

**NAPERVILLE DOWNTOWN ADVISORY  
COMMISSION MEETING SUMMARY - APPROVED  
March 10, 2016 – 3:30 P.M. – NEU Conference Room**

<b>Call to Order</b>	<u>Time:</u>	3:35 pm	
<b>I. Roll Call</b> Commissioners:	<p style="text-align: right;"><u>Present:</u> Steven Rubin Kevin Gallaher, City Councilman (arrived at 3:41 p.m.) Patty Gustin, City Councilman Marcie Schatz Peggy Frank Richard Hitchcock (Chairman Pro-Tem) Christine Jeffries Joseph Costello, Jr. Katie Wood Tony Zangler Tom Miers</p> <p>Student Members</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Connor McGury Rekha Iyer</p>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Staff Present:	TED –Allison Laff, Jennifer Louden, Bill Novack		
	Aaliyah, North Central College Student Julie Rothenfluh, Naperville Public Library Dee Dee McDevitt, DuPage Children’s Museum Debbie Grinnell, Naper Settlement Ruth Yackley, Downtown Property Owner		
<b>II. Approval of Meeting Summaries</b>			
2/11/16 Summary	Motion By: Frank Second By: Wood  Minutes approved (9-0).		
<b>III. Discussion Topics</b>			
<b>2015 Continuous Improvement Model for Parking</b>	Louden provided a recap of discussion from the February 11, 2016 DAC meeting at which the findings of the 2015 CIM were presented, referenced the full report as submitted to DAC for endorsement, and discussed next steps for Council review and approval following DAC endorsement.  Hitchcock asked for clarification about Council action. Louden indicated that staff will present the CIM report to the City Council for review; the report will include a		

specific list of implementation items, as well as a priority listing for their implementation.

Hitchcock requested clarification regarding staff's need for input on the proposed implementation schedule. Frank asked for clarification regarding DAC's role in the implementation. Louden noted that DAC will be involved in those items that pertain to their mission, such as baseline vacancy levels, target occupancy rates, downtown parking boundary, site options for new supply; others will be coordinated with DNA (i.e., CBD hang tags, coordination with private property owners, etc.).

Zangler asked if staff has preliminary ideas regarding additional parking supply locations. Louden noted that a prior study identifying potential location options was conducted; we will revisit this study and determine if the results are still valid and what other factors may apply.

Novack recapped recent discussions that the City Council had regarding downtown parking (raised during a City Council workshop held on March 7, 2016). Hitchcock asked for timing/planning for the Nichols Library vs. CPF rebuild. Novack noted that the CPF rebuild would definitely require a longer timeframe due to the fact that plans have not yet been drawn up for this project; preliminary drawings have been completed for a deck at Nichols Library.

Gallaher noted that the City Council embraces the process that is currently being undertaken: reviewing the CIM report, awaiting outcomes from the Water Street Development. Some Council members are nervous about the Nichols Deck based on past resident feedback; others on the Council are open to consideration of the Nichols Deck. Gallaher noted that he supports the original premise for downtown parking with 4 decks provided on the perimeter of the downtown – it additionally helps with parking for library patrons and is more convenient for downtown shoppers. Some members of Council are unaware of the prior history related to Nichols.

Gustin noted that time is on their side – we have time to bring forward the CIM information and await the outcomes of the Water Street development. It is important issue for DAC to review, but not an urgent one. DAC should continue to focus on technology improvements, coordination with private property owners, and consideration of the impact that alternative travel methods (i.e., Uber) may have on downtown parking needs. Financing of any new supply will also be an important consideration.

Gallaher noted that there is some uncertainty as to how quickly parking demand will begin to come out of Water Street. There will be a lag between when parking is available vs. when the parking demand from the development will reach its peak. You know a parking problem when you see it.

Schatz noted that many Council members are not familiar with the CIM. Therefore, education will be an important component of these discussions. In addition, prior

assumptions regarding items such as satisfactory occupancy and vacancy levels may need to be revisited. DAC's expertise and history on these discussions will be an invaluable part of these discussions.

Hitchcock – is a DAC/City Council workshop needed? Gallaher noted that City Council may determine a need for a workshop to discuss this topic as it moves forward. Gallaher noted that the City Council respects input from boards and commissions.

Jeffries noted that the financing of the deck is a critical discussion. As a committee, DAC should know where we've been on this topic and understand where future funding will come from.

Miers – are other commissions involved in the review of plans for deck construction?

Costello noted that new developments need to prove out prior to undertaking construction of a new parking deck. If the national tenants have a higher level of turnover than expected, we may need less parking than we believe we need right now. How much are we tracking this data? On a daily basis, ample parking is available – we may just need to do a better job with technology to help people find the available parking spaces.

Jeffries noted that NDP is working on the app.

Frank asked if the PGS has been down? Novack noted that we've had some issues with the sensor at CPF. Frank noted that if we proceed with the parking summit, DAC needs to do their homework first – particularly with respect to location and financing. The summit should be used to gather feedback on specific items from the stakeholders.

Gustin noted that DAC members may choose to have one on one conversations with Council members on parking-related topics (vs. using a workshop setting) as these items move forward.

Frank noted that if DAC can be more helpful on the 2017 CIM, staff should rely on DAC as a resource. Frank is particularly concerned with the continuously declining customer satisfaction rate and would be happy to help monitor it in the future.

Schatz noted that it will be important to provide Council with additional background information on the CIM, history of downtown parking, prior financing, etc. prior to any specific conversations on this topic. Loudon noted that staff plans to provide this information to the City Council in advance of their review of the 2015 CIM Report. Zangler noted that timing required for future parking supply improvements would also be helpful to understand.

Wood noted that it would be helpful to consider all parking supply options, not just

those that have been previously discussed. DNA reviewed the report on Monday, March 7<sup>th</sup> and was anxious to move forward with the implementation of certain items, such as signage and technology.

Hitchcock noted that it will be important to focus not only on the major tasks (i.e., financing and construction), but also the management items (i.e., technology and signage).

Miers noted the importance of considering not only the consumer, but also the downtown merchants. Merchant concerns may be addressed by management type items. Louden noted that the CIM Report recommendations do capture both supply and management discussions.

Costello noted that DAC should turn its immediate focus on maximizing the existing supply vs. planning for new supply.

Jeffries asked if wayfinding is still budgeted for in the CIP. Louden noted that staff is currently undertaking a streetscape project; wayfinding will follow in the future. Jeffries noted that future signage should focus on getting people to parking locations.

Hitchcock noted that if DAC endorses the CIM report, it marks the beginning of the conversation, not the end.

Gustin recommended that staff identify the short-term vs. long-term goals recommended in the CIM report. Jeffries recommended additional information to be included in the report regarding implementation – what are the potential outcomes? Stakeholders involved? Louden noted that staff can attach a work plan to the CIM report when it moves forward to City Council.

Jeffries noted that implementation becomes more manageable and achievable when the recommendations are broken down into smaller pieces.

Motion (Jeffries) made a motion to endorse the 2015 CIM Report which will include an implementation plan as developed by staff. Motion seconded by Miers (approved, 10-0).

Next Steps: Staff will present the CIM report to City Council on April 19, 2016. Hitchcock noted that DAC representatives can be present at the Council meeting to support the report.

Hitchcock referenced the Parking Summit proposed by Steve Rubin. Laff noted that staff is recommending that the Parking Summit be held after City Council endorsement of the 2015 CIM Report. Jeffries noted that proposed discussions regarding the downtown retail picture are still planned to occur as well.

Miers noted that another component key to downtown is housing. Will there be an

	<p>evaluation of the downtown housing stock as well? What housing stock is existing? Where is additional housing planned?</p> <p>Hitchcock noted the importance of proceeding forward with management solutions prior to the May DAC meeting.</p>
<b>IV. Correspondence / Updates</b>	
	<p>Wood noted several new businesses are opening in the downtown in the next 4-6 weeks. Nando Peri Peri, Mod Pizza, Soft Surroundings, sandwich shops on Jefferson, etc.</p>
<b><i>Next Meeting</i></b>	<b>May 12, 2016</b>
<b>V. Adjournment</b>	<b>Motion to Adjourn Approved unanimously.</b>
<b>Adjourned</b>	5:05 p.m.