



**TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, October 24, 2017**

I. CALL TO ORDER and APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A regular meeting of the Manitou Springs Transportation and Parking Board was held on Tuesday, October 24, 2017, in Council Chambers, 606 Manitou Avenue. Chairman Koerner called the meeting to order at 8:36am. The following were in attendance:

PRESENT: Chair BILL KOERNER
Vice Chair NEALE MINCH (left at 10:00am)
Board Member JAY BEETON
Board Member JOY PORTER (left at 10:40pm)
Board Member L'AURA WILLIAMS (left at 11:15am)

ABSENT: Board Member VALERIE ROSENKRANTZ (excused)
Board Member SUSAN WOLBRUECK (excused)

STAFF: Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner
Sherri Johnson, SP+ Facility Manager
Dane Lyon, SP+ Senior Manager

GUESTS: Becky Elder, Council Liaison (arrived at 8:45am; left at 11:00am)
Robert Todd, Council Member
Farley McDonough, Adams Mountain Café Owner and URA Chair
Natalie Johnson, MAC and Creative District Director
David Chorepenning, 1100 block Manitou Avenue Property Owner
Tim Beeson, Resident
Ken Jaray, 1100 block Manitou Avenue Property Owner
Dave Meese, Spencer Avenue Resident
Daniel Price, Loop Employee
Heather, Loop Employee
Josh, Business Owner at 1107 Manitou Avenue
Randy Ferguson, Lovers Lane Resident
Bruno Pothier, 1100 block Manitou Avenue Property Owner

Chairman Koerner asked everyone present to introduce themselves, welcomed the guests, and asked for a change in the agenda order as follows:

- Item 6 becomes Item 3 after Public Comment
- Item 7 becomes Item 4
- Item 4 becomes Item 5
- Item 5 becomes Item 6, and
- Item 3 becomes Item 7

MOTION:

Board Member Minch moved to change the agenda order as outlined by Chairman Koerner.

SECOND:

Board Member Porter seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no further discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. July 25, 2017

MOTION:

Board Member Porter moved approval of the July Meeting Minutes as presented.

SECOND:

Board Member Williams seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no further discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 3-0. (Board Members Minch and Beeton abstained as they were not present for the July meeting.)

ITEM 2. September 26, 2017

MOTION:

Board Member Minch moved approval of the September Meeting Minutes as presented.

SECOND:

Board Member Beeton seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no further discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0. (Board Member Williams abstained as she was not present for the September meeting.)

III. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NONAGENDA ITEMS

Natalie Johnson noted a \$5,000 grant from the Department of Local Affairs had been received, with a \$5,000 required match, for development of a wayfinding and signage plan (not installation) for the URA area, which could also be applicable to sign plans in other areas. She reported she was organizing the project

and putting together a committee. The project was to be completed January 2018. Dan Lyons from SP+ agreed to participate and Ms. Anthony noted she was on the list of team members as well. Ms. Johnson indicated members of the Open Space and Park and Rec Boards, were also participating. She was issuing a Request for Proposals and then would meet with the committee after consultant selection. Ms. Johnson noted there would be a public process once the basic plan was drafted. She agreed to send information on the project schedule to Ms. Anthony and Mr. Lyon.

Randy Ferguson, resident on Lovers Lane behind City Hall, indicated he was present to inquire about his property being included in the Upper Washington RPP. Brief discussion occurred regarding including the north side of Lovers Lane from El Paso to Lafayette Road in the residential parking permit area. Ms. Anthony stated the request needed to go through the process so Staff could evaluate and make a recommendation regarding the proposal, then if approved it could be managed as part of the Upper Washington RPP. Mr. Ferguson was advised to obtain the paperwork from the Parking Office.

Tim Beeson stated there was misinformation which needed to be corrected from the meeting the previous month. It was indicated a two-story garage on the Hiawatha property would yield 400 parking spaces and that number would need a three-story building and to cover the area where the current building was located. Chairman Koerner indicated he had analyzed the parking capacity and had not included the area of the building, but noted he would be glad to get together with Mr. Beeson to discuss further.

Board Member Minch noted the preliminary design drawing of the proposed parking garage on the Wichita Lot were at the Chamber of Commerce and he thought they would be published in the next Pikes Peak Bulletin. He noted anyone interested in the garage should attend the Metro Board meetings on the first Wednesday of the month at 4:00pm as that was the right forum to discuss a garage at the Wichita Lot location. Ken Jaray asked what the scope of the Transportation and Parking Board's participation in the planning for the garage would be. Chairman Koerner indicated he felt the TPB's input was germane to the process and the board should have a role in discussions regarding the parking garage. Board Member Beeton stated the TPB and Metro needed to collaborate. Chairman Koerner suggested the TPB ask Metro to hold public meetings and request they work together outside of the City's development review process; the TPB should be part of the Metro's planning for the garage. Board Member Minch suggested TPB representatives should go to the Metro meeting to discuss this; however, questioned how Metro could be required to include the TPB. Chairman Koerner indicated the City Council could require Metro to engage the public and work with the TPB. Board Member Porter stated the garage proposal was causing an uproar in the community, which wants to have a lot of input. She felt the Metro needed to get more information out in the public. Board Member Minch again stated the appropriate forum for discussion of the Wichita parking garage was at a Metro meeting and if the TPB chose, it could request the Council require Metro to engage in more active participation with the TPB and the public. Ms. Anthony indicated the Wichita parking lot was private property and she did not know of a mechanism for the City to insert itself into the process before the owner came forward with a development request. Board Member Beeton suggested the City's process was consisted of checking boxes. Chairman Koerner noted by the time the Metro District applied for development approval they will have spent significant funds, and the District was not simply a private property owner; the TPBs involvement early could mean money would be spent differently and the issue of a parking garage had major implications for the community. Therefore, the City Council should have the ability to guide how the Metro works with the TPB.

MOTION:

Board Member Beeton moved to ask City Council to request the Metropolitan Parking District Board engage in a more open public process and to include the Transportation and Parking Board in the project planning as the interface with the Wichita parking garage on behalf of Manitou Springs' citizens.

SECOND:

Board Member Minch seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Anthony was asked to read the motion back to the board.

Ms. Johnson stated much of the Metro Board's conversation was around money, so perhaps they might respond to an offer to pay for a study or help with arranging public meetings.

Board Member Minch noted the TPB didn't have any budgeted funds to participate in such a study, but could commit to do other work that may have value.

Ken Jaray suggested the TPB's 2018 Budget request for a Master Plan could provide funds for this effort. He felt as a quasi-governmental entity, the City Council could have oversight of the Metro District.

David Chorepenning stated the TPB was the most knowledgeable group in regard to the City's parking and transportation issues and should be involved in the planning for the Wichita parking lot and the discussion should not be at the Metro meetings. He stated the City Council should give the TPB backbone to be involved in the study of the property. He reminded those present about the Transportation Study for the Yellow Deli property that didn't take into consideration the approved Wheeler House project and the approval was based on flawed information. He stated the TPB needed to be part of the decision-making mix on the Wichita Lot.

Councilman Todd made an analogy with the Fire Training Center, which Council didn't want to stop because of the work that had gone into the planning, so went ahead and put on the ballot for a public vote. He stated by the time it is in the City process, the Wichita project could have momentum politically. The following Monday was the next City Council meeting and this recommendation had to be at that meeting. Councilman Todd indicated the Council's deliberations regarding the boards and commissions also included not just responding to requests, but having the right to represent citizens and bringing issues to the City Council and recommending what needs to be done. Decisions between one location for a parking garage and another and selecting the ideal location for the City need to be made together with the Metro District. Mr. Todd indicated this was the opportunity for this to be done and if not now then the political momentum will be a factor in any future development approvals.

Board Member Williams agreed with Councilman Todd and also noted there was a lot of misinformation about what the Metro District is and does and what the TPB is and does. She stated there needed to be public outreach and the TPB needed to take the lead.

Board Member Minch stated he still urged people to turn up at the Metro Meetings so the Board could hear directly from the public, noting the motion referred to the process was regarding a garage on the Wichita parking lot, not where to put a garage.

Chairman Koerner and Board Member Beeton agreed with this clarification.

Board Member Porter asked when the Metro meetings were held. Staff responded the regular meetings are scheduled the 1st Wednesday of each month at 4:00pm in City Council Chambers.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0.

Councilman Todd suggested the left side of Spencer between Canon and Cave Avenue should be repainted as No Parking and there should be clear signage on Canon Avenue stating there is no Highway 24 access and no through traffic via the Agate Hill neighborhood. Parking Manager Johnson indicated she would put in a Mobile 311 request for painting the yellow curb and follow-up regarding this.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 3. Discussion and Recommendation Regarding Spencer Avenue Residential Parking Permit Area Designation – Sherri Johnson, SP+

SP+ Parking Manager Sherri Johnson presented information on the Spencer Avenue RPP request, review the process to date, and noted the support of the property residents in the proposed area. Ms. Johnson stated approval of the RPP designation was recommended.

Board Member Minch asked about a resident on Canon Avenue who was asking about being able to park in the Spencer RPP whenever there was rain or potential for flooding. Ms. Anthony stated she had replied to the inquiries and had spoken to another resident at the neighborhood meeting about this. She did not recommend residents outside of the Spencer RPP be allowed to parking in this very limited area, but had advised they could park on Spencer above Cave or on Cave or Dudley if those residents were concerned about flooding on Canon Avenue.

MOTION:

Board Member Minch moved to recommend approval of the designation of the first block of Spencer Avenue between Canon Avenue and Cave Avenue as a Residential Parking Permit area as requested by the residents and recommended by Staff.

SECOND:

Board Member Beeton seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no further discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

ITEM 4. Information Regarding Proposed Manitou Avenue Residential Parking Permit Area – Sherri Johnson, SP+

Parking Manager Johnson presented the application for creation of an RPP area on Manitou Avenue in the 1100 block to the intersection of Minnehaha Avenue. It was noted this would only apply to the south side of Manitou Avenue and would include two-hour parking from 9:00am to 6:00pm in two areas adjacent to business. The entire area would be RPP only from 6:00pm to 9:00am, with the areas along the residential properties RPP 24/7/365. Ms. Johnson noted there had been a good neighborhood meeting and Staff had expanded the RPP from the initial proposal which covered only a partial block, up to Minnehaha Avenue. She reported there had been significant discussion at that meeting about parking for downtown employees. Residents were strongly in favor of the RPP designation.

Board Member Porter asked about the split between commercial and residential parking. Ms. Anthony indicated this RPP, although not currently paid parking, would function similarly to the parking on Ruxton, which had public parking available in certain areas and not others and which also had time-limited commercial parking.

Board Member Minch asked about timing for implementation. Ms. Johnson stated it could be as soon as December, if the board recommended approval to the City Council. Mr. Minch noted with the parking on Canon and Park Avenue not available, he wanted to make sure people could park during the peak visitor periods in the two-hour parking areas.

Ms. Anthony recommended extending the eastern boundary of the RPP area to immediately adjacent to the end of the downtown paid parking. It was noted there were not parking spaces in this additional area, but for simplicity of illustrating the RPP area and signage, she felt this made sense. She also recommended the parking along the entire frontage of 1141 Manitou Avenue, instead of only two parking spaces, be designated as the two-hour parking. This would be approximately four spaces instead of the two currently proposed. Bruno Pothier, the owner of the property favored limiting the commercial parking to only two spaces, noting people parked in either of the two-hour areas in front of 1107 and 1141 Manitou Avenue would not necessarily be patrons of those specific businesses. He felt two spaces along his frontage was sufficient.

There was discussion regarding whether residents could park in the two-hour areas at any time. Parking Manager Johnson indicated they could park in these areas, but only for the two hours allowed during those times of day.

Board Member Williams stated customers coming into her business downtown can't find parking and are frustrated when they go onto Duclou and see empty spaces. She indicated she was not comfortable with resident parking only.

Board Member Minch noted a significant amount of downtown parking was currently not available on Canon and Park Avenues, so when that came back online it would help ease the lack of parking.

Board Member Williams stated all the green spaces on the map showing the proposed RPP were residents only and she felt they would sit empty all day long.

Ms. Anthony asked if the board preferred to make the area operate more like Ruxton by allowing public parking during the day during the week, and then RPP only evenings and weekends.

David Chorepenning, who was the original petitioner for the RPP area, stated not all residents work from 9:00am to 6:00pm. The proposal was designed to serve the residents and small businesses in the area.

Mr. Pothier noted the north side of Manitou Avenue was not proposed for RPP restrictions and he did not feel the proposal was excessive or detrimental to his commercial building.

A business owner at 1107 Manitou Avenue, Josh, stated he offered classes from 6:00pm to 9:00pm and wanted to have the two-hour commercial parking extended to 9:00pm. This was discussed, and it was noted his students could park on the other side of Manitou Avenue or in the Schmishny parking lot in the evenings.

Mr. Chorepenning also noted after 6:00pm, all parking on Manitou Avenue was free.

Daniel Price stated the issue was if the RPP went in on the south side of Manitou Avenue, that would create more demand on the north side and it was going to be even harder for employees at downtown businesses to park.

Loop employee Heather stated she felt employees were not being heard and were being overlooked. She had worked at the Loop for three years and had no say in the parking programs put in place. More areas had turned residential, making it hard to find parking to get to work. She noted in Colorado Springs employees could park in residential areas and she felt the City provided no support for people coming to work. Heather noted she carried cash tips when she got off work in the evening and it was too long a wait to get a police escort to her car.

Chairman Koerner asked what her suggestions were. Heather stated she wanted a permit to park in residential area. She understood residents also needed to be able to park, but employees needed a place as well.

Chairman Koerner asked if her employer offered any assistance and she responded he did not.

Ms. Anthony noted there were permits available on Ruxton and Upper Washington for out-of-area employees; these were not free and no one had taken advantage of their availability.

Chairman Koerner noted any of the RPP areas could be amended if found to not be working.

Board Member Williams stated she had changed her business hours so employees didn't have to walk in the dark and she didn't think the Board was looking at this from a business perspective. Duclot sat empty and this made customers upset. Board Member Williams also noted she had tenants who live on Manitou Avenue and she had trouble renting those units because there was no convenient parking. She stated the lack of employee parking affects business.

Board Member Beeton asked how much trouble employees had with finding parking, not during special events, but regularly. Heather stated she had to come to work at least 30 minutes early in order to look for a parking space.

Board Member Beeton asked if the issue was employees were afraid they were not going to be able to find a place to park. Heather replied yes.

Board Member Beeton stated the board should potentially look at allowing some employee parking in RPPs. Council Liaison Elder stated she supported this.

Farley McDonough stated when her restaurant Adams Mountain Café was in the Spa Building she purchased permits for the Canon Lot and the Schmishny Lot. She focused on the night shift, which came in at 4:00pm so was able to purchase evening permits and the parking office worked out hours that allowed her employees to come in and park before their shift started.

Board Member Beeton stated he believed the City needed an employee permit parking program.

Board Member Minch left at this point in the meeting.

Board Member Beeton suggested the board give themselves a deadline for establishing this program.

Ms. Anthony suggested the board work with the Metro District regarding provisions for downtown resident and employee parking in the new garage, as this was where these types of parking could best be accommodated.

Board Member Beeton stated the Incline was the 800 lb. gorilla in the room and the ultimate toothpaste squeezer, so was reason parking was such an issue.

Ms. Johnson suggested the Cog shuttles employees, so perhaps there could be some opportunity there to work with them to shuttle downtown employees.

Mr. Chorepenning asked for the RPP proposal to move forward and the employee parking issue to be kept separate.

Chairman Koerner asked if timing on this RPP was important; were there issues being experienced. Mr. Chorepenning stated there were and he was okay with the extension of the RPP area to the east adjacent to where the paid parking ended as recommended by Ms. Anthony, but not with extending the commercial spaces along 1141 Manitou Avenue's frontage.

Mr. Pothier stated he was fine with two commercial spaces along his frontage, but was also fine with the four potential spaces as, again, none of the two-hour parking was dedicated to the immediately adjacent businesses.

MOTION:

Board Member Porter moved to recommend designation of the Manitou Avenue Residential Parking Permit area with the change to the eastern end of the RPP as recommended by Staff.

SECOND:

Board Member Beeton seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no further discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 3-0. Board Member Williams abstained from the vote stating she was having trouble being unbiased about the issue based on her personal experiences.

Councilman Todd stated he appreciated the Board's willingness to take on a leadership role in regard to the development of a parking garage and applauded taking on the issue of employee parking. He urged the board to set a date for a worksession and to let the community know when this discussion would be. Councilman Todd stated at some point it may be RPPs were not serving the best interests of the City during business hours, noting parking on Old Colorado City was wonderful and open during the day. Manitou Springs had excess capacity that was not being used.

Board Member Porter left at this point in the meeting.

Chairman Koerner stated the issue of employee parking had been laid on the table and needed to be taken care of.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 5. Update on Status of Smart Card Roll-Out – Sherri Johnson, SP+ (9:05am)

Ms. Johnson referred to the memo in the board packets. She indicated timing for program roll-out was anticipated by December 1st, noting they had had issues getting information from the company who would provide the equipment and cards.

Ms. Anthony noted she needed specifications for the design of the artwork for the resident and non-resident cards. She also suggested a list of all residences be obtained from the Assessor's Office as this would likely be more comprehensive than trying to compile a list other ways.

The Board asked for an update and specific timeline at the November meeting.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 6. Discussion Regarding Complaints About RPP Ticket Fines

Chairman Koerner indicated this item had been put on the agenda because of a complaint the Board and City Council was familiar with. He asked if the fine was appropriate.

Ms. Anthony indicated, after discussing with the Parking Manager, the recommendation was not to lower the fine, but to provide warnings to first time offenders in the RPP areas. This would provide an opportunity to raise awareness regarding the RPP restrictions and but still provide a disincentive to people who habitually parked in those neighborhoods. Lowering the fines was not recommended, as they had been fairly recently increased to gain compliance. Staff did not support going back to a lower amount as that had not been successful in deterring parking in the RPP areas.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 7. 2018 Budget Update – Bill Koerner

Chairman Koerner provided information on his report to the City Council regarding the proposed 2018 budget.

Staff advised the board City Council was holding a worksession the following Monday, October 30, to discuss the unfunded budget requests and encouraged board member attendance. She advised she would make sure there will be discussion from the audience allowed during this meeting.

Chairman Koerner asked how the Ruxton Functionality Study in the 2018 budget would differ from the existing Ruxton studies.

Ken Jaray stated that there had already been studies of Ruxton and he felt it was silly to do another one. He suggested implementing the Ruxton Study he helped fund and questioned why this had not been done. Mr. Jaray also asked what happened with the LotSpot project and why had someone not contacted him if there were issues since he had brought the student corporation to the City.

Ms. Anthony noted the Ruxton Functionality Study was going to inform a transportation grant already received by the City to create construction plans for improvements on Ruxton. However, she was not the lead planner on that project, so could not discuss it in detail. Ms. Anthony also noted the City Council had instructed Staff to terminate the LotSpot project due to the difficulties getting information and follow-up from the student entrepreneurs. She noted Council had asked SP+ to recommend an alternative by an established company. However, Council chose not to fund the alternative project that had been proposed. She believed one reasons being the Metro District did not want to implement the parking space ID system in the Wichita Lot as they were planning the garage construction and would have to take up and reinstall sensors in each parking space within a couple of years of the initial installation. Staff also believed the Metro Board was told by their consultant the proposed system was not reliable.

Council Liaison Elder stated if there were to be public meetings about the Wichita Parking Garage these needed to be in the evening. She then left at this point in the meeting.

Board Member Beeton asked why the Ruxton Study had been wholly ignored and questioned the City doing another one.

It was suggested members of the TPB meet with the Planning Staff to more fully understand what the Ruxton Functionality Study was going to accomplish and how it differed from the previous Ruxton Study.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

ITEM 8. Discussion Regarding Changing the Transportation and Parking Board Scope

Staff noted she had not received any information from the TPB members as was requested at the previous meeting.

Board Members asked the plea for input be put out again to the board. Chairman Koerner noted he had recommended to City Council the word “transit” be changed to “transportation” in the current board regulations draft.

Board Member Williams left at this point in the meeting.

ITEM 9. Presentation of Kezziah-Watkins Report, Suggested Revisions to Combined Board and Commission Ordinance, and Revisions to TBP Bylaws

Ms. Anthony noted the report and ordinance had been provided electronically. She suggested she bring revised bylaws to the next meeting, as she had not had time to work on these for this meeting. She indicated she understood Board Member Rosenkrantz had some comments or suggestions regarding changes to the Bylaws as well, and she would contact her about this.

X. UPDATES

- Shuttle Operations – information on Shuttle ridership was provided in the Board packets
- Parking Management and Financial Report – information from the Parking Manager was provided in the board packets
- Ruxton Avenue Study – this project was scheduled to start in January 2018
- Incline Management Committee Minutes – Minutes were not available. Board Member Beeton stated he wanted notice of when the meetings are scheduled, stated the committee should meet monthly and should aggressively publicize the meetings.
- Complaints/Input Regarding Need for Change Machines – no complaints had been received since the previous meeting.

XI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

There was no discussion regarding these items listed on the agenda.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business before the Board, Chairman Koerner adjourned the meeting at 11:35am.

Submitted by Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner