



**MANITOU SPRINGS  
PARKING AUTHORITY BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, February 23, 2016**

**I. CALL TO ORDER and ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

A regular meeting of the Manitou Springs Parking Authority Board was held on Tuesday, February, 23, 2016, in Council Chambers @ 606 Manitou Avenue. The Board asked Mr. Minch to Chair the meeting. Mr. Minch called the meeting to order at 8:32 am. The following were in attendance:

Present: Board Member JAY BEETON  
Board Member NEAL MINCH  
Board Member JOY L. PORTER  
Board Member SUSAN WOLBRUECK

Absent: Board Member BILL KOERNER (excused)

Staff: Michelle Anthony  
Sherri Crowley, Planning Technician  
Neal Yowell, SP+ Facility Manager  
Joe Lung, SP+ Regional Manager  
Andy Amidon, SP+

Guests: Coreen Toll, Council Liaison

**ITEM 1. Election of Chair**

**NOMINATION:**

Mr. Beeton nominated Bill Koerner as Board Chair

**SECOND:**

Mr. Minch seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

Ms. Wolbrueck preferred Mr. Koerner be present for the nomination. Mr. Beeton stated Mr. Koerner had expressed interest in being Chair.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 3-1. Ms. Wolbrueck voted in the negative.

**ITEM 2. Election of Vice Chair**

**NOMINATION:**

Mr. Beeton nominated Mr. Minch for the position of Vice Chair

**SECOND:**

Ms. Wolbrueck seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the nomination.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 3-1. Mr. Minch abstained

**ITEM 3. Election of Treasurer**

Mr. Minch felt the position of Treasurer was not necessary saying between the Chair and Vice Chair, responsibilities could be divided up. Mr. Beeton suggested putting the position on hold for the time being. Ms. Anthony stated a motion would not be necessary to not elect a Treasurer.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**ITEM 4. September 22, 2015**

**ITEM 5. December 15, 2015**

**MOTION:**

Mr. Beeton moved to approve the September and December Minutes as presented.

**SECOND:**

Mr. Minch seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the Minutes or the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 2-0. Ms. Porter and Ms. Wolbrueck abstained as they were not present for either meeting.

**III. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

There was no public comment on non-agenda items.

*There was discussion among the board regarding amending the agenda in order to accommodate the public as well as speakers.*

**MOTION:**

Mr. Beeton moved to amend the agenda as follows:

- Item 11 would be heard first
- Item 9 would be heard second
- Item 8 would be heard third
- All other items in the existing order

**SECOND:**

Ms. Wolbrueck seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 4-0.

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

**ITEM 11.** Discussion Regarding Installation of Bikes Racks in Public Parking Lots – David Moorefield

David Moorefield, 7 Stover Lane, informed the board of his passion for bicycling and bike safety, which was the reason for his interest in bike racks in Manitou. Mr. Moorefield felt having visible bike racks could reduce the number of cars driven in the city and open up more parking. Bike racks also offered security for cyclists. Mr. Moorefield said there are many types of bike racks and suggested something artful that would protect the feel of the city.

Mr. Yowell said there was a bike rack at the Wichita Lot, one in the 800 block of Manitou Avenue in front of The Keg and one roughly in front of Old Time Photo.

Mr. Beeton said when you visit bike friendly cities, bike racks are omnipresent and there was enough interest in bicycling in the area that, if bike racks were visible, they would be used. Mr. Beeton agreed this would encourage bike use and reduce car usage. He felt this was a good idea but wondered how it would be funded, suggesting a fundraiser or donation box.

Ms. Wolbrueck asked Mr. Moorefield if he was asking the board for funding. Mr. Moorefield replied he was not at this time but if the board would like to move forward with the conversation that would be part of the discussion.

Ms. Wolbrueck said she would be nice to partner with the Makerspace as well as Concrete Couch. How much bike racks would cost was important to making a better decision. Ms. Wolbrueck supported amazing, artistic, Manitou-esqe bike racks.

Ms. Toll cautioned against clutter and recalled opposition a few years ago from merchants regarding recycle bins. She stated strategic placement would be important and suggested bike racks where Mountain Metro regular bus service ends and the shuttle picked up, noting many people that ride the bus also ride bikes.

Ms. Anthony felt it would make sense to have bike racks in all of the parking lots. Ms. Anthony suggested Mr. Moorefield look at the lots to determine which have racks and if they were placed well and would there be obvious areas he felt they should be located or relocated.

Mr. Minch told Mr. Moorefield the city could provide a map and he believed there was a lot of support but to advance the idea there needed to be a more specific request. Mr. Minch also suggested Mr. Moorefield consult with the MAC on appearance and options for what the racks might look like.

Mr. Yowell said the Smischny Parking and Wichita Parking Lots are owned by the Metro District, which met the first Wednesday of every month at 4:00pm in Council Chambers, and they needed to be consulted for approval of anything to be placed in those lots..

Mr. Leung, SP+ Regional Manager, added there are pedestals often placed next to bike racks that have various tools attached which might also be a consideration. There are also vending machines that have inner tubes and various repair parts that could be sold. Mr. Leung said he could send information to staff. Ms. Anthony thought that would be a good idea as there are no bike shops in town.

Ms. Toll said funding was not in the budget for this year however a request could be made to City Council.

Mr. Beeton asked if there was any precedent anywhere for charging a minimal fee for bike racks to offset the initial cost. Mr. Leung said from a municipal stand point he had never seen that but at various commercial properties it was common to purchase a \$5.00 permit to use bike racks. This was often done for employees, however there were more tourists in town and he did not know if that would make sense for Manitou.

Ms. Anthony said the Planning Director is currently looking at a bike share program but she did not have details yet.

Ms. Porter felt safety regarding where bikes would be on the street or on sidewalks needed to be addressed. She noted children would be on bikes the City didn't want them on the sidewalks.

Ms. Wolbrueck suggested doing surveys on social media and getting feedback based on questions such as would you use a bike rack and where would you like to see a bike rack. Ms. Anthony stated the planning department had a face book page and could ask those questions as well.

**ITEM 9.** Provision of Free Parking for All Manitou Springs Residents in RPP Areas – Tim Beeson  
Tim Beeson said the agenda suggested he wanted to discuss free parking which was not exactly correct. His interest was in making the most effective use of a parking spot, adding the City had done a very good job - if not too good a job - of cutting down congestion in some of the neighborhoods. Mr. Beeson felt 50% of the time the parking spots were unused in the residential areas adjacent to downtown and wanted to suggest a Manitou Residents-At-Large permit for parking in any of the residential areas. Mr. Beeson said this would simplify the permit process and open parking for residents during the in-season and allow parking for residents while freeing up paid parking spots for tourists.

Mr. Minch remarked to Mr. Yowell that he understood there was going to be a more quantitative study of the occupancy in RPP areas, particularly in the Duclou/Osage area. Mr. Yowell said that was correct; each zone had specific regulations and the purpose of the RPP was to ensure residents and their guests had available parking. Some RPP areas were more dense than others at certain times of the day. Mr. Yowell said the RPP also factors in emergency vehicles and providing adequate access, noting this was the first year in his memory that a snow plow was able to make it up to Prospect Place and other streets because the streets were no longer so congested with parking. He noted there was not yet a full year of experience in the new RPP areas to determine if there was availability for extra spots at this time. Mr. Yowell outlined the process for changing the RPP area regulations, which began with a proposal to this board, the

residents would need to be involved and then City Council would have to ultimately approve any changes. Mr. Yowell stated he would want to take anything like proposal for a vote of the residents of each zone to see if they would accept it by the 50 plus one majority the RPP process required.

Mr. Minch asked if each RPP was by ordinance. Mr. Yowell replied it was not an ordinance, but did go through postings, two meetings and neighborhood voting as well as final approval by City Council.

Mr. Beeson stated the RPP's had been over-managed and if parking were allowed in those areas, he would not have gotten to this point.

Ms. Wolbrueck stated if you don't ask, you don't get and applauded Mr. Beeton asking. Ms. Wolbrueck felt if all residents had a permit it would eradicate all the good the RPP had accomplished in her neighborhood. She added if everyone in an apartment downtown, such as the Barker House, was given a permit to park in her neighborhood, she would not be able to. Even with the RPP, people did not respect the restrictions on event and holidays, so enforcement was key. Ms. Wolbrueck noted the standard for an RPP was a 20% vacancy to allow for fluctuations in car ownership in the neighborhood – such as for new drivers or currently unrented homes. Ms. Wolbrueck said if there was some technology that could help organize hours in the residential areas while residents are at work that would allow for some outside use, that might work however, she would not support that being free. Ms. Wolbrueck stated she was not trying to discourage anyone from doing the work of moving forward some concept of allowing some outside parking in the RPPs.

Mr. Beeson understood and appreciated the amount of work that had gone into building the RPP's. However, he wished the City could have begun with something a little less stringent.

Mr. Minch asked Mr. Beeson to stick around for more of the meeting because there would be information regarding the Downtown Resident Parking Study discussed, which Mr. Minch felt would be very informative for Mr. Beeson.

There was a question from the public asking how many downtown residents come into Manitou. Mr. Leung said there were a lot of residents coming into downtown however many were not shopping, but working in the shops and restaurants. Mr. Leung said if the City allowed any resident to come and park downtown or in the RPP areas, the areas would fill up with folks that do not live there. One of the original issues that was to be solved by parking management was getting shop owners and employees off the main avenue. The goal was to get those folks out so you can get customers in there who are patronizing the shops and restaurants.

Mr. Minch said later there would be review of the turnover of parking spaces.

Mr. Yowell mentioned during the off-season, Monday through Thursday, there was a three (3) hour free parking option available to anyone. Mr. Yowell also noted during the off-season, there was free parking after 5:00PM

One audience member did not know about the free parking and suggested that information needed to be communicated to residents.

Mr. Beeson said he was aware of the free parking, adding during the off-season, there is not a problem.

Mr. Minch said the Pikes Peak Bulletin seemed to be the most effective way to communicate with the residents. He noted there were a number of long term actions to increase capacity, which were not ready to be articulated as there was currently no timeline. He noted the board was working on a more coherent capacity strategy.

Ms. Toll said she had been reading about the Community Master Plan and part of the deliverables during Phase III addressed a parking plan. Ms. Toll stated she asked Mayor Nicoletta to ask the Project Consultants, Clarion, if they could speed the parking plan portion up and possibly do that in an earlier phase.

Mr. Minch asked if the decking at Wichita Lot was a done deal. Ms. Toll replied she recalled from the Metro President, Randy Hodges, report was the return on investment was not great enough and a the board was discussing paying off the Smischny Lot before it could look at a parking structure.

At this time, Mr. Beeson left the meeting and thanked the board for listening to his concerns.

#### **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

##### **ITEM 8. Update on LotSpot Project.**

Preston Hare, President and CEO of LotSpot, informed the board they had assembled the Barr Trail technology. He noted they had attempted to communicate with Kevin French however they were having difficulties arranging a time to meet. They had researched an outside contractor to provide electricity and were prepared to bring him in to expedite the process saying they were starting to fall behind schedule. Mr. Hare said once they had power and mounted the equipment, they could begin to collect data.

Ms. Wolbrueck asked Mr. Hare to explain LotSpot as she and Ms. Porter were new members of the PAB. Mr. Hare said LotSpot, Inc. is a parking analytics company that tracks parking lot occupancy using cameras. The technology they developed autonomously tracks cars as they enter and exit lots and they then take that information and provide it to residents of the city, tourists, and parking managers so they can make data driven decisions based on parking volumes.

Ms. Toll asked if this was in real time. Mr. Hare replied yes, it was real time and there was an app that could be downloaded to a Smartphone that would direct people to available parking spots

Mr. Minch asked Mr. Preston to speak about the scope and how it would be deployed. Mr. Hare said the actual hardware is a camera, such as at the Barr Trail. In the pilot phase they would not implement a sign as yet because they wanted a pilot period to get control data. The pilot was to make sure about weather conditions and could last anywhere from a month to two months so they could understand the variables before setting up other lots.

Mr. Minch recalled in an earlier discussion there was to be signage. Mr. Hare said they were working with Colorado Sign Management on the sign installation. The goal was to have a sign in the planter at Subway that would have the occupancy of each lot. The timeline for this was June and would cover three lots. Once they got the three lots installed, they would have an idea of where to push people as lots filled up.

Mr. Minch asked Mr. Hare to inform the PAB as soon as possible if that timeline slipped as the project needed to be in place before the summer.

There was discussion about how and where visitors will find the app to download. Mr. Hare said as people come into town, they will see the signs which will direct them to the lot. Mr. Minch said that is why he is pushing the signage. QR Codes would be on available for easy scanning.

Mr. Hare said over the last three months, they had the opportunity to further develop the technology and hardware and actually brought the cost down approximately 30%. The original cost was \$3,122 for the unit now it is around \$2,000.

Mr. Minch said to Mr. Hare it would be invaluable to have electronic monthly updates. Mr. Hare agreed.

Ms. Anthony said if Mr. Hare would send the updates to her, she would distribute them to the board.

Mr. Hare said he would like to begin working in the Hiawatha Lot on April 16th. Mr. Minch noted the PAB meeting in April was after that date so the timing worked out very well for an update.

Ms. Wolbrueck asked if there would be any privacy issues concerning the camera. Mr. Hare replied the beauty of this system was it does not save any of the video adding there was the option if the city would like to store video for security purposes but as is, the system only processed the video as it came in.

Ms. Wolbrueck asked if the City had decided what they would do with that. Ms. Toll said to her knowledge, they had never discussed it.

Mr. Hare said once Barr Trail was functional, they would record an hour or so for three days so vehicles could be manually counted to create a baseline to calibrate to.

Ms. Porter asked if a sign notifying people that cameras were in use would be required. Mr. Hare replied that would be up to the City however, signs were not required as it is public property. Ms. Toll felt it would be appropriate to notify people that cameras are in use. Ms. Wolbrueck felt signs would be a good crime deterrent. Mr. Hare said he had the ability to create very large banners saying Lot Spot is in use.

Ms. Anthony said there would be a discussion regarding signs because a sign could serve several purposes- information about downloading the app, notifying the public cameras are in use, etc.

In closing, Mr. Hare said he would attempt to contact Kevin French and said he would begin sending updates on the 30th of the month.

There was discussion regarding Lot Spot and the Iron Springs Chateau. Ms. Anthony said she would like to see Lot Spot nail down the Iron Springs Chateau as well as the Cog. Many people felt it would be in their best interest to get on board with Lot Spot.

Mr. Minch noted we would like to include Iron Springs and the Cog but not at the expense of slowing down start up of the City's project which included: Barr Trail, Hiawatha, Canon, and Smischny Lots and signage near Subway. Mr. Hare said his goal with signage was to install one month after all the equipment had been installed.

There was discussion regarding signage later at the western entrance to town.

Ms. Anthony asked Mr. Hare in his first monthly update to include the short summary of LotSpot which he gave to Ms. Wolbrueck.

***Chair Minch asked if the Agenda could be amended again to hear Item 7 next and then Item 6.***

**MOTION:**

Ms. Wolbrueck moved to amend the agenda to hear Item 7 Presentation of Information on Downtown Resident Parking Study next.

**SECOND:**

Mr. Beeton seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed 4-0.

**ITEM 7. Presentation of Information on Downtown Resident Parking Study**

Mr. Yowell reviewed the work by himself and Ms. Anthony gathering data for the Downtown Residential Parking Study. He had issued permits as a short-term solution for some residents until the Board could discuss the issue. Mr. Yowell stated he issued approximately 30 free permits for use in the Wichita Lot or Canon Lot. The permits expired on October 31, 2015 but were extended through the end of the year. When the 2016 season began, the permits were expired and residents had to look at different options, such as the Prospect Lot at \$60.00 per year and the Smischny Lot at \$75.00 per year. The number of permits sold to-date just for downtown residents only was 22.

Ms. Wolbrueck asked how many residents there are. Ms. Anthony said there were 217 downtown residential units, at two residents per unit there were approximately 434 residents; at 1-1/2 residents per unit there would be 326. Without a much more detailed study, it would be hard to know exactly what the resident count was, but likely between those two numbers. Ms. Anthony stated there were approximately 119 off-street parking spaces provided by downtown properties. That left a gap of between 207 and 315 potential cars unaccounted for. Yet out of that potential parking gap, only 22 permits were sold. Either few people downtown have cars or they are finding parking elsewhere. Ms. Anthony felt the gap was very large compared to the number of permits sold.

Ms. Wolbrueck asked when free parking was available and how many permits were given out. Mr. Yowell replied between 25 and 30. Ms. Wolbrueck noted this was almost the same number as people who came in to purchase permits.

Mr. Minch said of the current residents it seemed there was a lower density of vehicles. Mr. Minch said he did not know where 200 cars could be absorbed adding there was no one in town at 5:00am. Mr. Minch added if the policy was changed, there could be more people moving in who had cars. It felt to him like the parking situation was a factor in the choice of residents of downtown apartments

Ms. Porter agreed it was hard to estimate how many people were walking and how many had cars. Lower income units might not have even one car.

Ms. Anthony said as she had been told by parking professionals as solutions are put into place, such as RPP's, it was not unusual to see an increase in the number of vehicles as people begin to feel more comfortable getting a second car because there was hope of having a parking space.

Mr. Leung said this logically made sense, if there was not a place to park multiple cars, then people were less likely to own multiple cars, otherwise they were finding offsite or storage parking.

Mr. Yowell pointed out people from the west tend to want more vehicles, whereas, people from the east use ride shares such as Uber or transit systems more frequently.

Mr. Minch said in terms of policy, the study points to the City being on the right track given the parking capacity available.

Ms. Wolbrueck said she was often stopped by business owners who do not live in Manitou who feel they had been squeezed out and asked her to tell the board, because in the past before managed parking, they did not have to spend \$600 a year to buy permits for themselves and employees.

Mr. Minch stated at the end of the day the choice was to have Manitou Avenue parking be occupied by business owners and employees, or by customers. Ms. Wolbrueck agreed.

Ms. Anthony said another answer was to talk to the Metro District. The Metro District is the entity getting money directly from the business and building owners and if enough business and building owners are concerned then they need to go to the Metro District. Having support of those people in the district boundaries who would vote to raise the mill levy would allow the parking garage to happen faster. This was the kind of thing businesses and property owners downtown should be engaging the Metro district in.

Ms. Wolbrueck felt the shuttle running more could potentially be a solution by helping employees be a bit further out.

Mr. Yowell said some of the businesses expressed to him they appreciate the later shuttle on Friday and Saturday evenings as this was good for the employees and allowed them to park at Hiawatha Gardens.

There was discussion among the members about communicating with business owners. Mr. Yowell said he spoke with Leslie Lewis at the Chamber at least once per week and thought she would be able to offer some assistance with sharing information.

Ms. Anthony said she would like SP+ to look at all the parking lots and the permits and make sure they are comfortable with what the permit capacity is so we all know what capacity is left and don't keep selling permits only to discover we have sold too many.

Ms. Wolbrueck noted many business owners would not purchase permits until after Memorial Day which was when they hired summer staff. A study done before that may offer skewed results and suggested doing a study after July.

Mr. Leung stated there are different factors to consider such as oversell and diversity. At any given time there were a number of permit holders who would not be parking during the day because they are at work.

**ITEM 6.** Request for Restriction of Parking in the 1<sup>st</sup> block of Ruxton Avenue to No More than Two Hours.

Senior Planner Michelle Anthony presented the memorandum dated February 18, 2016.

Mr. Beeton asked Ms. Anthony if she tallied survey data so the board knew specifically what the business owner responses were as he was curious to know if business owners and employees felt differently about whether parking was changing over quickly enough. Ms. Anthony replied she did not try to drill down on each question that way and noted some pages of the survey answers were missing from the packet.

Mr. Minch mentioned to Mr. Beeton what would be coming up next would answer his question to a degree.

Mr. Leung with SP+, shared data that 90% of the transactions which happened in July were for three hours or less for the lower Ruxton area. Ms. Anthony reiterated 90% of the people who paid for parking moved in three hours or less.

Mr. Minch added this was consistent across every area.

Ms. Wolbrueck said her take-away from that data was that it was a perception that cars were not moving; the reality was that they are.

Ms. Anthony said it appeared that the 10% of parkers was what was being noticed.

Mr. Yowell was not in favor of one particular block requiring different signage and different restrictions from other areas and this was addressed when the tiered fee structure was created, adding the first three hours are \$1.00 per hour then the cost escalated after that. This fee structure also helped drive longer parkers to other areas such as the lots..

Mr. Minch noted Leslie Lewis of the Chamber could not be at the meeting, but was very interested in reviewing the data and he felt it would be important she understood the information.

Ms. Wolbrueck felt it was important business owners get the information.

Mr. Beeton wished there was a way to test who was parking downtown and not patronizing businesses. Ms. Toll questioned why this was pertinent, if the people were paying for the parking. Mr. Beeton stated, and felt the Chamber would support this, that the people who are shopping in the stores and eating in the restaurants will only walk so far. If we find the a high percentage of the people parking are not shopping, he felt it would be on the board to find other parking for those people. Mr. Beeton wants the people who are shopping to have the best parking.

Ms. Wolbrueck said there are families who will come to Manitou, walk around for three hours and not shop or climb the incline. Ms. Wolbrueck said some advertising on the back of a receipt may help.

Ms. Porter noted there were many incline users who do shop and eat in the restaurants. She felt the group who does not shop is the group on the shuttle. They may or may not get off in town. Ms. Porter said we were all in this together and need to be careful not to alienate any groups.

Mr. Beeton said when Friends of Ruxton was formed they thought it would be very important to find ways to get incline users to patronize local businesses. At some level businesses need to understand what incline users are likely to do. We all agree there is no effort being made to drive incliners to patronize the local businesses.

Ms. Toll said she has said, as she had before, she was tired of whining about the lack of business. It was up the businesses to attract customers. Ms. Toll said the first thing they did when their business wasn't working was blame parking. She felt the incline users had a right to pay to park just like everyone else and the City shouldn't make any effort to drive them out as we don't say you can only park here if you are patronizing businesses. Ms. Toll said this was not a problem the board should attempt to solve.

Mr. Minch agreed, it was not the board's problem to solve. The data clearly indicated there was turnover. He believed the strategy for Hiawatha and the year-round shuttle was intended to address at least part of the incline challenge. However, the question being considered was about if there was a need to change the current parking time allowed. He did not think there was

Mr. Leung agreed with Mr. Minch. He suggested if there was a program like Manitou Money they could put a person at the top of the incline who could give people the Manitou Money or coupons to help drive people into the stores.

Ms. Wolbrueck said there was a program called Manitou Money. In the beginning of the parking program, the Chamber, through volunteers actually attempted to hand out real dollar bills and they were surprised at how many people would not take a dollar. Also, the Loop advertised \$3.00 off a meal bill for anyone who paid for 3 hours of parking on their social media and finally quit because no one ever asked them for it. Ms. Wolbrueck said she found it so surprising because people just did not want to be approached.

Mr. Amidon, SP+ said he was skipping ahead a bit but wanted to comment that Manitou Money could be printed right out of the kiosk onto parking receipts offering \$3.00 off at a local business. Ms. Toll commented that would be a great idea.

Mr. Beeton stated he spent his life in communications and felt only doing one thing never accomplished much, it really took more of a strategic approach and the City needed to look at that collectively. He said if he were a business owner and he saw that many people coming into town, he would find a way to capture them and felt there should be a better way to capture the spending power of the incline users. Marketing is a guessing game until you gather data. No one has done a smart survey of incline users and until that is done the board could not come up with a good marketing campaign.

Mr. Minch said in a conversation with the Chamber the idea was there were no data points, but there was information on incline foot traffic, visitors center number, Cog railway traffic, and we sales tax broken down by category and those could be triangulated to see if they all were growing equally or if one was

growing more than another. Mr. Minch felt there was a way of getting information with a reasonable degree of confidence using the data points already available.

Mr. Beeton said at some point, it was up to businesses to figure out how to better take advantage of the incredible number of people who come into the community and it was the Board and Council's role to figure out a way to manage the flow of that traffic and parking so as to not make this a less desirable community in which to live.

Mr. Yowell expressed his agreement with Ms. Toll regarding businesses complaining, adding he saw Matt Carpenter as a great example. In the summer his shop was open until 9 or 10:00pm and people were lined up at his business while other businesses were open from 11:00am to 5:00pm and this was also the case during the Christmas season. There are people coming into town at 9:00am and no one is open until 11:00am. So they turn around a leave. Mr. Yowell said regarding the data points, the three hours of free parking every Saturday in December and then the whole week of Christmas needed to be examined in regard to loss vs. benefit.

Ms. Toll stated sales tax was down and this was blamed it on the Planned Parenthood shooting and people being afraid to go out.

Mr. Minch said there was a significant reduction of incline users in December as well.

Ms. Wolbrueck was curious if Old Colorado City and Colorado Springs were also down.

Mr. Beeton said some things cannot be controlled, such as more people were shopping online, weather conditions, general economic conditions, things of that nature.

Mr. Minch, bringing the item to a close, asked the board if they agreed there was no need to take action on the existing parking on the first block of Ruxton. The board agreed. Ms. Anthony suggested the board make a recommendation to Council.

There was discussion regarding the data and the perception of the business owners who signed the petition. It was decided the data did not support the perception.

Mr. Amidon said he wasn't able to print it because of a security issue but they did was take transaction data from the months of May and July 2015 and broke the data down block by block. The transaction data told how much time was being purchased in each spot and was graphed by purchases for one hour, two hours, and three hours. In the lower Ruxton area, there were 80 transactions in July where people purchased 7 hours or more. The perception a car was parked all day could be true however the spot was paid for.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Beeton moved to impose no restrictions and make clear communication to all the business owners who signed the petition that we will be mindful of enforcing the existing rules.

**SECOND:**

Ms. Wolbrueck seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 4-0.

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

**ITEM 10.** Presentation of Smartcard Program Implementation - Andy Amidon, SP+ and Joe Leung SP+ Regional Manager

Mr. Amidon said at the request of the City, they developed a Smartcard program. He explained Smartcards came preloaded and were used in the kiosks. Mr. Amidon said 1,000 cards would cost the City \$2K. The cards could be purchased loaded or a device could be purchased for loading in the SP+ office. The kiosks could also be programmed to allow loading of the cards. Mr. Amidon indicated if the City logo or artwork was put on the Smart Cards, there was a one-time fee of \$150.00.

Ms. Wolbrueck asked if the cards would be interchangeable with the kiosks in Colorado Springs. Mr. Amidon replied they would not; the cards would be specific for the Manitou Springs program.

Mr. Minch said this would significantly reduce credit card transactions and asked if using the card would provide any sort of discount. Mr. Leung replied what he would prefer is with proof of residency purchasers would receive a discount, for example you could say any resident gets 10% off whatever value they wish to purchase. You could also extend the sale of SmartCards to non-residents and let them pay for the card. For example, a \$10.00 card would cost \$12.95. Mr. Leung suggested purchasing the machine that would allow you to program a specific amount would be a good investment rather than purchasing 10,000 cards in various denominations. There would be a significant cost savings.

Ms. Anthony discussed the previous SmartCard program and how it operated. In regard to Mr. Beeson's idea that residents should be able to park for free, her idea was to put together a program where the City gave a minimal amount of free parking on a reusable card. The card could be refilled for a discount. Residents still ended up paying for parking and this would also be a good public relations campaign. Ms. Anthony estimated 1900 residential units in Manitou Springs and providing free parking in the RPP's would not be a viable solution. Ms. Anthony's idea was not to give every driver free or discounted rate, her idea would be to give one per address.

Ms. Toll asked how much of a discount Ms. Anthony would recommend. Ms. Anthony suggested a \$10 free card and a 50% discount. This would not be mailed to every address; it would have to be requested at the SP+ counter. Some of the members responded saying they felt 50% would be too high a discount.

Ms. Wolbrueck suggested a substantial discount was not necessary because we the City had already given free hours adding it did not sound like the three free hours during the off-season would end. Ms. Wolbrueck suggested getting together with the business community and letting them know they were heard and the City understands they believe residents or people nearby are not visiting Manitou because of managed parking. She suggested offering them 5 or 10 hours for free which was a lot of shopping and dining time in Manitou. Ms. Wolbrueck felt this would be a huge offer from Parking because the City would be giving up the money.

Mr. Yowell said if the City implemented a program like this, the board needed to consider the manpower it would take. If there are 1900 people who come in for a Smartcard at the same time the Parking Office could not handle that. He suggested mailing cards to avoid lines of people

Mr. Minch said part of the objective was to get residents back into town.

Ms. Toll said she was not a voting member of the board but wanted to say she did not favor doing this as the City is providing a shuttle year round now. If anyone wanted an olive branch they could look at the cost of that. Ms. Toll said here again, we are reinforcing the whiners.

Mr. Leung suggested offering a discount to everyone and no free cards.

There was discussion among the members about the credit card fees with surprise at how many \$1.00 transactions there were.

Mr. Minch did not think the board would be able to make a decision at this time but asked SP+ and Staff to come up with some ideas to reformulate into a proposal for the next meeting. There was support but slightly different objective to the original idea. He also noted the 3 free hours stopping for the summer season needed to be communicated.

## **VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

**ITEM 14.** Review and Discussion Regarding Monthly Reporting Spreadsheets and Information  
There was no discussion regarding this item.

## **VII. UPDATES**

- Amendment to Bylaws Regarding Quorums
- Ordinance 0316 – Permits for Dumpsters and Pods to be Processed by Parking Manager
- Discussion with City Council Regarding Long-Range Parking Management Planning
- Transit Planning RFP
- Special Event Traffic and Parking Management
- Ordinance Adopting Traffic Engineer Regulations
- Parking Management Report
- Financial Report

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Mr. Minch moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:25am.