

Parking Deck – Discussion Starters

Any one of the options involves financial considerations and who could, and should, pay for whatever is the chosen path forward.

Whatever the solution to the issue will be, it seems the possible paths forward cover a broad spectrum of possibilities from the “do nothing and wait” to the other extreme of “sell it and develop it”. Both ends of that spectrum may appear absurd depending on one’s perspective and perceived needs. Hopefully these will be a lead-in for a larger conversation over time.

Deck stays. Do nothing and wait:

- Maintain the status quo
- Minimal if any maintenance
- Wait until major need arises
- Issues and liabilities will continue to accrue
- Loss of use of areas/features will continue
- Does not address cave
- No growth in tax base
- Least cost to taxpayers until decision is made to do major maintenance, demo, or address liability

Deck stays. Perform maintenance/upgrade work to extend useful life:

- Get new engineering study and work priorities (cost)
- Determine method of funding whatever work is recommended to extend use:
 - General Fund again (taxpayers)
 - Add a millage to fund work (taxpayers)
 - Special Assessment Downtown/DDA
 - Parking Fees?
 - Grants?
- No growth in tax base
- Current need based on cursory study approximately \$1.8M, does not include detailed structural assessment.
- Does not address cave

Remove part of deck to reduce overall liability associated with maintenance and repair:

- Need engineering study and plans
- Cost of work and then ongoing, but reduced, maintenance costs
 - Who pays?
- Reconfigure/optimize existing surface parking
- No growth in tax base
- Does not address cave

Remove part of deck and permit development on newly-available area:

- Need engineering study and plans

- Cost of work and then ongoing, but reduced, maintenance costs
- Would result in loss of parking unless scale of development could absorb cost of new parking assets (scale/critical mass needed)
- Potential for growth in tax base
- Does not address cave

Remove deck entirely, surface parking only:

- Has one-time cost, but still \$1M+
 - Who pays?
- Removes long-term liability from taxpayers
- Net parking loss about 50 to 70 spaces overall (surface parking optimized)
- Does not address access concerns to Shelden levels
- Provides options for future redevelopment to be unencumbered by deck demolition need
- No growth in tax base unless a portion used for redevelopment
- Lets the sun shine on Lakeshore Drive

Remove deck and replace with more efficient parking structure:

- Cost estimated \$5M to \$8M – source of funds? Grants? Taxpayers?
- Would potentially open up some area to reuse or redevelopment
- Could be built to address access concerns with Shelden Level
- Would still require annual maintenance expense
- May allow growth of tax base with some development
- Lets the sun shine on Lakeshore Drive

Offer area up for private redevelopment with conditions:

- Sell deck property with development agreement to address parking, access issues, scope, scale, etc.
- Increases downtown tax base value
- Could be built to address access concerns with Shelden Level
- Would still require annual maintenance expense, but new revenue coming in to cover
- Lets the sun shine on Lakeshore Drive