

**MINUTES OF THE INFORMAL MEETING OF THE JOHNSON COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:
MARCH 11, 2011**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Adoption of Policy and Implementation Plan for Employee Parking	1
Comments from Employees	2
Discussion with Facilities Manager David Kempf.....	8
The Next Steps	22
Pre-Evaluation and Goal Setting of Executive Assistant Andy Johnson	27
Pre-Evaluation and Goal Setting of Planning and Zoning Administrator Rick Dvorak.....	27
Pre-Evaluation and Goal Setting of SEATS Director Tom Brase.....	28

Chairperson Harney called the Johnson County Board of Supervisors to order in the Johnson County Administration Building at 9:30 a.m. Members present were: Pat Harney, Terrence Neuzil, Janelle Rettig, Sally Stutsman, and Rod Sullivan.

**ADOPTION OF POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR EMPLOYEE
PARKING**

Harney said he does not know if everyone has had an opportunity to see the draft of the new employee parking policy. There will be some discussion and then the Board will allow the employees an opportunity to speak. He asked those wishing to speak to refrain from being argumentative and limit repetitive talking.

Neuzil said the information in the employee parking policy is fairly fresh. The Board has received the Parking Committee’s recommendation and it is a matter of fact-finding and getting some input. Sullivan said he will give an update on the process and how the policy ended up in its current draft. He thinks the Parking Committee has been working since 2007. The Parking Committee has been represented by a number of employees from many different departments, including employees that work in the Courthouse, the Health and Human Services (HHS) Building, the Administration Building, and the SEATS and Secondary Roads building. The Parking Committee has come up with a series of recommendations and Human Resources (HR) has held some meetings to inform people about what those recommendations are.

Sullivan said the Board talked with Assistant County Attorney Andy Chappell, who is the person who put everything together in the form of a resolution. He thinks this has sped up the process a little, because Chappell thinks the County needs to have something written before getting too far along in the process. Stutsman said the Parking Committee started meeting in December of 2006.

Harney asked why the employee parking policy is a resolution rather than a policy. It appears to Harney that it would be similar to the Snow and Ice Removal Policy that the

Board is looking at, which was changed from a resolution to a policy. Chappell said it is because that is how the Board did it in 1979. In 1979, the Board adopted a County Employee Parking Lot Ordinance. The County Employee Parking Lot Ordinance was somewhat bare bones and, given the language, it is meant to be supplemented periodically by resolutions. The resolutions are supposed to fill out the details, provide rules, designate the specific lots and areas, and any fees and related regulations that go along with those.

Chappell said what actually appears in the document is partially an ordinance and partially a resolution. The County Employee Parking Lot Ordinance was adopted on October 17, 1979, and created the first resolution designating two parking lots at that time. On November 14, 1979, the Board did the next resolution. On December 2, 1982, the prior resolution was replaced. On October 23, 1986, there was another resolution replacing the prior resolution. Then, that resolution was altered in May 1988 to add some different rules for the Courthouse. He thinks at that time there were some courtrooms added and the Board gave the County Attorney some specific duties and allowed the County Attorney to make some decisions relative to the parking situation at the Courthouse.

Chappell said as far as he can tell, by looking through the minutes from the Auditor's Office, that was the last time the Board adopted any resolution related to parking. So, the 1986 and 1988 resolutions are still in effect. If the County is going to start charging employees for parking at the Administration Building and the HHS Building then the Board will need something in writing because the County's existing County Employee Parking Lot Ordinance and resolution together only allows for charging employees at the Courthouse. That is considered Lot 1 and the current rate is \$5, which it has been since 1979.

Harney said part of his concern was having it be a resolution rather than a policy. It is similar to the Snow and Ice Removal Policy in that there so many changes to specific lots that may, or may not, change over a period time. Then, the resolution would have to be changed, rather than just changing a policy. He thought changing a resolution is more difficult than changing a policy, as was described during the Snow Policy discussions.

Chappell said the distinction there is there is difficulty in changing an ordinance rather than changing a resolution. A resolution could potentially be changed every week and the change is effective immediately upon the time it is adopted. Ordinances, however, are more complicated.

Comments from Employees

Clerk of Court Lodema Berkley thanked the Board for giving employees the opportunity to express their thoughts. She said she has an email that was given to one of her employees. She told Sullivan he is incorrect because Courthouse employees do not have free parking. As Chappell stated, Courthouse employees have been paying for parking for a long time. Sullivan said he realizes that. Berkley said the Clerk of Court's

Office thinks it is probably time to raise the parking fee, but going to \$25 is a 500% increase, which her office thinks is ridiculous. She said Clerk of Court employees have done a petition and voluntarily said that \$10 would be a reasonable fee to all Courthouse employees, because the Courthouse employees have been paying for parking when other County employees have not. She said Courthouse employees think they are being pointed out to be in the same predicament as the rest of the County employees that have not paid.

Berkley said she agrees that everyone is in the same boat when it comes to the County budget, but thinks that some of the comments were unnecessary. She said some employees park on nothing but gravel with potholes, as Stutsman saw during the tour of the Courthouse parking lot that morning. Since 1999, Berkley has gotten out of her car daily and there is a hole there that she has to jump over to stay out of the mud. There has been very little upkeep to the Courthouse parking lot. She is present at the meeting to represent the Courthouse employees that think \$25 is an unfair rate to be charging. Courthouse employees usually pay for parking every quarter, as can be confirmed by the County Treasurer and County Attorney. She may have a couple employees that she has to remind to pay, but most employees pay a year in advance. It is not like the Courthouse employees have said they are not willing to pay for upkeep of the parking lot, but they do think the \$25 is a ridiculous amount to pay. Berkley said she does have a petition with signatures and presented it to Harney.

Judicial Clerk II Mark Stimmel said he has been an employee at the Clerk of Court's Office for ten years. He said Berkley hit on a lot of the points he was going to talk about. One thing he would like to say personally is he knows some people who live in town have alternate options available to them for transportation. Some employees, like him, do not. He lives in Kalona, so he has no other way to get to work, except to drive. He knows if the Board does raise the parking rate to \$25 per month it will affect his personal budget. Like Berkley mentioned, Courthouse employees have been paying the \$5 for parking per month and agree that has been a bargain rate. Nonetheless, Courthouse employees have been paying for parking since the mid 1980s and other County employees have not. To make Courthouse employees pay the same as other County employees, who have newer parking lots, is unfair. Additionally, Courthouse employees would like to see their parking lot taken care of better with the parking fees that the employees have been paying.

Judicial Clerk II Patrick Kennedy said he has worked in the Clerk of Court's Office for seven years in the Small Claims department. He would like the Board to know that the Courthouse employees are State of Iowa employees and have a different budget than the County. The State employees have had their pay cut several times. Since working at the Clerk of Court's Office, he has seen three rounds of furloughs and his pay was frozen in 2005. If funds need to be raised for the County, he wishes it could be done in a way that does not target the State employees, because about half of the people who use the Courthouse parking lot are Clerk of Court staff. He wishes something could be done without placing such a huge burden on the State employees.

Kennedy said he has a copy of an Iowa Supreme Court order where State employees were ordered to take 17 days of unpaid leave starting on March 20, 2009 through June 2010. He said there are a lot of complaints about the parking situation. He knows at the Administration Building there is a large lot that is open to the public, so people are able to find a spot. However, at the Courthouse, employees have to fight for their parking spots with the public. If an employee leaves for two minutes, someone from the public will take their spot. Sometimes the Sheriff's Office will talk with the public, but Kennedy has heard that the Sheriff's Office cannot really do anything about it. The staff has to have the City of Iowa City give the offending person a parking ticket, but no one has seen that happen. It is a bad situation.

Kennedy said most employees in the Clerk of Court's Office agree that raising it to \$10 per month would be reasonable, but a 500% increase essentially amounts to employees losing about \$20 per month of income. Like Stimmel said, many employees do not have any other way to get work and cannot choose not to park in the Courthouse parking lot. Where he lives, he would have to walk a mile to take a bus to work. He would like to point out that the State does not pay Clerk of Court's Office employees for the cost of living for living in Johnson County. He thinks the cost of living in Johnson County is higher than in other counties. The State employees get emails for job openings in rural counties and see that those comparable positions are being paid the same rate. He said he has heard that the cost of living in Iowa City is one of the highest in Iowa. In some cases, it is higher than Cedar Rapids or Des Moines, when factoring in the price of gasoline and property taxes. He understands that parking is expensive in an urban area like Johnson County, but State employees have not been receiving a pay adjustment for the cost of living.

Kennedy said he understands the parking rate at the Courthouse has not been raised in quite a few years, but would welcome a gradual increase. The Board could review the parking rate after two years to see what the situation is like. He said State employees anticipate potentially having furloughs in FY12. He said he will give the Board a copy of the Iowa Supreme Court order regarding the furloughs and pay cuts. Sullivan said Kennedy can give the document to the Auditor's Office.

Judicial Clerk III Timothy Zwiener said he has worked at the Clerk of Court's Office for 30 years. He likes his job and the people he works with. He thinks the Clerk of Court's Office staff is all loyal, dedicated, and responsible employees. He works for the State, not the County or the University of Iowa (the University). He said if he did work for the County or the University, he thinks his annual salary would probably be 10% to 20% more than what it is currently. The furloughs did cause a major hit.

Zwiener said he considers parking to be one of the better benefits he has in his position. He likes his hours, retirement benefits, and health insurance. He considers a reserved parking spot to be a very good benefit and appreciates that. He thinks at least 95% of the Clerk of Court personnel in the State do not have to pay any parking rates at all. Since Courthouse employees have been paying for parking for years, he thinks it is rather harsh to raise the rate the amount that has been proposed. He could go along with

the \$10 monthly rate that has been proposed by others. He thinks it would be a loss of a benefit to have to pay quite a bit more.

Judicial Assistant Leroy Nida said he has worked in the Courthouse for 16 years. In the past, he has sent numerous emails to maintenance personnel about fixing the Courthouse driveway and parking lot without results. He thinks the back parking area has dropped at least six inches and there is a large trench next to the sidewalk. He used to park back there and had to replace right side struts on both his vehicles. No other parking area would have damaged the struts on his vehicles, except there. He knows there is an issue if two struts were damaged on the same side of two different vehicles. He thinks \$10 to pay monthly would be fine. The Courthouse employees have been paying \$5 monthly and the parking lot is cleaned most of the time.

Nida said it is his understanding that County employees have their parking taken out of their paychecks pre-taxed. State employees pay for parking out of their pocket, post-tax. That is not a huge difference, but it is something. He said he was in the southwest corner of Iowa and went to 16 counties in three days ratifying the judicial branch contract. Out of 16 different courthouses, there was only one where he had to pay for parking.

HR Coordinator Vanessa Wierman said she wants to clarify that parking deductions are not pre-tax at the County. Employees will and do have the option to participate in flexible benefits parking transportation where the employees can have amounts deducted pre-tax.

Trial Court Supervisor I Tammie Christiansen said she has been at the Clerk of Court's Office for four years. She lived and worked in Des Moines for 20 years and never had to pay for parking while working for the court system there. She had to wait to get a parking spot at the Courthouse parking lot, even though she is a supervisor in the Clerk of Court's Office. She understands there is an issue with parking at the Courthouse because the space available is so limited. However, to raise the parking rates so much is unfair to the employees. Yes, employees can enroll in flex spending through the County to have the amount taken out pre-tax, just like employees can enroll in pre-tax for healthcare. However, State employees do not have the option to do that.

Christiansen said she knows the Courthouse employees are State employees in a County building, but that does need to be taken into consideration. She said something needs to be done as far as the width of the parking spaces at the Courthouse because she ends up with door dings. This did not happen prior to her moving to Johnson County. There is no ability to get out of a vehicle without hitting the neighboring vehicle. She said she was sad when the person next to her repaired the dent in her car, because her car door hit that dent. So, once that person repaired the door, she had to be even more careful while getting out of her vehicle. There have been times where she has had to get in the passenger side of her vehicle and crawl over to the driver's seat, due to lack of space between vehicles. She said she understands that there is limited space. However, she thinks there needs to be some rearrangement or something done with the

Courthouse's parking so that employees who do pay to park there can park in a spot that is safe to get in and out of and so that employees do not have to worry about their parking space being used by someone from the public.

Christiansen said one time she came back from lunch to find a car in her parking spot, with the woman sitting in it with the car running. She said she pulled in behind the woman's car and waited for the person. The woman tried to back out of Christiansen's space and got angry when she almost backed into Christiansen's car. Christiansen said she told the woman she was parked in a reserved spot that Christiansen pays for and the woman apologized and said she did not know what reserved meant. At the Courthouse, employees deal with a lot of persons from the public who only worry about what business he or she has going on at the Courthouse and not where their car is parked. As long as there are not any gates across the Courthouse parking lot entrances, the public will continue to park there. She said she understands there is an issue with having gates and keeping access open to the handicapped parking spots.

Christiansen said there was an employee in the Clerk of Court's Office who did say she had to shovel in front of her car in order to get out of her parking spot one day. This employee is one who parks down behind the Courthouse and the way the snow is plowed, the employee had to get out of her car and shovel in order to get in and out of her parking spot.

Ambulance Director Steve Spenler said he wants to talk to the Board about the Ambulance parking lot, which is Lot 4 in the parking policy. Currently, with the way the rules are, he does not think Ambulance employees will be utilizing that lot. He would like to figure out a way to encourage employees to use the Ambulance lot. With the fee the way it is, he thinks most Ambulance employees will probably choose to park in the HHS Building ramp. Full time employees only come to work about five days per month and the Ambulance lot is now a 24 hour lot. The hours for the ramp at the HHS Building are 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. He thinks it would be nice if the rules for the Ambulance lot are the same.

Spenler said he is also concerned about safety and security when it comes to employees getting off work at 11:00 p.m. or 3:00 a.m. and walking over to the HHS Building ramp. He thinks the Ambulance parking lot is more secure, so it would be nice if employees were encouraged to park in the Ambulance parking lot. He suggested altering the parking cost to promote Ambulance employees to park in the Ambulance lot versus parking in the HHS Building ramp.

Harney asked Spenler if there is sufficient space for Ambulance employees to park in the Ambulance parking lot. Spenler said yes. He thinks full time employees will only be using the Ambulance parking lot with their Coralville shifts, which will probably only be five days per month. If the County could do some kind of a prorate on the \$11.53 per pay period, then Ambulance could encourage employees to park in their lot.

County Attorney Janet Lyness said she understands that parking rates could certainly increase at the Courthouse. The \$5 per month rate has remained the same for over 30 years. However, she does have to express her concern over how quickly this has happened. She knows someone from the County Attorney's Office has been on the Parking Committee for some time and there has been a lot of discussion about the Administration Unit and the HHS Building parking. However, it was only two weeks before this meeting that she suddenly heard it would be affecting the Courthouse employees too. That has really not given notice to employees to budget for the change.

Lyness said the fact that the Board wants to keep the parking policy consistent County wide is one thing. However, Courthouse employees have been paying for parking for many years and that makes the Courthouse employees' situation unique. Additionally, some employees have already paid for the full year of parking and she is not sure how that would be addressed. She thinks the County Attorney's Office would request that the Board not implement the parking policy as quickly, so there is time to notify the employees and let them budget for the change, because it will be a big hit to personal budgets, especially for the State employees. It is not unreasonable to consider that Courthouse employees have been paying for parking and maybe not increase the amount so much. She is not sure where the \$25 or \$11.53 per pay period came from, why that particular amount is so essential, and what will be done with that money.

Sullivan said the intention was to implement the parking policy starting June 1, 2011, with the Sheriff's Office and at the Courthouse. The reason for that is to provide time for employees to talk with HR. He said Wierman has been holding meetings with employees. He asked Wierman if those meetings have been open to everyone or just a couple buildings.

Wierman said the meetings have primarily been for those employees in the Administration Building, the HHS Building, and Ambulance to address flex parking enrollment. Sullivan said part of the reason the Board chose June 1, 2011, as the beginning date for the parking policy is so there is adequate time to give County employees a chance to consider flex parking enrollment. Wierman agreed.

Sullivan said the Parking Committee spent a long time looking at comparables and what City of Iowa City employees, University employees, and individuals working in downtown businesses pay to park. The Parking Committee arrived at a number that the Committee members thought would create an incentive for employees to not drive to work. If an employee can take a bus to work, then that is for the better. If the congestion at the Courthouse can be reduced by that fee amount, then that is a good thing. The \$25 seemed like the right amount to create an incentive to not drive to work, to cover costs, and also be less than what other people are paying for parking locally. It was the subject of at least a year and half's worth of discussion.

Stutsman agreed. She said when the Board began discussions, there were various opinions. Some thought County employees should pay what the going rate is for parking in this area, which is probably \$80 per month. The Board said that is not what the

members want to support. She asked Facilities Manager David Kempf what the estimate is on maintenance of the parking facilities. She said the County has built some fairly expensive parking facilities and there is a cost associated with that ongoing maintenance.

Discussion with Facilities Manager David Kempf

Kempf said \$25 per month for parking is in no way going to pay for the parking structures or lots. Parking lot maintenance varies from year to year. In 2011, the maintenance costs will be high with the blizzard and other snow events the area has had. Over the last few years, the County's parking maintenance expenses have been a lot more than what the County normally budgets for.

Kempf said one of the assumptions has been that the County will use the parking fees toward the maintenance of the County's parking lots, but it has never officially been identified what those funds will be used for. There have been a lot of other possibilities suggested, so it is not like the money will come back into the Physical Plant budget. Sullivan said all income for the County, with very few exceptions, goes back into the General Fund and then the Board spends it how the Board sees fit. Stutsman said currently, the County taxpayers are completely subsidizing County employee parking, aside from the \$5 per month paid by Courthouse employees.

Kempf said he has not taken the time to figure out what each lot's maintenance fees are. The Physical Plant's budget is just under \$1 million and a portion of that, probably in the \$40,000 range, is parking. That is a conservative amount, considering painting parking stripes, sweeping, and the general maintenance that Physical Plant staff does.

Kempf said the parking at the Courthouse is excruciatingly tight. Conservatively, he thinks three to five more spots have been squeezed in since he has worked for the County. Three were added in the back, where there used to be no parking, and a couple on the south side were added. The parking spots have not been made any wider or narrower. It is just the way the parking places have always been. The struggle with gating the Courthouse employee parking does involve the handicap parking. It is possible to make it all reserved County parking around the Courthouse and have a handicap parking space placed in front, but that is not a very good solution for customers that come into the Courthouse. There has to be some way for those individuals to be closer to the Courthouse's handicap accessible entrance, which is located in the back. Unfortunately, the current setup allows for members of the public to take the reserved parking spaces that employees pay for. He knows for a fact the public ignores the reserved parking signs and it is an ongoing struggle to manage that.

Sullivan said the Board had discussed placing a gate on the north drive of the Courthouse. It would not be hard to put a gate in, but there would have to be a call buzzer if someone needs to access the handicap parking. Kempf agreed. There would need to be a call buzzer, and someone would have to be available during business hours to buzz in anyone with a handicap sticker. He does not know if the County would have to have cameras so that the person opening the gate can see that the person has a

handicap sticker. Law enforcement and Iowa Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) personnel would need to be let in the gate because there are some parking spaces reserved for them. Even at its best, the parking situation around the Courthouse is not good.

Kempf said if the County moves forward on a justice center, one of the fears he has is someone coming in from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and telling the County all of the parking needs to be moved away from the Courthouse. It is a possibility. He asked where everyone will park then. Currently, there is parking right up against the Courthouse.

Kempf said as a member of the Parking Committee, there was a lot of discussion about the \$25 rate. He agreed with Sullivan that it is an amount the Parking Committee thinks will encourage employees to seek alternative modes of transportation, yet is not an amount that is near as much as what University or City of Iowa City employees pay. He has the privilege of hearing from almost everyone about this topic. Any conversation he has with County employees always comes back to parking. He has someone who works in the Clerk of Court's Office who is not afraid to voice her opinion to him. He has to tell that employee it is not his parking policy.

Kempf said it is affecting his family as much as it is affecting anybody. He is sympathetic towards everyone involved. He had to clarify something with one of his employees earlier this morning because the employee said fortunately he or she parks in a certain area which would not be affected. He said employees can park there, but will be paying the flat rate. He said he has been telling his employees this all along, but he did not know that it had not dawned on the employees until this morning that they will have to pay for parking just like everyone else. The employees were not happy about it either.

Stutsman asked if Kempf knows how long people have to wait for a parking spot at the Courthouse and if there is a waiting list. Kempf said Managing Secretary Danelle Essing manages that and could probably clarify. Essing said she currently has a waiting list for three people and there is one vacancy. That will continue for awhile. Rettig asked if an employee has to seek other parking arrangements until he or she makes it to the top of the waiting list. Rettig said she noticed across the street from the Courthouse, at the corner of Burlington Street and Clinton Street, is a gravel surface lot filled with potholes. The monthly rate there is \$40. The location is the future site of Hieronymus Square Tower. Sullivan said it is the former Rebel Plaza. Rettig said if she was on the Courthouse parking waiting list, then her only options would be to take the bus, carpool, walk, bike, or pay downtown rates.

Essing said those are options. She said the other option is have a reserved space at the Courthouse with potholes, ruts, snow, and the potential for paying for the privilege of having other people parking in their space.

Rettig asked Kempf what the ramp next to the HHS Building cost, including acquiring the land. Kempf said he thinks the bid for Phase II of the project was

\$3,285,000, which included the site work, sidewalks, and the drive in between the two buildings of the HHS building. The ramp probably cost \$2.8 million. Rettig said that does not include land acquisition costs. Kempf agreed. Rettig asked what the cost was to acquire 3 houses from the City of Iowa City near the Courthouse complex. Kempf said \$490,000. Rettig said the County is attempting to acquire four more houses now. Kempf said three of them will cost a little over \$1 million. Rettig said in the justice center \$50 million plan is a parking ramp. She asked if Kempf remembers what that cost is. Kempf said he thinks that is in the \$4.2 million range. Rettig asked if that amount is before the County acquires the land. Kempf said yes, that cost is in addition to land acquisition.

Rettig said that discussion was to point out some of the challenges the County faces. All taxpayers of Johnson County are subsidizing County employee parking. At the City of Iowa City, if an employee wants a parking permit there is a waiting list. It costs \$30 per month to park in their surface lot and \$40 per month in the ramp. If an employee chooses not to purchase a parking permit, then that employee is eligible to purchase a subsidized bus pass at half price. That parking is actually half price. If she were to buy a parking permit at the City of Iowa City parking ramp on the open market, it would cost her \$80 per month, if she could even get in that ramp. Some of the ramps do have waiting lists. The City of Iowa City subsidizes their employees' parking at half price and, as an incentive for employees to not choose a parking permit option, offers bus passes at half price. As opposed to \$25 per month, City employees receive bus passes for \$12.50 per month.

Rettig said the City's parking is actually a bargain compared to the University's parking. Kempf said he knows nine years ago, he paid \$112 per month for the privilege to walk three-quarters of a mile down the Iowa River in the winter. He worked at the Iowa Memorial Union and had to park over by Hancher Auditorium. At that time he was paying close to \$100 per month for parking, if not more.

Rettig said she came into this process after the decision to start charging for parking had been progressing since 1996. She has been told that employees in the Administration Building did pay for parking at one point and then that stopped. She said apparently, the resolution was not changed while that went on, but it happened. Her point is she thought the metered parking idea was very progressive. Unlike the City of Iowa City, the University, and most downtown employers, she always wanted County employees to only pay for what the employees use. She did not like the flat rate idea and disagreed with some of her colleagues. She thinks this is a cutting edge way to make people choose different options in their transportation choices and to get the employees away from subsidizing the car culture. She said she drove her vehicle to work today, but would prefer to be on her bicycle. She will have to do a combination of biking and parking. She has not filled out her flex benefit because she is not sure how much she needs of what. She also thinks the County should offer a bike commuter tax credit or a flex benefit for bike commuting and consider subsidized bus passes. If the County is going to reach the County's sustainability goals and reduce commuting miles, then the Board is going to have to make it so that employees choose other transportation options. This

could include carpool, bus, vanpool, bike, or whatever. Employees can choose to live within walking distance of their place of employment and not live 50 miles away.

Rettig said the problem with the County's current system, is the Board is using a combination of the incentive to not drive to work and the flat rate. At one point, the Board had discussed how an employee could pay the flat rate and then fill out a form through an honor system to be reimbursed for what that employee did or did not use. It could be done even on parking lots that the County cannot install gates on, including Ambulance, the Sheriff's Office, and the Courthouse. She understands that there would be trouble with that because of the flex benefit issue, but she still wants the County to figure out how that can be possible.

Rettig said if the County charges every employee \$25, it is far below market rates already. Then, the County further provides incentive by telling employees that if they are on vacation, carpool, bus, bike, or walk, then they do not have to pay for parking for those days. She would like to see that figured out for all five County buildings. Employees can choose the flat rate, or it will be metered. If the County cannot do that using parking arms, then the County will do it through an honor system of filling out a form. Her problem is not with the \$25 monthly parking rate. She agrees with Spenler, because there are problems with the 24 hours. She thinks parking should only be charged during daytime hours, which is when parking has value in downtown Iowa City. She would prefer if the County figures out a way to do metered parking, even if it is not quite right and even if that means people cannot use the flex benefits.

Kempf said the Parking Committee has spent a lot of time developing the metered parking approach. Information Technology Director Jean Schultz and Account Clerk II Carla Scherbring have done a wonderful job trying to get the two programs to communicate with one another and capture the right kind of information. They continue to work on that to try and make sure all of the bugs are worked out of it. That does not help out any of the State employees, which is not just the Clerk of Court's Office. It also includes Juvenile Probation and the Iowa Department of Human Services (IDHS). He thinks the pay-as-you-play program is a wonderful thing and thinks if they continue to work on it, then they can come up with some way of doing it. They just have not gotten that far down the road yet. It has to continue to be worked on and refined to try to get it up and running. Unfortunately, it does not help out people at the Clerk of Court's Office, IDHS, and Juvenile Probation.

Stutsman said the Parking Committee will continue to meet and address some of these issues to see if there is a better way to do things. She said she has heard that some people think the County did not pay anything for the former Iowa National Guard Armory lot. The County did get IJOBS to demolish and landscape the area, but the County did do a trade. The County gave property up at the Chatham Oaks area, in order to acquire the former Iowa National Guard Armory lot. In doing so, the County limited their resources and assets by doing that. There may not have been a direct cost associated with the parking lot property, but there was a cost.

Neuzil said there was a direct cost of about \$300,000 also. Kempf agreed and said IJOBS is a matching grant. He said the County did a 28E Agreement land swap and ended up acquiring a flooded out building. Neuzil reminded Kempf that acquiring the former Iowa National Guard Armory parcel is going to allow for the potential for the Administration Building to grow someday. Kempf agreed. Neuzil said there is land that is still above flood grade, which is why the lot was purchased.

Kempf said the County had money budgeted to raze the former Iowa National Guard Armory building, so the County does have a cost in that. He said the County was able to do an enhanced version of it through IJOBS to make it much nicer for County employees and for the public as a whole.

Sullivan said he thinks the Parking Committee was very committed to this process. Everyone thinks using employee identification badges that double as an electronic keycard to allow entrance to County buildings and parking lots is the best way to go with having the lots be reserved and capturing the data. Overall, it is better for everyone. It solves a lot of the problems at the Courthouse. A lot of the concerns would not be as big of concerns if the County is able to figure out a way to make the employee keycards more usable there. Handicap parking accessibility is the biggest issue. Maybe there is a way around it. He thinks the Parking Committee is committed to looking into that. He told Spenser there may be something that can be done in the Ambulance parking lot.

Sullivan said the Parking Committee has had so much on their plate that the Committee members are trying to get through the first steps and know the Committee will continue with ongoing meetings. He thinks everyone would like it so that County parking is accessed by employees via identification badges. The County is just not quite there yet. Kempf said he is working on a possible solution to that and would like to wait on bringing it up until the next Parking Committee Meeting. Sullivan said it is the Parking Committee's goal to make the employee parking policy consistent. Kempf agreed and said the Parking Committee is trying to make the policy as fair as possible to everyone. He thinks what he is working towards could potentially be expanded to benefit the State employees too. It just depends on what approach the Board decides to take. It may not work, because it is not going to be an easy thing to accomplish.

Neuzil asked if the Parking Committee discussed the potential of having commuting employees park at SEATS and Secondary Roads. The Iowa City bus does stop across the street at Chatham Oaks. There is a lot of land located near the County barns that could potentially be used for parking. There could be a voucher system to pick up employees as far as the City bus goes.

Kempf said the Parking Committee has talked about the development of a commuter parking lot in the County Poor Farm area. Stutsman said there has been discussion of having a SEATS bus pick people up in the morning and take them back to their vehicles at the end of the day. Kempf said SEATS Director Tom Brase was going to look into whether that is something SEATS can do. Neuzil said there is a City bus that does stop at Chatham Oaks.

Rettig said there is a problem having SEATS participate in picking up and dropping off County employees because of how the buses are purchased. The County now owns one and will soon own two of those vans that the County was intending to use for vanpools. The one van will be held in reserve to start one vanpool in the next year, if there are enough people who sign up in one location. The second van will be held in reserve and there is no reason that van cannot be used as a shuttle for employees between their vehicles and work.

Stutsman said the point is the Parking Committee has and will continue to talk about these options. Kempf said the Parking Committee just has not gotten that far down the road. Sullivan agreed it is on the radar for the future.

Neuzil said he is further along with the concept of the County campus than he is holistically with the Courthouse and the Sheriff's Office. He is comfortable with the \$1.20 per day and \$11.53 per pay period rate for the County campus. The County campus includes the employees who work in the Administration Building, the HHS Building, and Ambulance. The County would have a designated area for employees with a gate that can be monitored through keycards. The public cannot access the parking areas and take an employee's parking spot, so employees are guaranteed a parking spot.

Neuzil said he is not as comfortable with the parking policy for the Courthouse or the Jail, because those employees are not guaranteed a parking spot. He does not like the idea that those employees would be charged the same parking rate as the rest of the County, but are not guaranteed a spot. He asked if there would be enough parking spaces if the Courthouse plus the Jail is included and no public parking.

Kempf said he has been working with County Sheriff Lonny Pulkrabek and Sheriff's Major Steve Dolezal with a plan to gate the parking lot at the Jail. Neuzil asked if both parking lots would be gated. Kempf said yes. Vehicles would enter from the north and exit from the south of the lot. One of the things involved in that is working with the City to get a handicap parking spot located in front of the Jail. There is nothing in the Jail standards that says the County has to supply public parking for visitors. The University opened up the public lot that was Lot 11, which is located west of the Courthouse and behind the Jail to the public, so there is now plenty of parking for the public. Neuzil said the Courthouse does not provide public parking, so people park on Harrison Street for now.

Neuzil said he would like the Board to look at this policy and move forward with the County campus, but thinks there is still some work to be done looking at the next part of the stage. Holistically, he thinks this policy encompasses a little too much for him right now. Sullivan said the Board recently approved some work at the Courthouse and Kempf thought an arm could be installed at the parking lot at the same time. Kempf said at the Jail. He said he is looking at doing a change order to see if the County has enough money and contingency on the project to potentially add the parking lot gate arms at the Jail. If so, the hope would be the parking policy could implemented by June 1, 2011.

Neuzil said once this part is done, it seems like the Board would look at the next one, rather than do it all at once. He asked if there would be enough parking for the employees at the Courthouse and at the Jail if available spots from both places are combined. Kempf said there is not enough parking at the Courthouse for all Courthouse employees. Neuzil said he is asking if there will be enough spots for everyone if the Jail parking is added to it. Kempf said it would be close. It depends on the number of squad cars that are at the Jail at any given time. Currently, he thinks the patrol deputies take their cars home. There have to be parking spaces available for those cars to park when the patrol deputies come to the Jail. That is a tough question to answer, but there is not enough room at the Courthouse for the employees that work there.

Sullivan said the Board could realistically assume there are more than three spots available at the Jail, since the Courthouse parking lot only has a waiting list for three people. Kempf said he could find spots for those three individuals. Stutsman said there is room in the parking lot at the Administration Building. It would mean that people would have to walk. Kempf said there is parking available in the HHS Building ramp too. Stutsman said the County offers parking very close to where employees work. If someone works at the University, that person could be parking at Finkbine Arena and taking a shuttle from their parking space to and from work. It would require the need to plan an extra ten to 15 minutes to get to work.

Kempf said the University also has a sliding parking scale where parking rates decrease the further away one parks. Neuzil said that may be another way to look at it. It is easy for the Board to say County employees can walk three to five blocks to their car because their own cars are right outside the Administration Building. He thinks there is still some work to do for the next lot. He still thinks the Board can move forward with the County campus and get something worked out with the Ambulance employees. The Board already said that after 4:00 p.m. employees can park in the public parking spaces. He does not want Ambulance employees to have pay for public parking if working a late shift.

Spencer said he hopes Ambulance can encourage its employees to use Ambulance's back parking lot, rather than parking in the HHS Building ramp. Currently, the way the cost is for Ambulance's full time staff, it is going to be a little over \$4.00 per time to park in the lot, if they choose the \$11.53 rate versus the \$1.20. He thinks there are options to reduce driving to work, but with the way Ambulance's schedule is, those employees have fewer transportation options available to them. Rettig agreed; buses do not run at 3:00 a.m. or on Sundays.

Rettig asked what the purpose is for charging for parking. The purpose is parking has value and is a commodity that the County could sell. She said Kempf has some people in the area who would like to buy parking spots from the County, because the County rates are cheaper than the University's rates. Stutsman said those individuals would be willing to pay more than what County employees will. Rettig said the Johnson County taxpayers subsidize the automobile culture in the County's parking lots. Parking structures are very

expensive to buy the land for them, to build, and to maintain. Parking has more value at the Courthouse and the Jail than it has at the County campus, because those buildings are closer to downtown Iowa City. There is not a lot being advertised near the Administration Building for \$40 per month to park in, but across from the Courthouse there is.

Rettig said the Board could say there is no employee parking at the Courthouse except for a list of elected officials and judges. Then, the County could rent out the rest of the parking, because there is a demand for it. If parking has value, and that is the reason the Board is implementing a parking policy, then the County should do all of the downtown County buildings close to the same time because the parking at the Administration Building is less valuable than parking at the Courthouse.

Neuzil said his point is if the County is going to charge employees for parking, then there should be a specific, designated area for those employees only which is gated off from the public. Rettig said that is not true at the University or at the City. Neuzil said he is just voicing his opinion. While that is still being studied, the County could still move forward with the parking policy at the Administration Building, Ambulance, and the HHS Building. Rettig said she does not think a gated community should hold the County up from being fair to everyone. There are no gates at the City or the University. Neuzil said parking is guaranteed for employees who work in the Administration Building, the HHS Building, and at Ambulance. He asked why the employees who work at the Courthouse and Jail, who do not have guaranteed parking spaces, should pay the same as the other County employees. Rettig said because those employees have more valuable parking. The County could charge \$40 per month per parking space at the Courthouse and Jail immediately. Harney said the huge difference is the University and the City has an enforcement group which provides that guarantee, and the County does not. Neuzil said the County has a gate.

Stutsman said the reason the Board wants to do this all at once is because the Board heard from employees that if they are going to be charged, then they want all County employees to be charged for parking. Two locations were specifically pointed out which the employees felt should be included. People think Secondary Roads, SEATS, and Conservation should be charged, too.

Sullivan said this is the original conversation that the Parking Committee had. The original question was whether all County employees will be charged for parking. The Board is just being consistent. The University does not charge to park at MacBride Raptor Center and the City does not charge its employees for parking who work at the facilities on Sand Road. Neuzil added or Mercer Park. Sullivan said it is because there is not a demand. In speaking with the parking guru of the University, the Parking Committee was told it does not make sense to charge someone for parking where there is not a demand. The only reason it would be done is because the parking lots have the demand, which is the advice the Parking Committee took.

Berkley said the Board keeps saying that all County employees should pay for parking and she agrees. She asked about the years that the employees at the Courthouse have paid for parking and the other County employees have not. She said there are rumors that employees at the Administration Building started off paying for parking and another agency or department decided not to pay, so all Administration Building employees stopped paying for parking. She said the Board talks about being fair and making money off of people's backs because the parking is going to make the County money. She asked where the Board stops and thinks about the dedicated employees that go to work every day, regardless of whether they live in Iowa City or somewhere further away.

Sullivan asked what the Board should tell the 30,000 public employees who work near downtown Iowa City and pay a minimum of \$40 per month for parking and sometimes over \$100 per month. Those are public employees who are paid for by taxpayers and are subsidizing Berkley's parking.

Berkley said Sullivan keeps mentioning public employees. She asked about the employees who work at the Courthouse and if those employees are not considered public employees that pay taxes too. Sullivan asked if the 30,000 public employees should subsidize 25 employees at the Courthouse. Berkley said the Courthouse employees have been paying for parking. She said it is not the Courthouse employees' issue that other County employees have not been paying for parking. She said she is not going to be argumentative.

Sullivan said Berkley is being argumentative and he thinks her argument is a poor one. The Board is concerned about the taxpayer, who lives in Johnson County and is subsidizing parking for the employees who work in this area. The taxpayer is not subsidizing parking for the University, the City, or for the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. The County is the only group that has free or \$5 per month parking available for its employees. He said Berkley does not hear from these people, but the Board does. Berkley said she does hear from people. Sullivan said Berkley should then agree with the Board that people ask why they should pay for County parking when they have to pay three times as much and they are also a public employee. He asked what Berkley's response would be to that person.

Berkley said she would say what she does when she leaves her parking spot and returns to find someone from the public parked in her spot. She would say she is paying for that spot and the person would ask Berkley to excuse them and that they did not realize that. They understand Berkley is paying something. They do not get obnoxious to her and she does not get obnoxious with them.

Sullivan said he does not think Berkley answered his question. Berkley said she would say she chose where she is working and that the other public employee chose where he or she works. Rettig said even at charging \$25 per month for parking, the County will not be making money on parking. Stutsman agreed. Rettig said the County will still be subsidizing it at the cost of millions of dollars. In any future expansion of the

Jail and the Courthouse, a parking ramp will cost the County about \$5 million. If half of that parking ramp is used by County staff, then the true cost will be about \$2.5 million. The County will never recapture that money at \$25 per month, because it will have ongoing maintenance.

Rettig said she may be the only one with this opinion, but she thinks the County should charge for parking, she wants it to be metered, and thinks the County can work through the issue of gates with some better enforcement of ticketing or towing offenders. She thinks the County should take some of the revenue from this that is not income, because it will not cover expenses, and reinvest it in making incentives for employees to make other transportation choices. That is already slightly being done in that the Board has budgeted money to start the vanpool without having parking.

Rettig said she thinks the County should look at having subsidized bus passes and should do anything in their power to help employees make other transportation choices. That may include having employees get together with their coworkers who live in other areas, such as Kalona, which is outside of Johnson County, and does not pay Johnson County property taxes, and drive in together. She thinks investing some of this parking revenue back and further meeting the County's sustainability goals is a good idea. She thinks the City did that when the City took some of their parking revenue and subsidized bus passes for employees. She wants to make it clear that even if the County charges \$25 per month for parking, the County will never be making money. She does not think anyone intends for that to happen.

Berkley said she is saying that if the County is going to charge \$25 per month for parking, then the employees should be provided reasonable parking structures that are not full of potholes. She asked Kempf when the last time potholes were filled in the Courthouse parking lot. Kempf said Physical Plant fills holes with several loads of gravel every spring. Berkley asked Kempf what happened with the big hole that was in the Courthouse parking lot in 2010. She said that was a dangerous situation. Filling the holes is one thing, but coming in and making sure the parking lot is safe for everyone is another.

Kempf said that is exactly what Physical Plant staff did when that hole showed up in 2010. Berkley said a hole like that could happen again. Kempf said Physical Plant did not expect to find a 25 foot deep well in the middle of the drive behind the Courthouse. Berkley said her point is that Courthouse employees have been paying for parking lot maintenance for quite some time. She repeated that she did not come to the meeting today to be argumentative, but some of the comments given were not factual. To people that are looking at a 500% increase in parking costs, it is not fair.

Stutsman said the Parking Committee is going to continue to meet and there have been some good things that have been brought up at today's meeting. The Parking Committee will discuss those things and hopefully can address those concerns and provide solutions. Neuzil said if the Board wants to vote on this item next week, he is not comfortable doing so. Harney agreed. He said the Board wants to treat everyone

equally and if the Board is only going to apply the parking policy to one group of County employees and not another then he is not going to vote in favor of adopting it. Sullivan said Harney wants to include the Courthouse and the Sheriff's Office employees in the policy. Harney said yes, otherwise he does not want a policy. The County has to reseal the ramp, maintain the parking lots, clean them, sand them, and Harney thinks that money received from parking fees should go back into the maintenance of those lots. The County is never going to get enough money to pay for the actual costs associated with parking lot maintenance.

Stutsman said she wants to be very clear why Neuzil will not vote on adopting a parking policy. Neuzil said if the County has a specific designated area for employees only and gates it off from the public, so that County employees that are charged for parking will then be guaranteed a parking spot then he is OK with charging those employees for parking. That can be done right now with employees at the Administration Building, the HHS Building, and Ambulance. If the same thing can be done at the Jail, then employees who work there should be charged for parking. If it can be done at the Courthouse, then employees should be charged for parking there too. If it cannot be done at the Courthouse, then he has a problem with that. If it cannot be done at the Courthouse, then there should be a flat fee for parking and the fee should be increased \$10 or \$15. He said it should not be same as everyone else in the County because Courthouse employees are not guaranteed a parking spot.

Harney said he understands what Neuzil is saying, but at the same time at any other location people wait in line for a parking spot. There are never enough parking spaces at the University or the City. Neuzil said his point is that at the County there is. Harney said when someone does pay for parking, then that person gets a parking space. Neuzil said if someone is guaranteed a parking space then they should be charged. Stutsman referred to the reserved parking list at the Courthouse. Employees there do have a place to park. She said she has had instances where someone has parked in her spot at the Administration Building.

Neuzil said he is suggesting for those spots at the Courthouse to be charged a flat fee of \$10 or \$15. He said he is in favor of charging employees for parking. Stutsman said she just wanted Neuzil's opinion to be clear. Neuzil said he is just talking about using common sense.

County Auditor Tom Slockett said he is not on the Parking Committee so this is the first chance he has had to consider the parking policy. He said the idea that there is a not guaranteed parking at the Courthouse can be addressed. He said there is that problem in Elections when parking spots are reserved for voters. If Courthouse employees work with the Iowa City Police Department, then the Police will ticket those offending vehicles and will make revenue off of doing that. The Iowa City Police are already ticketing vehicles around the Courthouse and downtown Iowa City. As soon as people start being ticketed and towed if necessary, then word spreads really quickly. If that is done consistently, then that will help address the issue of the public taking reserved parking spots.

Slockett said a lot of people do not park in reserved parking spots, so it is just a problem with some people. He said he drives around and finds a metered spot, rather than park in someone's reserved spot. Neuzil asked if better signage at the Courthouse might help notify the public of the reserved spaces.

Slockett said he thinks there is a little bit of a logical fallacy. He understands the good intent and appealing to the idea of environmentalism and green efforts in not charging people for parking on the days they do not drive to work. What is really happening is the employees are being subsidized by the taxpayers every time they do not drive to work and do not pay, because the taxpayers paid for building the parking structures and the maintenance. On one hand, the Board says they are discouraging employees from driving to work. The other side of that is the Board is encouraging employees to drive, because by allowing employees to have a reserved, paved, maintained parking structure at the taxpayers' expense, the Board has created a larger lot than would otherwise be needed if employees had to decide whether to park there.

Slockett said there are many benefits in choosing not to drive, without being reimbursed additionally by the taxpayers for their parking spots. Many people do not drive. Some people ride their bikes, like Rettig. Some people have their significant other or family members drive them into work and then that car is available to someone else. That is an advantage to those people. He is not sure the marginal effect of slightly less parking will significantly address the problem of Americans liking to use their cars.

Slockett said there is the logical fallacy of wanting to treat everyone the same. He asked why it is that all of the property taxpayers of Johnson County should reimburse County employees for not driving and no one else. It is just as important to the environment if the Federal employees and other local business employees do not drive to their work. He asked why the County does not use the public property tax dollars to reimburse everyone else in the County for not driving. If the County is truly going to treat everyone fairly, then the Board would have to do that.

Slockett said a flat fee to help compensate the property taxpayers for providing the parking structures and maintenance would be a better way to go. In terms of fairness, he asked what the University and City employees think about not charging or reimbursement for not driving to work. City employees do not get that privilege and are the ones paying the property taxes. He asked why those entities do not reimburse University employees when their employees do not drive to work. The question is whether property taxes should be used to reward people for not driving a car.

Essing said she thinks she is in a very unique position. She is a long term employee at the County of 24 years. She said she is looking forward to that longevity moment where she gets to receive a plaque from the County. While she has been employed with the County, the Administration Building was built and offices were moved into it. At that point, the Auditor's Office turned over administration of the Courthouse parking lot to the County Attorney's Office, because the County Attorney's Office staff was the only

entity representing the County within the Courthouse. That is how the parking lot ended up as her responsibility. She comes to the Board, having administered the Courthouse reserved parking in that entirety, as a long time County employee and as an observer of the Parking Committee which has been meeting for many months.

Essing said the issue of the Courthouse and Sheriff's Office parking fee suddenly came to fruition at the last Parking Committee Meeting out of the blue. The topic had been on the back burner while the Parking Committee discussed the HHS Building and Administration Building parking lots. All of a sudden, because something needed to be formalized in a resolution and an ordinance, then it became an issue. Since the County can charge for parking at the Sheriff's Office and the Courthouse, then it should start being done immediately. That evolved rather quickly because the Parking Committee suddenly started doing the paperwork.

Essing said she wants to mention that it is not just the fact that the County Attorney's Office has been administering the reserved parking at the Courthouse for a very long time, but that Slockett's suggestion of just putting a traffic ticket on offending vehicles is not quite that easy. The Courthouse does not have someone who is in charge of policing the parking lot. No one is available to run out and write a citation. It involves calling the Iowa City Police Department, who may arrive on the scene 20 to 40 minutes later. Usually, when a person pulls into a reserved parking space, that person runs into the Clerk of Court's Office, make a payment, run back out, get in their car, and drive away. She asked if that is worth the hassle of interrupting her, Lyness, or someone else in the County Attorney's Office to deal with it. When it happens two to three times per day, it probably is not worth it. The County Attorney's Office has looked the other way when these things happen, unless it is egregious. The County Attorney's Office staff does not pursue writing tickets or towing vehicles, because staff does not want to treat their constituents that way.

Essing said as a long term County non-bargaining unit employee, she has worked for two of the best bosses in the entire County in her 24 years. She loves her job and has appreciated all of the County departments she has worked with. She sees professional people who work very hard in the interest of the County. She tries to do that, too. However, in her own personal employment, her longevity took a hit, so she basically had a \$900 cut in pay and will not see that come back. Her health insurance rates have increased and various other little expenses are now coming out of her paycheck as part of her employment with the County. Now, she will be adding the expense of the parking increase. She said none of that changes her perspective as a County employee. She still loves her job and will keep doing her best. However, that little glowing advertisement that the County likes to say about excellent benefits does not shine quite so brightly any more.

Neuzil said he will propose that Lots 2, 3, 4, and 5, as long as the lots are gated, would be \$1.20 per day and \$11.53 per pay period. Lot 1, which is at the Courthouse, would be charged a \$20 per month flat fee. That at least compensates for the \$5 over the years that employees have been paying there. Lot 6, which is SEATS and Secondary

Roads, would continue to have no charge. The Courthouse lot will not be gated, but if the parking lot at the Jail can be gated, which Neuzil thinks is highly possible, then that would be a little fairer.

Sullivan said he would warn Neuzil that he is hearing from employees right now that do not work in the HHS Building or the Administration Building who might have differing opinions. Rettig said she has no interest in doing Neuzil's proposal. The Courthouse actually has the County's most valuable parking. In all reality, the Courthouse employees should be paying \$40 per month and the employees in the HHS Building, Administration Building, and Ambulance should be paying \$20 per month.

Rettig said if the Board is going to apply a parking fee to all five downtown County buildings, then employees should all pay the same rate or it should be based on the value of the parking. She said the parking at the Courthouse could easily be rented out to attorneys. Neuzil asked if Rettig would not support what has currently been proposed. Rettig said no, what has been proposed is that all employees would pay \$25 per month, along with a metered system. Her problem with that is she would like it metered everywhere. She does not agree with Slockett. She thinks it has to do with the County's greenhouse gas and sustainability goals.

Neuzil said this is where he stands. He asked if there are three votes to go with his plan, because he is just trying to find a compromise. Harney asked Neuzil about the lot numbers he mentioned. Neuzil said Lots 2, 3, 4, and 5 will be gated and employees would be charged \$1.20 per day and \$11.53 per pay period. Lot 1, at the Courthouse, would have a \$20 flat fee, instead of the current \$5 flat fee. Lot 6 would have no charge. Stutsman asked what Lot 6 is. Neuzil said it is at SEATS and Secondary Roads.

Kempf asked if the parking policy could possibly use the term "controlled," as opposed to the term "gated." He said the word "gating" implies a specific device. Neuzil said he is talking about installing an actual parking arm at the Jail. Kempf said yes, he knows that. Neuzil said he is not talking about installing that at the Courthouse. Kempf said he would like the County to use the term "controlled" because there are other ways to control the parking lots to potentially fix some of the County's problems, other than using a gate.

Neuzil said Lots 2, 3, 4, and 5 would have controlled parking and Lot 1 would have a \$20 flat fee. That would help to compensate for the employees who have been paying for parking, while everyone else has not. Lot 6 would be the incentive for employees to drive out there, park for free, and the County will provide those employees with a free bus pass to get downtown.

Harney asked if the removal of the Communications Center has made a difference in available parking space, if the parking area is gated. Deputy Sheriff Christopher Langenberg said the change has freed up a few spots. On a normal shift, there would be between two and three dispatchers working one shift at a time, so those spots have been freed up on a regular basis. Neuzil said if there was no public parking, then there would

likely be more available parking. Both sides of the Jail would have employee parking. Langenberg said OK. Neuzil said there should be sufficient parking available. Langenberg agreed. He said that would be especially true if the visitors' parking lot on the north end is eliminated. He asked if those employees who drive their squad cars in to the Jail will incur a parking fee. Neuzil said no.

Sullivan said County vehicles, like the County Assessor's, have a parking keycard in each of them. That way, whoever is driving it can swipe the card and get the vehicle in and out. Langenberg said the squad cars do not have those cards yet. Sullivan said the squad cars will not get key cards until the parking gates are installed.

The Next Steps

Lyness asked what the Board plans to do, procedurally. She said Stutsman mentioned going back to the Parking Committee. Lyness said she thinks this is the first draft of the parking policy. She asked if the draft will go back to the Parking Committee before it goes to the Board. Sullivan said the Parking Committee has gone through the first draft of the parking policy. The process has become slightly rushed, because Chappell advised the Board that the parking policy needs to be adopted before payment for parking begins. He said the hope was to have changes made to the parking policy now, put it on the agenda for the Informal Meeting scheduled for March 17, 2011, then have it on the agenda for the Formal Meeting scheduled for March 24, 2011, and then the parking policy would be adopted before employees' payrolls are affected.

Lyness said she does not think a lot of this has been discussed by the Parking Committee. She saw some emails going back and forth about part time employees, so she is not sure the Parking Committee has looked at all of it. Sullivan said there are slight variations. The Parking Committee discussed part time employees who work for the State in the HHS Building. Then, the Parking Committee discussed part time employees who work for the State in the Courthouse. He said everyone on the Parking Committee seemed to agree that it would make sense to handle both situations the same way. Stutsman said there are just some tweaks that are being made. She said an issue regarding how to handle reserve deputies came up. Neuzil said maybe those individuals would be reimbursed back or get a special parking access card.

Harney said he thinks Lyness is right. He did not receive this copy of the parking policy until March 10, 2011. Sullivan said the intent is there are three weeks before the Board votes on a parking policy. Neuzil agreed. Stutsman said she thinks Lyness is wondering if the parking policy should go back to the Parking Committee. Sullivan said all of the Parking Committee members have it. Neuzil said he thinks the question is if the Parking Committee is going to go with this parking policy draft and not allow any changes. Sullivan said that is not the Parking Committee's job to do that; it is the Board's job.

Rettig said the Parking Committee is an advisory committee and the Parking Committee gave the Board a recommendation after five years. She asked if the Board is

going to give the Parking Committee another five years to discuss the parking policy. She thinks committees are sometimes overused in the County. Neuzil said he thinks the current parking policy draft is really close to a final draft. He just thinks something should be added in the policy to address the Courthouse parking situation. Rettig said she does not agree with the 24 hours. She does not think parking at Ambulance has value in the middle of the night. Neuzil agreed that can be addressed.

Stutsman said input has been taken from employees today and there has been some discussion. She thinks the parking policy should be placed on the agenda for the Informal Meeting scheduled for March 17, 2011, for further discussion. Neuzil said OK. Stutsman said the Board is on track to implement the parking policy by April 1, 2011. Sullivan said no one seemed to infer that the Parking Committee needs to have another meeting. He said some of the Parking Committee members are present today, and know that members can attend the Informal Meeting scheduled for March 17, 2011. He said he is sure some will be at that meeting, too. The Parking Committee members have electronic copies of the draft parking policy and have been making comments. He said Wierman caught a couple of issues, so the Parking Committee members are involved.

Rettig said the March 17, 2011 Informal Meeting will be televised. On March 16, 2011, the Board is scheduled to hold an all day Work Session. She asked if the Board can take an hour of time at the Work Session to work on what the Board members want and are comfortable with for a parking policy. After the Board has the document, has heard input, and everyone has a chance to digest it, then the Board can work on what gets three votes. She asked if there is still time to implement the parking policy, because it could not be on the agenda on March 17, 2011. Neuzil and Sullivan said it could be on the agenda for March 17, 2011. Rettig said the parking policy can be on the agenda on March 17, 2011 without the formal draft done. Neuzil, Sullivan, and Stutsman said that makes sense.

Sullivan said it is important for the Board, and anyone in the public, to understand that someone will often come to the Board with a "what if" scenario. When a committee has been meeting for five years, many times those "what ifs" have been discussed. In fairness, those who are not on the Parking Committee do not know what the discussion was. He thinks that is a reasonable approach.

Stutsman said Sullivan has done a yeoman's job with the Parking Committee. She said it has not been easy and there have been a lot of meetings, discussions, and feedback. She thanked Sullivan for his work. She said the Parking Committee has worked very hard. There have been minutes taken of the Parking Committee Meetings, too. Sullivan said that is a good point because those minutes are posted on the Johnson County Employee Intranet. The Parking Committee Meeting minutes are not formal minutes taken by the Auditor's Office, but are notes from each meeting going back to 2007.

Neuzil said he received the draft parking policy earlier in the day, so he hopes he has a chance to read through it a little bit. He thinks the document is really good. He can see

the point that the Courthouse employees are making and thinks the parking policy can be adjusted to accommodate those employees. He thinks the Jail issue can be worked out. Stutsman said that is a good way to approach the matter.

Harney said he has a concern with Ambulance. He asked if the Board is making the Ambulance lot open 24 hours per day, then why would the Ambulance employees park over there when the employees can park in the Administration Building and HHS Building lots. It does not make a lot of sense. He understands the issue during the day when the lots are being used, but at night the demand for parking spaces is not there. Neuzil said after 4:00 p.m., employees can park in the public parking spaces at the Administration Building and the HHS Building. Harney said unless it creates an issue for Spenler.

Spenler said after today's meeting, he will want to talk with his Ambulance employees, because he is sure Ambulance staff will have some questions and offer more feedback. He asked if the parking policy will be on the agenda at an Informal Meeting, where employees will have an opportunity to provide further input before it is placed on the agenda for a Formal Meeting. Sullivan said Rettig's suggestion was having the Board discuss the parking policy at the meeting scheduled for March 16, 2011. Rettig asked if the parking policy can be placed at the beginning of the agenda for the meeting on March 16, 2011. Stutsman suggested placing it at the end of the agenda. Sullivan said the Board can figure that out. Rettig said Executive Assistant Andy Johnson can assign a time to the agenda item. Spenler said there will be another opportunity to provide input and ask questions. Rettig agreed. She said Johnson will pick the time for the parking policy to be discussed at the March 16, 2011, meeting. Johnson suggested 1:30 p.m. on March 16, 2011, as a time for the parking policy to be discussed.

Sullivan said in the meantime, he would encourage Spenler and his employees to brainstorm. He thinks the Board is open to hearing better solutions, but the Board just does not have any right now. Rettig said particularly about the 24 hour workers. In her opinion, parking has value during the day. Neuzil said yes, 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. or 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Spenler said Ambulance has a nice parking lot that is well-lit, secure, and employees are comfortable parking back there. With the way the parking is currently set, Spenler does not think Ambulance employees will utilize the Ambulance lot. It makes sense to him for something to be done so that lot is utilized.

Sullivan said one concern is that First Deputy Auditor Chris Edwards and Scherbring will have to deal with the ramifications of anything the Board does. It does not make any sense to make an extra ten hours of work for Scherbring, so the Board has to keep that in mind. It will be a balancing act, potentially. Whatever ideas employees have, will probably have to go to Edwards and Scherbring first to ask about the impact. Spenler said he appreciates there will be another opportunity to provide feedback. He said he only found out on March 9, 2011 that there is going to be a parking policy. After talking with Kempf, Spenler said he understood he should give his employees some guidance, so he put out a memorandum, which is in conflict with the draft parking policy. Now, he needs to go back and touch base with his employees again, so everyone is on the same

page and so he can get some more input from them. Then, he can provide that feedback to the Board.

Rettig said the County already has a County Employee Parking Lot Ordinance. What the Board is discussing now is a resolution that is amending the County Employee Parking Lot Ordinance. Spenler said he understands. Stutsman said one oversight that occurred was not having someone from Ambulance on the Parking Committee. Spenler said he was contacted about it, but the meeting was canceled and he forgot all about it. Stutsman said the next Parking Committee Meeting is scheduled for March 18, 2011, at 1:30 p.m. Spenler said he thinks Ambulance Assistant Director Dave Dvorsky has some free time and might attend.

Neuzil asked Spenler if he is concerned about Ambulance employees who are at work after 4:00 p.m. and until 7:00 a.m. Spenler said no. His concern is that Ambulance is being charged a full rate to park in the Ambulance lot. As someone who works Monday through Friday and comes to work five days per week, those that use Administration Building and HHS Building lots are only being charged for parking between the hours of 7:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. or 5:00 p.m. Those who use the Ambulance lot will be charged 24 hours per day. Ambulance employees will not park in the Ambulance lot, because the Ambulance employees would end up being charged a little over \$4.00 to park per day. It is going to be much more cost effective for the Ambulance employees to park in the HHS Building lot. He is also concerned that when Ambulance employees get off of work at 11:00 p.m. or 3:00 a.m., then the employees will be in a parking lot that is not secure and controlled.

Neuzil said at the Administration Building, if an employee works between 7:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., the employee parks in the designated area in the gated parking lot. After 4:00 p.m., employees can move their vehicle to the public parking lot. Spenler said Ambulance's lot was going to be 24 hours per day. If an employee did not pay \$25 per month, then that employee could not park in the Ambulance lot and would have to park elsewhere. Rettig said that is how the policy is written. She said Spenler has employees that do only five shifts per month, even in the daytime. Spenler said between working in Iowa City and Coralville, a full time employee may only park in the Ambulance lot five times per month. Rettig said even in the daytime. Spenler agreed.

Rettig said Spenler wants Ambulance employees to only be charged for the parking that the employees use. Spenler agreed. Rettig said some of the Ambulance employees are not going to be at the Iowa City location 20 days per month. It is two different problems. Neuzil said that is \$1.20 per day. Spenler said yes, it would be fair if Ambulance employees would pay \$1.20 each time they park in the Ambulance lot. Neuzil said after 4:00 p.m., he does not want to see anyone charged for parking. Spenler said he is referring to during the day. Neuzil asked why Ambulance employees cannot park in the ramp at the HHS Building during the day. Spenler said the Ambulance employees can, but Ambulance's parking lot was going to be closed off for 24 hours unless employees paid to use it. Neuzil said he does not think it will be that big of an issue to address that in the policy. Rettig agreed.

Paramedic Michael Mothershed said it sounds like Ambulance employees will be charged a \$25 flat right to park in the Ambulance parking lot, even if the employees only park there five days per month. For most Ambulance employees, it would be more cost effective to park in the ramp at the HHS Building and pay \$1.20 per day of parking. Mothershed suggested having a reduced or prorated flat rate for Ambulance's lot, because it seems like a flat rate would be more simplistic to charge to payroll.

Rettig said it seems simpler than it would be, because Ambulance has employees who work five days per week and 40 hours per week who do use that lot. The difference is between Ambulance employees who work 40 hours per week in one location and employees who work less than that. She is not sure Mothershed's suggestion will work, but she does think the Board can figure out a way to make it fair. Sullivan said Spenler can help the Board figure out what will work. Mothershed said he knows other departments, such as the Sheriff's Office, have employees who work evening and weekend hours. Those employees who only work nights would not be subjected to parking fees. He suggested a specialized reduced or prorated parking rate for those employees who do not work a regular 40 hour schedule. Neuzil said the Board can change the hours, but if an employee is only working at Ambulance five days per month, then that employee should park in the HHS Building ramp, which is just across the street.

Public Health Director Doug Beardsley said he is on the Parking Committee, which did discuss Ambulance's parking situation quite a bit. He thinks the only concern was that Ambulance's parking lot is not gated or controlled. That is how the \$25 flat rate per month suggestion came about. If there could be a control device installed at the Ambulance parking lot, then that lot would be eligible for the daily parking rate of \$1.20 per day. It was just a logistical issue. Sullivan said there was the concern with spending the money to install a parking control device when the Board is discussing investing money in a new Ambulance building. Neuzil said it is still nice to have Ambulance's lot, because from 4:00 p.m. until 7:00 a.m. a County employee can park there.

Sullivan said the Parking Committee had some discussion about the hours listed in the draft parking policy. He said Schultz has set up the way in which the data is captured. An employee can come and go as many times in a given day as a person wants, and that person will receive a single parking charge for that day. People asked if it matters then what the hours are on the County buildings. He said Chappell thinks the hours on the buildings are important because if Kempf needs to move snow and there are cars there, Kempf needs to have some kind of authority to tell them not to park there at that time. It gives Kempf some tools with every building to tow a car if necessary, even if the person is an employee. It is an extra protection. Until Chappell explained that, Sullivan said he had not thought of that.

Kempf said currently, data is captured on a given date. That means if an employee enters the parking area at 12:00 a.m. and one second, then the data is captured for that day. If the County wants to control that date and only capture parking data between specific hours, such as the hours of the HHS Building ramp, which is 7:00 a.m. until 6:00

p.m., then that can be done. His concern with that is he comes to work before 7:00 a.m. every day. Sullivan said he does not think the Board wants to go that route. There are employees who arrive at work a lot earlier than 7:00 a.m. and stay later than 6:00 p.m. and the Board does not want those employees to lose that flexibility. The hours for the lots essentially give Kempf the authority to tell the owner of a vehicle to move their vehicle.

Neuzil said employees do not have to use the gated parking areas from 4:00 p.m. until 7:00 a.m. Kempf agreed. Rettig said the Board has not set a specific time yet, but public parking can be used by employees once business starts slowing down for the day. A lot of offices close at 4:30 p.m. and more close at 5:00 p.m. Kempf said he wants to be clear that if someone parks at 6:55 a.m. on a Monday, then that person will be charged for parking that day. Sullivan said the Board does not want to change the way the data is captured.

Harney asked if the Board is going to address other parking issues, such as when someone parks their vehicle in a County lot and then walks elsewhere. Stutsman suggested saving this discussion until the meeting scheduled for March 16, 2011. Rettig said the reason the Board needed to create a resolution is so there can be enforcement to have a car towed, which Chappell talked about at another meeting.

Recessed at 11:20 a.m.; reconvened at 11:27 a.m.

PRE-EVALUATION AND GOAL SETTING OF EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT ANDY JOHNSON

Motion by Stutsman, second by Sullivan, to enter into Executive Session at 11:27 a.m. for an annual evaluation of **Executive Assistant Andy Johnson** under section 21.5(1.i), *Code of Iowa*, “to evaluate the professional competency of an individual whose appointment, hiring, performance or discharge is being considered when necessary to prevent needless and irreparable injury to that individual’s reputation and that individual requests a closed session.” Roll call: aye: Harney, Neuzil, Stutsman, Sullivan, Rettig.

Motion by Stutsman, second by Sullivan, to leave Executive Session at 11:57 a.m. Roll call: aye: Harney, Neuzil, Stutsman, Sullivan, Rettig.

Recessed at 11:57 a.m.; reconvened at 12:00 p.m.

PRE-EVALUATION AND GOAL SETTING OF PLANNING AND ZONING ADMINISTRATOR RICK DVORAK

Motion by Rettig, second by Stutsman, to enter into Executive Session at 12:00 p.m. for an annual evaluation of **Planning and Zoning Administrator Rick Dvorak** under section 21.5(1.i), *Code of Iowa*, “to evaluate the professional competency of an individual whose appointment, hiring, performance or discharge is being considered when necessary to prevent needless and irreparable injury to that individual’s reputation

and that individual requests a closed session.” Roll call: aye: Harney, Neuzil, Stutsman, Sullivan, Rettig.

Motion by Stutsman, second by Rettig, to leave Executive Session at 12:28 p.m. Roll call: aye: Harney, Neuzil, Stutsman, Sullivan, Rettig.

**PRE-EVALUATION AND GOAL SETTING OF SEATS DIRECTOR TOM
BRASE**

Motion by Rettig, second by Stutsman, to enter into Executive Session at 12:30 p.m. for an annual evaluation of **SEATS Director Tom Brase** under section 21.5(1.i), *Code of Iowa*, “to evaluate the professional competency of an individual whose appointment, hiring, performance or discharge is being considered when necessary to prevent needless and irreparable injury to that individual’s reputation and that individual requests a closed session.” Roll call: aye: Harney, Neuzil, Stutsman, Sullivan, Rettig.

Motion by Stutsman, second by Sullivan, to leave Executive Session at 1:11 p.m. Roll call: aye: Harney, Neuzil, Stutsman, Sullivan, Rettig.

Adjourned at 1:12 p.m.

Attest: Tom Slockett, Auditor
Recorded by Angela McConville-Laffey