



**PARKING AUTHORITY BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, October 4, 2016
(Rescheduled September Regular Meeting)**

I. CALL TO ORDER and INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

A regular meeting of the Manitou Springs Parking Authority Board was held on Tuesday, October 4, 2016, in Council Chambers @ 606 Manitou Avenue. Chair Koerner called the meeting to order at 8:34am. The following were in attendance:

PRESENT: Board Member JAY BEETON
Vice Chair NEALE MINCH
Board Member JOY PORTER
Chair BILL KOERNER

ABSENT: Board Member SUSAN WOLBRUECK (excused)

STAFF: Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner
Sherri Johnson, Planning Technician
Joe Leung, SP+ Regional Manager

GUESTS: Bob Todd, City Council Liaison
Paul Meade, President Friends of the Peak
Karole Campbell, MadWomen Marketing (arrived at 9:25am)

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. July 26, 2016

MOTION:

Board Member Porter moved to approve the July 26, 2016 minutes as presented.

SECOND:

Board Member Beeton seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no further discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

ITEM 2. August 23, 2016

MOTION:

Board Member Minch moved to approve the August 23, 2016 minutes as presented.

SECOND:

Board Member Porter seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no further discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

At this time, Chairman Koerner asked to make a change to the agenda asking to move the budget discussion to the beginning of the meeting.

MOTION:

Board Member Beeton moved to amend the agenda and discuss Item 4. Review and Recommendation of 2017 Parking Budget Request, first.

SECOND:

Board Member Minch seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no further discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

ITEM 3. Review and Recommendation of 2017 Parking Budget Request

Ms. Anthony discussed the handout from RMFI outlining their proposed 2017 Barr Trail Improvement Project. Ms. Anthony also noted RMFI requested \$40K in support from the city of Manitou, which was anticipated, and in the budget.

Ms. Anthony confirmed with Mr. Meade the Friends of the Peak were asking for an additional \$5K. Mr. Meade stated they had been doing work on Barr Trail for years and turned out at least 100 volunteer workdays per year; the money would help them meet the goals set for 2017.

Mr. Koerner provided background on a recent meeting with the City Administrator and discussion regarding if enough was being done for the Barr Trail and the Incline cut-off trail, as the conditions had worsened. It was decided proposals for additional funding from Friends of the Peak and RMFI could be accepted.

Ms. Porter added she was an Incline user and was appalled at the trail cutting and the leaning railings. She stated something had to be done to save the bottom portion of Barr Trail.

There was discussion regarding how lower Barr Trail could be improved.

Mr. Minch asked if the City of Colorado Springs contributed to trail maintenance. Ms. Anthony replied she did not know.

Mr. Beeton said his inclination was to support this request but also challenge appropriate agencies in Colorado Springs to match funds, adding it was not the Barr Trail users causing the problems, but was the Incline users.

Mr. Koerner talked about the IGA with Colorado Springs Utilities regarding management of the Barr Trail Parking Lot, which laid out how funds generated from the lot could be used. One of the eligible items for those funds was to take care of the Barr Trail. Mr. Koerner said there was a long history of Manitou Springs' funds caring for the Barr Trail. Mr. Koerner said to his knowledge Colorado Springs provided funds for the Incline and the connector trail.

Mr. Meade noted the City of Colorado Springs was supposed to install railing fencing along the entire Incline, but ran out of money and never completed them.

Mr. Minch asked if the line item should read "material and equipment" versus "material and labor" because all the labor was volunteer. Mr. Meade clarified he hoped to get funding for materials, gifts for volunteers, as well as other projects they work on.

Mr. Koerner said concerning the Barr Trail part of the budget, on page 3 Line 10-496-320 "Services Professional" for the Incline Capacity Study looked to him like a mission impossible as there were so many variables. \$30K struck him as a lot of money for nothing and asked Mr. Todd where the \$30K came from.

Mr. Todd replied at a Council Worksession regarding the Ruxton corridor, the concept of economic impact of the Incline and the capacity of the corridor, not incline specific, was lightly discussed. He related there was more discussion during the recent Council meeting where the Ruxton and Barr Lot rate increases were approved because the Mayor wanted, in particular, the people present from outside of Manitou Springs to understand the City was looking at the issues at a higher, more global level. The Mayor said the City was going to do this and suggested the City Administrator put that number in the budget.

Ms. Anthony clarified she put the number in the budget, adding the capacity study had also been discussed at the Incline Management Committee meeting quite extensively. Ms. Anthony clarified the Incline Study would be in addition to the Parking Management Study, also in the budget. The Incline Study would be more about the capacity of the physical incline itself as well as the parking and transportation related to accessing the Incline. It would address questions such as what was the capacity for a sustainable facility, what was the future capacity, and how the City would manage that.

Mr. Koerner felt there were two factors- something that could be studied and quantified which would be the Ruxton study, but the factors would be very diverse for an Incline study and again, he thought that would be impossible.

Ms. Anthony replied there were other studies being done by the Parks Service and Forest Service similar to what had been discussed, so there were examples available of this being done.

Mr. Minch agreed adding he was not sure there was \$30,000 worth of value the City would get out of a study. Mr. Minch said the Incline's capacity was vastly greater than the Ruxton corridor's and that should be the emphasis.

Mr. Beeton wanted to know why there had never been an environmental impact assessment, saying instead of doing a capacity study why would the City not do an environmental impact assessment that included the Incline and the corridor. That to him was the comprehensive answer.

Mr. Koerner asked Ms. Anthony if she had any ideas about how they could fund the Friends of the Peak's efforts. Ms. Anthony replied the board would simply add \$5,000 to the line item in the proposed budget.

Mr. Minch asked if the board would recommend dropping the Incline Capacity Study. Mr. Koerner felt it needed to be better defined because it implied it was the capacity of the incline. Ms. Anthony said that was what the discussions had been about. The Mayor had volunteered to bring back more specific information to the Incline Management Committee and provide examples of other studies on trails and recreational facilities.

Ms. Porter said things should be called what they were, so not to imply the study was simply on Incline capacity. Ms. Porter said the City needed to be smart regarding what it planned to do with a capacity study and how it would benefit the city.

Ms. Anthony stated the scope had not yet been fully defined which was understandable considering this stage in the process. Ms. Anthony added she just put that figure in, as a placeholder saying she did not know if that would be too much or too little.

Mr. Koerner confirmed with Ms. Anthony that her opinion was to simply add \$5K for Friends of the Peak to Line Item 10-496-911, Barr Trail Facilities.

Mr. Koerner suggested making two separate motions - one in support of both the RMFI and Friends of the Peak request for funding and the other regarding the Incline Capacity Study.

MOTION:

Board Member Minch moved to add \$5K for Friends of the Peak and recommend approval the existing \$40K for the Rocky Mountain Field Institute.

SECOND:

Board Member Beeton seconded the motion

DISCUSSION:

There was no further discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

There was discussion among the members regarding asking the City of Colorado Springs and others to help support maintaining Barr Trail.

Mr. Koerner suggested taking the discussion to the Incline Management Committee. The Board was in agreement regarding asking that a discussion item be put on that committee's agenda

MOTION:

Board Member Beeton moved to request a discussion of contributions from the City of Colorado Springs, and other larger users of the Incline such as the military to support maintenance of the Barr Trail and also that this item be on the next Incline Management Committee agenda.

SECOND:

Board Member Porter seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no further discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

There were questions regarding line items in the budget which were not funded. Ms. Anthony said if an item was in the budget the previous year and would continue into the current year, assuming that action needed to be continued. Anything over that goes into the unfunded category and then they decide what would be funded or not funded.

Mr. Meade left the meeting at 9:18am. The conversation regarding the budget continued.

Ms. Anthony confirmed the Police Department was requesting a second enforcement vehicle for parking however, it was currently in the unfunded budget, adding Chief Ribeiro needed an estimate for a second LPR. Joe Leung, SP+ said he would follow up with the LPR company again.

Ms. Anthony stated she needed more information on the Management Services to be sure she was reflecting a real number. Ms. Anthony said Management Services were split between Parking and Barr Trail. The reason was that there was a need to charge Barr Trail for some of the expenses.

Ms. Anthony said line item 10-495-340 covered the SP contract with the remainder of those funds coming from Item 10-496-571 out of Barr Trail Parking Lot revenues. Items such as credit card fees were split between Parking and Barr Trail Lot, as well as charged for the enforcement equipment.

Mr. Leung and Ms. Anthony went over each line item. Ms. Anthony reviewed SP+ Management fees in 2017 and the requested fees in 2017. She noted that an increase was requested, which was based on increased costs, not a request for more profit.

Mr. Koerner wanted to know about the net profit, asking whose profit was it. Ms. Anthony replied that profit belonged to the City.

Mr. Minch remarked that 2016 revenue growth had come from citations, the Ruxton and Barr Lot increases - basically all of the increase was coming from the Ruxton corridor. The commercial district was flat. Mr. Minch predicted a decrease in the Ruxton Corridor revenue in 2017 because of the recent fee increases, adding he felt revenue projections might be optimistic.

There was discussion about traffic moving from the Ruxton Corridor into the downtown area and a possible 3-hour limit. Ms. Anthony reminded the members there was a 3-hour limit previously and the City wanted to move forward not backward. One of the reasons a tiered fee schedule was implemented was that allowed people flexibility in choosing to stay longer. There were a lot of complaints about time limits before paid parking went into effect.

The board discussed the City Council and how items were added to their agenda. Ms. Anthony offered, in her opinion, advisory boards should discuss an item and make a recommendation before a topic was discussed at City Council. Mr. Todd said he would have a discussion with Mayor Nicoletta.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NONAGENDA ITEMS

There was no public comment on nonagenda items.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 4. Review and Recommendation - Ordinance 0316 - Permits for Dumpsters and Pods On-Street - Referred Back from City Council for Amendments and Review of Fee Schedule

Ms. Anthony reminded the board at the last meeting they requested a fee schedule for both on-season and off-season permits be presented for various areas of town. Ms. Anthony produced an outline for discussion and recommendation.

Mr. Minch said the outlined looked very close to what was discussed.

Ms. Anthony said she reduced the permits to one for all kinds of uses (dumpster, POD, etc.) and created fees for on-season or off-season, in the paid parking areas and in residential areas. Ms. Anthony said these permits would only be used for on-street parking spaces, not in lots or on private property.

Mr. Todd suggested at the end of thirty days, rather than have an extension; the fee would simply start over again.

MOTION:

Board Member Minch moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance 0316 with the fee schedule as discussed, with removal of extension column, noting if an extension was needed it would be prorated from the 30 day rate at the discretion of the Parking Manager

SECOND:

Board Member Porter seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no further discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

V. NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 5. Discussion and Recommendation to City Council Regarding Reuse or Demolition of the Hiawatha Gardens Building

Ms. Anthony said the Architect's report had been posted online. Board discussion ensued and the following comments were made:

- after reviewing the report and information on the building, demolition would not be in keeping with what the community is about
- the video of the property did not show the building's historical attributes
- the addition of a few parking spaces and more pavement does nothing to enhance the visitor experience
- the City would miss an opportunity - the Hiawatha could be a hub for activities
- the building could welcome visitors, provide public meeting space, be used for small conventions, community meetings outside of the City's potential use, and be a terrific benefit for the community
- the hazardous materials remediation has to be done whether the building is removed or retained
- as with any older building, there are expenses and needed upgrades but those are not reasons to tear it down
- parking operations could be moved into the building to make it a hub for parking and transportation and free up space in City Hall

MOTION:

Board Member Beeton moved to support the retention and use/reuse of the Hiawatha Gardens facility recognizing its potential as a community asset far exceeds the value of approximately 40 parking spaces added to the City's inventory.

SECOND:

Board Member Porter seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

There were questions regarding the Conditional Use permit for the Cog. Ms. Anthony explained the conditional use postponed to the December planning meeting.

Mr. Leung announced a replacement for Andy Amidon had been found. His name was Dane Lyon and he had been with SP+ for five years. Mr. Leung stated Mr. Lyon had a Master's Degree in Planning and would be introduced at the next meeting.

VII. UPDATES

- Ordinance Changing Board Name and Updating Vacancy Appointment Procedures

Staff had not been able to determine what the status of this ordinance was prior to the Commission meeting or if the informal report Council did not want to consider the name change pending undertaking the larger effort to redefine the board's scope was accurate.

- Cog Railway Conditional Use Permit Request

The application was forwarded to board members FYI. Individuals were invited to comment.

- Ruxton Management Recommendations

The Incline Capacity Study had been discussed earlier in the meeting.

- 2-hour parking 1st Block of Ruxton

Staff noted informal reports were merchants in the area felt the 2-hour parking limit had benefitted businesses. This item to be discussed in January 2017.

- Shuttle Operations

Staff noted a proposal from Mountain Metro Transit for 2017 operations and costs would be provided at the Board's October 25 meeting.

- Incline Review Committee Minutes

The Minutes from the last Committee meeting were provided in the board packets. Staff noted this committee met the second Wednesday of each month at 3:30pm

- Parking Management Report

The August 2016 Report from SP+ was provided in the board's packet.

VIII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Ordinance Adopting Traffic Engineer Regulations (Review City Attorney Document)
- RFP for Ticket Collection Services
- Draft of Operating Procedures Document (Review City Attorney Document)
- Initial Draft Changes to the Board's Scope and Powers and Duties
- Work session on Long-Range Parking Planning
- Downtown or Near Downtown Resident Parking Study (Long-Range and Continuing)
- Downtown Employee Parking Study (Long-Range)
- Scope for Transit Planning RFP

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business before the board, Chair Koerner adjourned the meeting at 10:53am.