact: None

City of Columbia

701 East Broadway, Columbia, Missouri 65201



Vision, Strategic & Comprehensive Plan Impact

Vision Impact: Not Applicable

Strategic Plan Impact: Not Applicable

Comprehensive Plan Impact: Not Applicable

Suggested Council Action

Amend Section 14-301 establishing the restriction of parking between the hours of 9:00 AM to 7:00 PM weekdays, and from 9:00 AM to Noon on Saturdays for enforcement of meters with hoods rented by banks and savings and loans; and amend Section 14-411, establishing on-street parking enforcement between the hours of 9:00 AM to 7:00 PM on any day except Sunday and public holidays.

Legislative History

8/18 & 9/2/14 (B237-14) - Amending Chapter 14 to change on-street parking enforcement hours from 8:00 AM - 6:00 PM to 9:00 AM - 7:00 PM on any day except Sunday and public holidays, effective October 1, 2014.

9/15/14 (B237-14A) - Amendment Sheet to B237-14 to establish parking enforcement hours at 8:00 AM - 7:00 PM, effective January 1, 2015.


Department Approved


City Manager Approved

Introduced by _____

First Reading _____

Second Reading _____

Ordinance No. _____

Council Bill No. B 350-14

AN ORDINANCE

amending Chapter 14 of the City Code relating to on-street parking enforcement hours; and fixing the time when this ordinance shall become effective.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COLUMBIA, MISSOURI, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Chapter 14 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Columbia, Missouri, is hereby amended as follows:

Material to be deleted in ~~strikeout~~; material to be added underlined.

Sec. 14-301. Rental of on-street metered parking space to banks and savings and loans.

On-street metered parking spaces shall be available for rental to banks and savings and loans on any street in the central business district, except Broadway, subject to the following conditions:

...

- (5) Banks and savings and loans renting such parking spaces shall place hoods on the parking meters at such parking spaces which shall provide that the spaces are paid for by the banks or savings and loans and shall designate the applicable parking restrictions. Parking may be restricted only during the hours of ~~8:00-9:00~~ 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. weekdays, and from ~~8:00-9:00~~ 9:00 a.m. to noon on Saturdays. The hoods shall designate the hours of parking restrictions, and shall be removed from the meters during all other hours.

...

Sec. 14-411. Installation; hours of operation; parking time limited.

Parking meters shall be installed and maintained on the streets and off-street parking lots set forth in this division, and no person shall, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. for off-street parking and ~~8:00-9:00~~ 9:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. for on-street parking, on any day except Sundays and public holidays, park a vehicle in any parking space on

such street alongside of, next to, in front of, or behind which a parking meter is installed, for a period of time longer than is indicated in this division for any street or off-street parking facility or lot established in this division.

. . .

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after January 1, 2015.

PASSED this _____ day of _____, 2014.

ATTEST:

City Clerk

Mayor and Presiding Officer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Counselor



SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS INCLUDED WITH THIS AGENDA ITEM ARE AS FOLLOWS:

Excerpts from 9/2/14 Council meeting minutes

“cash and help” and other programs so they all understood how they worked and the amount of funding available to those in need. Mr. Matthes stated he thought they could provide a report at the next meeting regarding the issue, and pointed out the money in the programs tended to be used up fairly quickly.

Mr. Skala asked when the final report would be delivered. Mr. Burnham replied he thought they could provide it within about two weeks of knowing the final budget decisions of Council on the sewer utility.

Mayor McDavid understood parking meter fines collected went into the general fund instead of the parking utility, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Blattel replied the fines collected went into the general fund because the salaries of the meter enforcement personnel were paid from the general fund.

Mayor McDavid asked if a formal report would be provided to the Council with regard to the collection of parking fines. Mr. Matthes replied yes. Ms. Chadwick asked if the report would be provided before the next meeting. Mayor McDavid replied he did not know. He thought there had been 192,000 tickets issued in the last 2.5 years, and 52,000 tickets were still outstanding. He understood the problems associated with chasing down the payment, but felt that also amounted to \$500,000-\$800,000. He commented that the amount charged did not matter if the City did not collect the money.

Mr. Thomas understood staff had proposed parking fine increases and parking fee increases, and that the parking fine increases would pay for the additional public safety officers and the parking fee increases would go into the utility. Mr. Blattel stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser commented that fines were utilized to deter bad behavior, which in this case was the delay in paying parking tickets. She understood they had hoped people would pay their parking tickets on time with a higher fine, and was concerned this might not be a long-term, stable funding source to pay for additional officers. Mr. Blattel agreed there was a concern, and as a result, they had benchmarked the fines with those of other communities, and Columbia was low. Ms. Nauser asked if those benchmarks included the total number of tickets to the number of outstanding tickets, and what they tended to spend to recoup those unpaid tickets. Mr. Blattel replied they only looked at the amount of the fines. Ms. Chadwick stated she would also be interested in knowing where the money for these fines was going in the benchmarked communities. Mayor McDavid understood it was undesignated if put in the general fund, similar to property tax revenues. Mr. Matthes noted they felt there was a connection in terms of traffic enforcement and the parking fine, and pointed out sales tax was equally unrelated to police work. He stated it was a legal way to accomplish the goal. Mr. Thomas thought most of them felt the parking fines were too low, and that the City had too few police officers and firefighters.

Mr. Blattel noted this item also included a change in the enforcement hours, and asked if the Council was in agreement that the enforcement hours would be extended and effective January 1 as had been shown on the amendment sheet. Mayor McDavid stated he was supportive of it. Mr. Trapp explained the idea was for the parking enforcement time change to not go into effect at the same time the parking fines were increased. Ms. Nauser suggested enforcement continue to begin at 8:00 a.m. Mr. Blattel noted it was listed on the

amendment sheet to begin at 8:00 a.m. and end at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Chadwick stated her only concern was the confusion it would create between the University meters and the City meters. Ms. Hoppe commented that she liked the 8:00 a.m. start time for enforcement.

Mr. Trapp understood the Police Department paid the parking utility to be able to park cars on the street. Mr. Glascock stated they paid for parking meter usage and paid to park in the garages in which its vehicles were stored similar to the other City departments. Mr. Matthes pointed out the Police Department was provided the funding to pay for parking. Mayor McDavid understood this did not take away money in terms of public safety. Mr. Matthes replied no. It was a cost they would recover from whoever parked at the meters or in the parking garage, and the City provided money in the Police Department's budget to pay for parking.

Ms. Chadwick understood the garages were sold at about 125 percent of capacity, but there were still empty parking spaces, and asked if this ordinance could be amended if they wanted to increase it to 150 percent. Mr. Blattel replied that was done by policy so it could be changed at any time. Mr. Glascock explained they had tried to go to 130 percent at the Tenth and Cherry garage and it had been unsuccessful because people could not find parking spaces. Ms. Chadwick asked if that had been done in specific garages or in all of the garages. Mr. Glascock replied the policy could be specific to garages because the Fifth and Walnut garage could be oversold by a lot more than the Tenth and Cherry garage. Ms. Chadwick asked if the City had an across the board equal percentage of oversold spots. Mr. Glascock replied no.

Mr. Thomas suggested the fees of all departments be reviewed on an annual basis in terms of inflation and other factors instead of waiting several years.

Ms. Nauser asked if most of the parks and recreation fees were based on the cost of service and if they paid for themselves at a 75-100 percent recovery rate. She understood some services were subsidized, but not many. Mr. Matthes replied some recreation programs had to be subsidized. Ms. Nauser understood the ARC had a 100 percent recovery rate. Mr. Blattel stated the ARC fully recovered its fees. Mr. Skala understood the cost of the swimming pools was only partially recovered. Mr. Blattel stated that was corrected. Mr. Matthes explained they charged what the market would bear, which was far less than the cost. Mr. Griggs noted the recovery rates for their programs and facilities varied from eight percent to 100 percent.

Ms. Nauser asked if the inspection period would be reviewed because six years seemed like a long time between inspections. Mr. Matthes replied staff could provide a report with an analysis for shortening the time frame. Mr. Skala noted Ms. Hammen had indicated six years might not be long for a new building, but it was for older buildings, and suggested that factor be considered. Mr. Matthes asked if the Council wanted this information prior to voting on the proposed rental inspection fees at the next meeting. Ms. Nauser replied no, and explained she only wanted to have that information prior to the next budget cycle.

Mayor McDavid commented that he did not believe the City had done a good job of explaining the costs for all of the solid waste options, and understood the general public did not want a change at this time. As a result, he would suggest they continue with the existing