



**CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS, COLORADO
PARKING PLAN
PROCESS REPORT**



July 5, 2011



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Summary of Findings	2
Public Involvement Process	4
Observations and Conclusions.....	16
Process Participants.....	18
Appendix:	
City web site survey responses	
On-street survey responses	
May 25th Parking Problem Potluck verbatim group responses	
May 25th Parking Problem Potluck verbatim individual responses	

INTRODUCTION

Manitou Springs has a car problem of long standing. In a community dependent for much of its economy on tourism and one which is nestled in the heart of a mountain valley, finding space to accommodate the cars serving both residents and visitors is difficult. The parking challenge in Manitou Springs is not new. Solving it has, over time, entailed several analyses by professional parking experts, countless community meetings, innumerable discussions by elected and appointed officials and staff, and the emergence of the challenge time and again as other community issues have been decided.

With the creation of the Parking Authority Board , the City of Manitou Springs took on an active role in creating sustainable solutions to the ongoing challenge. The opportunity for change in the form of a comprehensive parking approach gained strength in 2010 as the plan for the Manitou Incline documented widespread parking conflicts among residents, recreationists, visitors, and business interests. At the same time, increased traffic and parking congestion in the downtown core and adjacent neighborhoods was highlighting concerns for public safety. Members of the Parking Authority Board identified several possible solution options and wanted to make sure they understood the community's preferences before making further recommendations on remedies and funding sources.

The firm of KezziahWatkins was hired to facilitate a public involvement process to provide residents information about possible parking solutions and to solicit community preferences. Parameters for solutions were first discussed by the Parking Authority Board, then by City Council. These "Givens" formed the framework of the discussion and delineated any non-negotiable principles that either body felt would be irresponsible for it to consider. The list of five Givens adopted by the Parking Authority Board and City Council are:

- The status quo related to local parking conditions is not an acceptable option;
- In accordance with local ordinances, solutions in the Parking Plan must not jeopardize public safety;
- Solutions must be financially viable;
- The Plan must achieve a balance between residents' and visitors' needs; and
- The process to develop the Parking Plan is open to all.

The process began with two surveys which were conducted as a prelude to community conversations. The first was an online survey posted on the City's web site asking people to express their perceptions on the severity of the parking problem: was it of little consequence in the life of the community, was it the most important issue needing resolution, or did the issue fall somewhere in between? The second survey was conducted on a Sunday in May by a volunteer from iManitou who contacted people in the downtown core on Manitou Avenue and asked a short series of questions framing the level of difficulty, if any, those with whom he / she spoke had encountered as they parked.

Understanding that the strongest and most enduring solutions to community issues are forged through face-to-face deliberation based on factual information, two community meetings were designed to build on one another. Of equal importance was commitments to sessions that were open to anyone who had an interest in the issue of parking in Manitou and to an environment that encouraged fair and safe conversation. Since Manitou Springs' "tourist season" is traditionally considered to begin at Memorial Day weekend, it was important to schedule the community meetings as early in the summer season as possible. Working around the City's scheduled meetings, the first "parking potluck" was set for May 25th, a date that turned out to also be the date for a number of evening school events and attendant celebrations as well as other community events, resulting in disappointing attendance by fewer than 30 people. The second parking meeting was held June 9th and, acting on the advice of attendees at the first meeting, the potluck component of the workshop was replaced with complimentary pizza. With more advantageous scheduling and a free dinner, nearly 100 people attended and 133 pieces of pizza were consumed. Participants at both meetings ranged in age from a 9-month-old to an undetermined upper age.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The chart below represents the cumulative findings from the Parking Plan public process. The numerical ratings reflect the combined ratings reached through consensus by attendees working in small groups at a June 9, 2011 public workshop after hearing a presentation about each of the options. The groups were instructed to use as a touchstone for their ratings through a set of community expectations developed by the attendees at a May 25, 2011 public meeting (see page 6).

Ratings of All Parking Solution Options

Option	Total Score	Mean Score	Median Score
Option M: Special event parking plan	97	9.7	10.0
Option Z: Signage & technology, downtown, to surface lots	96.5	9.7	10.0
Option AA: Signage & technology, east of downtown	94	9.4	10.0
Option V: Shuttle / trolley, seasonal, weekends, events only	89	8.9	10.0
Option L: Tour bus parking out of downtown	86	8.6	10.0
Option K: Shared public / private parking agreements	82	8.2	10.0
Option P: Residential permit, year-round	80	8.0	10.0
Option S: Residential permit, tailored by neighborhood	80	8.0	10.0
Option Y: Public / private facilities development	73	7.3	8.0
Option F: 3-level structure on Wichita lot	72	7.2	8.5
Option I: Hourly rate, parking passes, smart cards	67	6.7	7.5
Option G: Purchase and rehab 10 Old Man's Trail	65	6.5	7.5
Option U: Shuttle / trolley, seasonal only	64	6.4	6.5
Option C: On-street parking, no fee with time limit	61	6.1	7.5
Option W: Bus passes for employees	60	6.0	6.5
Option E: Loading / unloading, restricted hours	59	5.9	8.5
Option J: Downtown employee program, existing spaces	59	5.9	7.0
Option O: Residential permit, free	58	5.8	6.5
Option D: Loading / unloading, permit by user	50	5.0	5.0
Option H: Purchase and demolish 10 Old Man's Trail	48	4.8	5.0
Option X: Revision of land use codes / regs – fees in lieu	44	4.4	4.5
Option N: Residential permit, fee-based	41	4.1	3.5
Option B: Paid on-street parking, seasonal only	39	3.9	2.5
Option A: Paid on-street parking, year-round	24	2.4	0.5
Option R: Residential permit, consistent all neighborhoods	22	2.2	0.5
Option Q: Residential permit, seasonal	22	2.2	0
Option T: Shuttle / trolley, year-round	10	1.0	0

Recommended Sequencing of Parking Remedies

The following have informed this list of remedies and implementation timeframes recommended for consideration by the Manitou Springs Parking Authority Board and City Council as the framework for the Parking Plan :

- a review of earlier studies and reports on parking in Manitou Springs;
- the community expectations developed through the May 25th parking problems potluck;
- the numerical rating of options from the June 9th parking workshop and the comments attached to each group's rating;
- consideration of cost and feasibility; and
- assumption of limited staff resources.

Recommended Parking Remedies and Implementation Timeframes					
Program	Continue for now	In next 12 months	In 12 months to 2 years	In 2 to 3 years	In 3 to 5 years
Hourly parking rates, parking passes, use of smart cards	X				
On-street parking, no fee, with time limit	X				
Provision of parking for tour buses outside of downtown	X				
A parking plan for special events		X			
Institution of hourly regulations governing loading/unloading use of the center lane on Manitou Avenue		X			
Signage and technology providing information on parking availability east of downtown		X			
An inclusive, year-round residential permitting program, with no fee to residents, and tailored to each neighborhood's needs			X		
Signage and technology providing information on downtown and surface lot parking availability				X	
Agreements for shared parking in public and private lots				X	
A downtown employee program to consider provision of bus passes and use of existing parking space				X	
A public/private partnership to implement development of new parking capacity					X
Construction of a 3-level structure on the Wichita lot					X
The purchase and rehabilitation of 10 Old Man's Trail for community use, to include parking					X
A shuttle or trolley system for seasonal/weekend/events-only use					X

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

What's the Problem?

The process to engage the community in guiding the development of an action plan to address Manitou Springs' parking challenges began with a review and definition of the problem, both from a technical perspective and from a community perspective.

Consultants reviewed all of the past studies conducted over the last decade in order to gather important background information about the technical nature of the parking situation and the related community discussions that have previously taken place.

Surveys

In order to gather community residents' and visitors' ideas related to the parking obstacles faced in Manitou Springs, time and cost limitations necessitated surveys that were very brief and limited in scope. Consequently, it's important to recognize that the results reflect a limited snapshot in time and can be useful as background information. The results, however, are not conclusive and do not reflect a representative sample of the citizens of Manitou Springs.

The first was a short City web site survey conducted May 11-20 and designed to solicit residents' thoughts related to parking issues. A total of 28 responses were received; of those responses, 77% were Manitou Springs residents and 23% were from out of town. While a complete report of the web site survey may be found in the Appendix, the following represent the key findings:

- ◆ 100% of those responding said parking is a problem in Manitou Springs;
- ◆ 54% of those responding indicated they believe parking is the biggest issue facing the community and another 27% considered it a major problem, for a combined 81% who believe parking is a significant problem;
- ◆ 65% believe it is a seasonal problem and 50% see it as a year-round problem; and
- ◆ in defining for whom it's a problem, web site survey responders offered this list in ranked order: visitors; employees in commercial areas; residents in residential areas; visitors to residential areas; residents in commercial areas; and employees in residential areas.

The second survey was conducted Sunday, May 15th in downtown Manitou Springs by an iManitou volunteer who solicited a total of 105 responses to a very brief questionnaire about downtown parking experiences.



The complete results may also be found in the Appendix; a quick overview of results reveals the following:

- ◆ 77% of the people who responded to the in-person survey downtown indicated they did not have a problem parking downtown;
- ◆ 22% reported a problem with parking;
- ◆ finding an available space was the most often cited problem, followed by difficulty finding a free (without cost) space.

Parking Potluck

On the evening of May 25th area residents were encouraged to attend a “parking potluck” to begin the current community deliberation about the ongoing parking problem and possible approaches to addressing it. The meeting was designed to accomplish the following:

- ◆ review the “Givens” established by the Parking Authority Board and City Council that set parameters for the Parking Action Plan decisions;
- ◆ present a chronology of and progress on past parking initiatives;
- ◆ report the results of the web site and on-street surveys;
- ◆ identify meeting participants’ hopes and concerns related to parking solutions; and
- ◆ solicit guidance on the community’s shared expectations regarding parking solutions in Manitou Springs.

Participants spent the bulk of the meeting working in small groups to reach consensus on the answers to these questions:

1. What does your group hope can be achieved by implementing a comprehensive parking plan?
2. What are you worried about when it comes to implementing such a plan?
3. What does your group believe the Manitou Springs community should be able to expect as solutions to parking challenges are developed?

Once all groups had completed listing their responses to the questions on group response forms, representatives from each group reported out that group’s responses so that the full group could hear and understand the variety of perspectives.

The verbatim comments from the group responses forms may be found in the Appendix. A summary of those responses indicates the hopes people have for solutions focus on:

- * reducing the amount of traffic, rather than the number of people, in Manitou Springs;
- * addressing and balancing the needs of residents, local businesses, employees and visitors;
- * adequate signage and communication;
- * preserving the “integrity of the town”; and
- * using alternate means of transportation, such as bicycles and golf carts to reduce parking pressures.

Worries expressed by the groups focused on:

- * the cost and financing of solutions;
- * visual impact of parking structures in the downtown area;
- * loss of free parking;
- * residents’ needs not being considered for the sake of business and tourism;
- * rental property impacts on parking inventory;
- * shifting parking problems from one area of the community to another;
- * lack of communication on implementation;
- * emergency vehicle access;
- * traffic flow through town; and
- * the feasibility of shuttles.

Community Expectations*

The Manitou Springs community expects a Parking Plan that:

- * Preserves Manitou's character;
- * Is fair and equitable;
- * Is comprehensive, integrated and timely;
- * Provides for thorough communication with residents and visitors about plan timeline, options, and regulations; and
- * Is ultimately self-funded through a variety of payment methods.

**Statement of expectations based on group responses received at the Parking Problem Potluck*

Each person attending the potluck was also asked to complete a response form individually which simply asked: Is there anything related to parking solutions that you want to make sure the Parking Authority Board understands? Responses were wide-ranging:

- ◆ the need to consider local residents when developing solutions;
- ◆ negative impacts on residential parking as a result of enforcement;
- ◆ the necessity of good communication about parking options and programs;
- ◆ the need for fair and managed parking for the entire town;
- ◆ concern about Incline parking;
- ◆ interest in the purchase of Tajine Alami;
- ◆ support for a residential parking program;
- ◆ both support for and opposition to paid parking downtown;
- ◆ the need for a comprehensive, strategic approach to parking management that fits local conditions;
- ◆ the need to address parking for downtown employees;
- ◆ parking enforcement; and
- ◆ an offer of use of the parking lot to help alleviate parking issues from a representative from the Board of Trustees of a local church, assuming a list of issues could be worked out.

What Are the Solutions?

Parking Solutions Workshop

The focus of the second public meeting on June 9th moved from talking about the problem and defining parameters for solutions to the solutions themselves. The workshop began with a presentation by City staff about 27 different options that would help address the parking challenges in Manitou Springs. The options were developed by City staff and consultants and were based on strategies contained in the parking studies conducted over the past few years and included parking programs already initiated by the City. So that workshop attendees could develop judgment about the trade-offs of each option, information related to funding implications and mechanisms were also presented. For ease of understanding and organization, options were grouped in the following categories: on-street; off-street; residential; alternative transportation; and parking system management.

Following the presentation of information, people were provided the community expectations developed in the first public meeting and asked to use them as a framework for their discussion. Each group was also provided a worksheet that contained a description of each option, a 11-point rating scale, and space for providing the group's comments. Working in small groups, attendees were asked to reach group consensus on a rating for each option and to provide comments explaining their rating of each. So that the City could get a true sense of how people felt about each option, groups were instructed to rate each option separately, and not in relation any other option.

Once the groups had completed their assessment of all options, group representatives posted their group's ratings on the wall so that everyone could clearly see how each was assessed. The ratings and the verbatim comments from all group worksheets can be found on the following pages.

Parking Plan Options Workshop
June 20, 2011

Results of Group Discussion and Ratings

Category: On-Street Parking in High Demand Commercial Areas					
Option	Individual Group Ratings	Total Rating Score	Mean Score	Median Score	Group Comments
<p>Paid on-street parking:</p> <p>Option A: Year- round</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Option B: Seasonal only</p>	<p>Option A 0,0,0,0,0,1,2,2,9,10</p> <p>Option B 0,0,1,2,2,3,4,7,10,10</p>	<p>24</p> <p>39</p>	<p>2.4</p> <p>3.9</p>	<p>.5</p> <p>2.5</p>	<p>Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern with loss of tax revenue (rating: 2)* - <u>No meters/kiosks!</u> Will reduce sales tax, will not come (rating: 0) - Don't like progressive—why can't it be just \$1/hour? (rating: 0) - Meters in town will destroy uniqueness (rating: 0) - We are a year around tourist destination (rating: 10) - Will discourage people from coming; penalizes businesses (rating: 0) - Unfriendly to visitors—need a free option (rating: 1) - Adjust for demand (weekends, seasonal) rating: 9) <p>Option B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>No meters/kiosks!</u> If meters/kiosks, then should take cards and be inexpensive, not progressive, unreal (rating: 0) - Seasonal/free after 5 p.m./free on Sundays (rating: 10) - But definitely need expanded remote parking (rating: 0) - Give a break to off-season people (rating: 0) - Less revenue from seasonal equals longer time to pay off financing, etc. (rating: 7) - Include year-round weekends and special events (rating: 2) - Suggest free resident ½ hour (rating: 2)

*Indicates the rating of the group submitting the comment

Category: On-Street Parking in High Demand Commercial Areas

(continued)

Option	Individual Group Ratings	Total Rating Score	Mean Score	Median Score	Group Comments
<p>Option C: No fee with time limit (current)</p>	<p>0,2,3,5,7,8,8,8,10,10</p>	<p>61</p>	<p>6.1</p>	<p>7.5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Businesses' support working well (rating: 8) - Keep streets free, build more lots (rating: 10) - If it's not "C", afraid of other options, especially "A" (rating: 3) - Not working! (rating: 2) - Signage needs to be clear re. not just moving car to other spot (rating: 8) - May need to review time limit (rating: 8)
<p>Loading/unloading policy for use of Manitou Avenue center lane by:</p> <p>Option D: A permit program to restrict user</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OR</u></p> <p>Option E: Hours of use restrictions</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Option D</p> <p style="text-align: center;">0,0,0,1,2,8,9,10,10,10</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Option E</p> <p style="text-align: center;">0,0,0,2,8,9,10,10,10,10</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">50</p> <p style="text-align: center;">59</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">5.0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5.9</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">5.0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">8.5</p>	<p>Option D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People are abusing (rating: 1) - Permits for business use (rating: 8) - What about 15-minute spaces in front of certain business where people just go in and out, like Spice of Life, Swirl? (rating: 0) - No permits for local business use! (rating: 0) - Permit allows time of delivery (rating: 10) - Not practical (rating: 0) - Ensure that cars aren't running engines; commercial vehicles only, 15-minute time limit (rating: 9) - Reduce congestion and stopping (rating: 10) - Enforce current rules (rating: 2) <p>Option E:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hours must have some flexibility; some businesses need exemption to deliver all day; time limit for loading; encourage weekly deliveries (rating:10) - Customer loading and business delivery priority. <u>No</u> restrictions (rating: 0) - Permit allows time of delivery (rating: 10) - Need restrictions (rating: 9) - Reduce congestion and stopping (rating: 10) - Enforce current rules (rating: 2)

Category: Off-Street Commercial Parking *(continued)*

Option	Individual Group Ratings	Total Score	Mean Score	Median Score	Group Comments
Option I: Hourly rate, parking passes and smart cards (current program)	2,2,5,7,7,8,8,9,9,10	67	6.7	7.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add a downtown employee parking plan (rating: 7) - Good with additional capacity from other options (rating: 8) - Idea is good but so confusing; not user-friendly; businesses paying less to City (rating: 2) - Machines fail, too complicated for customer (rating: 2) - Residents are getting a good rate to park extra vehicles (rating: 8) - Better employee permit hours (rating: 9) - Consider high costs? Advertise availability (rating: 9) - Need better instructions (rating: 7)
Option J: Provide a downtown employee parking program utilizing existing spaces	0,0,3,6,6,8,8,8,10,10	59	5.9	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Let employees park in Wichita lot (rating: 10) - S/b (?) subsidized for/by employees and employers. Need additional capacity (rating: 8) - It's <u>NOT</u> working (rating: 6) - With permits (rating: 10) - Need this for employees (rating: 8) - Takes away tourist parking (rating: 3) - Too valuable (rating: 0) - Better emergency or better lighting (rating: 0)
Option K: Shared parking agreements for use of private/public parking assets	4,4,6,8,10,10,10,10,10,10	82	8.2	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to add a shuttle (rating: 10) - Messy—not very feasible (rating: 4) - Where feasible/need coordination (rating:10) - Great idea!!! (rating: 10) - Not practical (rating: 4) - Low cost (rating: 10) - Ask—request (rating: 10)
Option L: Parking for tour buses out of the downtown area	0,8,9,9,10,10,10,10,10,10	86	8.6	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Absolutely (rating: 10) - Bring significant revenue for restaurants (rating: 9) - Is this even an issue? (rating: 0) - Yes! (rating: 10) - Limited load/unload time with out-of-downtown parking (rating: 8) - Downtown passengers in designated area, not main street core area (rating: 10) - Tied to purchase of Tajine Alami (rating: 10)

Category: Off-Street Commercial Parking (continued)

Option	Individual Group Ratings	Total Score	Mean Score	Median Score	Group Comments
Option M: Development of special event parking plan	7, 10,10,10,10,10,10,10,10,10	97	9.7	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Absolutely (rating: 10) - Duh! Why doesn't this exist already? (See comments on G &H) (rating: 10) - Definitely!! (rating: 10) - Special events have shuttles (rating: 10) - Shuttle for event days (rating: 7) - SHUTTLE!! (rating: 10)

Category: Residential Parking

Option	Individual Group Ratings	Total Score	Mean Score	Median Score	Group Comments
Parking Permit Program:					
Option N: Fee-based	Option N 0,0,0,1,2,5,7,7,9,10	41	4.1	3.5	<p>Option N:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rather have fee-based than none. Fee would need to be nominal, \$100 per year per permit (rating: 7) - Small cost—costs <u>only</u>, not to make money (rating: 0) - Minimal fee for residents (rating: 9) - Max fee of \$10/year (rating: 2) - \$5/year max number per address, voted by neighborhoods (rating: 7) - Reasonable costs—administration (none extra for other programs) (rating: 10) - Leave all as is. Let residents adapt (rating: 0) <p>Option O:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make free for residents and a fee for non-residents (rating: 10) - Really, really need permit!!! (rating: 10) - Residents get 1 permit per car per year; 3-hour non-permit (rating: 8) - With a permit—visitors of residents get a temporary permit (rating: 10) - Leave all as is. Let residents adapt (rating: 0) <p>Option P:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Especially on Ruxton. What about guests? What about parties? Stickers would be best (rating: 10) - Not explained well (group did not rate this option)* - Tailored—certain areas (rating: 10) <p>Option Q:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Business owners want flexibility during winter (rating: 8) - Better than nothing (rating: 8) - Not explained well (group did not rank this option) - Leave all as is. Let residents adapt (rating: 0)
OR					
Option O: Free	Option O 0,0,0,5,5,8,10,10,10,10	58	5.8	6.5	
Option P: Year-round	Option P 0,5,7,(8), 10,10,10,10,10,10	72 + (8)=80	8.0	10	
OR					
Option Q: Seasonal	Option Q 0,0,0,0,0,0,(2),4,8,8	20 + (2)=22	2.2	0	

* Beginning with Options P through S and Options X and Y, only 9 out of the 10 small groups indicated a ranking. In order for the total scores to be comparable, we averaged the 9 scores for each option and added that averaged number to the total score. The number added is indicated by parentheses. Mean and median scores for these 6 options are based on those 10 ratings, including the averaged number.

Category: Residential Parking *(continued)*

Option	Individual Group Ratings	Total Score	Mean Score	Median Score	Group Comments
<p>Option R: Consistent across all neighborhoods</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OR</u></p> <p>Option S: Tailored to specific neighborhood needs</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Option R 0,0,0,0,0,1,(2),5,6,8</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Option S 0,5,7,(8),10,10,10,10,10,10</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">20 + (2)=22</p> <p style="text-align: center;">72 + (8)= 80</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2.2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">8.0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">10</p>	<p>Option R:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No change in details only if permit or not (rating: 10) - Not explained well (group did not rank this option) - Some areas have it bad! (rating: 10) - Leave all as is. Let residents adapt (rating: 0) <p>Option S:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some neighborhoods farther from business district & Incline might not need (rating: 6) - It's not needed in Crystal Hills!! (rating: 0) - Not explained well (group did not rank this option) - Leave all as is. Let residents adapt (rating: 0)

Category: Alternative Transportation

Option	Individual Group Ratings	Total Score	Mean Score	Median Score	Group Comments
<p>Shuttle/trolley:</p> <p>Option T: Year-round</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OR</u></p> <p>Option U: Seasonal only</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OR</u></p> <p>Option V: Seasonal weekends and special events only</p>	<p>Option T 0,0,0,0,0,0,1,1,3,5</p> <p>Option U 0,2,4,5,5,8,10,10,10,10</p> <p>Option V 4,7,9,9,10,10,10,10,10,10</p>	<p>10</p> <p>64</p> <p>89</p>	<p>1.0</p> <p>6.4</p> <p>8.9</p>	<p>0</p> <p>6.5</p> <p>10</p>	<p>Option T:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What would it cost for passengers? Depends on stops and pickups (rating: 0) - Grants?? (rating: 0) - Plus special events! (rating: 5) <p>Option U:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (Get a better rate from MMT). Spring, summer, fall <u>and</u> holidays and special events, make shuttle free (rating: 10) - S/b (?) + special events (rating: 10) - How paid for? (rating: 2) - Remote parking...feasibility (rating: 10) - Plus special events! (rating: 10) - Add winter weekends and holidays too (rating: 8) <p>Option V:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better than nothing (rating: 7) - Area should be compact—not past Amanda’s Fonda (due to homeless) (rating:10) - Paid by permit fees for events (rating: 9) - Open for bids other than Mountain Metropolitan (rating: 10) - All season, all weekends and all special events/paid rides (rating: 10) - Coordinate with Option M; winter weekends and holidays too (rating: 4) - Need a flexible contract if not utilized. Encourage better system (rating: 9)
<p>Option W: Bus passes for employees</p>	<p>0,0,3,6,6,7,8,10,10,10</p>	<p>60</p>	<p>6.0</p>	<p>6.5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hours of operation are poor; get a better rate; employees may not use (rating: 6) - Should be an option (rating: 8) - Overall consensus from business owners at our table is that it wouldn’t work (rating: 0) - Permit parking in lots only \$60/year (rating: 3) - Limited hours—of bus – for employees (rating: 7)

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on our review of prior parking studies, conversations with community members in other contexts and with City staff, and on the results of the community involvement process, KezziahWatkins submits the following for the consideration of the Parking Authority Board and the Manitou Springs City Council.

◆ **The Parking Plan needs to be comprehensive and integrated.**

The people who participated in the process were very clear in their stated desire to address the community's parking challenges by implementing a plan that is comprehensive. Rather than having a plan that focuses only on some particular parking challenges in some areas of the community, they want a plan that includes effective strategies to address on-street parking in the high demand commercial areas, off-street parking, residential parking in neighborhoods, use of alternative means of transportation, and parking system management.

Additionally, residents participating in the process showed an understanding of the complexity of designing parking solutions by acknowledging that the plan needs to be integrated. As one person involved in the process said, "This thing is like a tube of toothpaste—you squeeze it one place and it comes out another." People know that parking solutions implemented downtown will have a direct bearing on what happens in some of their neighborhoods and a plan for special event parking has to include considerations of resident convenience as well as attendee accommodation. They want a plan that is strategic and has no unintended consequences for local residents or visitors.

◆ **Difficult choices may be ahead.**


In order to significantly address the parking challenges, particularly downtown, additional parking capacity is needed. As a result, it is quite likely that residents may be forced to choose between maintaining the current free, on-street parking program and an on-street paid parking program capable of generating the revenue required to construct the additional parking capacity downtown that many people in this process indicated they support.

The community expectations for a parking plan developed by the participants in this process indicate the plan should ultimately be self-funded through a variety of payment methods. That said, if and when the time comes that building a parking structure(s) is seriously contemplated, it will still be a difficult issue for some. It will be critical that community residents be provided information about the relationship between free and paid parking downtown and the City's ability to pay for construction of that facility. It will likely be a difficult choice and must be based on factual information.

◆ **There may be no middle ground on some parking solutions.**

Each small group at the June 9th workshop was asked to reach consensus on a rating of its level of support for each of the 27 options presented. A '0' rating indicated no support and a rating of '10' represented unqualified support.

Four options presented elicited strong responses at both ends of the 11-point scale. The ratings for most options typically encompassed either a fairly even spread of rankings or a clear ranking weighted toward either the high or low end. The four options cited on the following page, however, indicate a sharply divided response among people attending this solutions workshop, and might well reflect an equally divided community.

- 
1. Options to address the use of the center lane on Manitou Avenue for loading and unloading purposes included an option to restrict users by permit. Five of the ten groups ranked their level of support for this option from '0' to '2', while the other five groups assigned rankings of '8' to '10'. Typical comments were, "No permits for business use" to "Permits for business use; reduce congestion and stopping".
 2. Restricting the use of the center lane by hours of use resulted in a similar division: four groups ranked this option from '0' to '2' while six groups rated this option from '8' to '10'.
 3. In the Residential Parking category, the options offering residential permitting with or without a fee resulted in a spread of ratings. The clear preference is for a program for residential permits at no or very minimal charge. There is, however, a strong sentiment among some participants that a city-wide residential permitting program should not be adopted at all. As one group wrote, "Leave all as is. Let residents adapt."
 4. The option to revise land use codes/regulations to consider fees in lieu of parking requirements was offered in the Parking System Management category. Four groups assigned this option a rating of '0' while three groups assigned a '10'. Two groups ranked this choice at '5' and one group did not respond. Comments included, "Sucks... unanimous" attached to a '0' rating to "...not necessary business friendly" accompanying a rating of '5'. Unfortunately, those groups rating this option at '10' did not write anything about their thinking. Overall, this option's ranking was below a 50% level of support.

◆ **Parking and community character are interrelated.**

A significant number of people who participated in this process do not see implementing parking solutions as merely a technical undertaking. They believe the parking program helps define Manitou Springs' unique character and are reluctant to take a chance on doing anything that might change that character. While acknowledging the importance of tourism to this community and the need to accommodate visitors, people also indicated they are not interested in solutions that come at the expense of day-to-day community life for locals.

Residents who participated in the process understand that, from a technical perspective, it is unusual for a community to give away its prime downtown parking spaces for free, while charging for parking in nearby public lots. At the same time, they like the fact that locals and people who visit Manitou Springs can spend time without having to deal with parking meters or kiosks. Free on-street parking seems to them to send a welcoming message, one that sets Manitou Springs apart from thousands of communities across the country.

◆ **Communication is critical.**

A consistent theme throughout the meeting discussions— the need for and interest in communication to and with community residents during development of the parking plan and after a plan has been crafted—cannot be overstated. People want to know what's being seriously considered and why, what will ultimately be included in the plan and when solutions will be implemented. It's important that the plan development and implementation process be as transparent as possible, that the City let those who participated in the process know that their ideas and assessments were used as guidance in developing the plan. All local residents should be provided information about plan development and implementation.

Process participants also expressed the desire to have a strong communication program to support implementation and ongoing understanding of the parking program. Some people said they believe the parking programs that are in place in the community today are underutilized as a result of lack of information for locals and visitors alike and they would like to see that communication gap rectified as the City expands the parking program.

PROCESS PARTICIPANTS

The following list includes participants who signed the attendance sheet at the May 25th parking problem potluck and/or the June 9th parking solutions workshop. We thank them for their time and their willingness to work together to address an important community issue and apologize for any misspellings.

Verna Aré	Rev. Dave Hunting	Coreen Toll
Roger Armstrong	Natalie Johnson	Shanti Toll
Rick Barry	Chris Kilroy	Sharman Treweeke
Janice Black	Kari Kilroy	Jon Tschannen
Teresa Blair	Jerell Klavell	Kathy Tuten
Lesley Blyth	Dale Latty	Leslie Vasquez
Noel S. Boyce	Leslie Lewis	Manny Vasquez
Juanita Canzoneri	Jason Lopez	Art Wanless
Matt Carpenter	James Malcolm	Betty Wanless
Mike Casey	Karen Malcolm	Michelle Wanless
Donna Chambers	Jermanie Martin	Gordon White
David Combs	Cline Matthews	Lane Williams
Aimee Cox	Sheryl Matthews	Julie Wolfe
Jeanne Davant	Farley McDonough	Jim Wood
Gwenn David	Mike Milar	Spencer Wren
Alan Delwiche	Terry Milar	Julia Wright
Cheryl Dewitt	Emily Miller	Neal Yowell
Barbara Diamond	Margaret Morris	
Sharon Erale-Palmer	Marcy Morrison	
Joe Fabeck	Ann Nichols	
Matt Fago	Jeff O'Brien	
Danu Fatt	Michele O'Brien	
Larry Ferguson	Bruno Pothier	
Sara Ferguson	Lisa Quintana	
Bud Ford	Gene Roberts	
Donna Ford	Jay Rohrer	
Ann Foster	Teresa Shogren	
Ginni Francis	Vicki Rae Snider	
Gretchen Graham	Marc Snyder	
Mike Graham	Riley Snyder	
Brett Gray	Leland "Chip" Spangler	
Joel Grotzinger	Merril Baruchin Spielman	
Linda Groub	Houston Stanley	
Scott Guthrie	Margaux Stanley	
Tim Haas	Val St. Cloud	
Ron Heine	Lisa Streisfeld	
Randy Hodges	Kathy Sullivan	
Marles Hoffe	Dave Symonds	

Appendix

City Web Site Survey Results

1. 1. Do you believe there is a parking problem in Manitou Springs?						
	Are you a: (check all that apply)					
	business owner	business employee	resident	visitor	emergency responder	Response Totals
Yes	100.0% (5)	100.0% (5)	100.0% (19)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (26)
No	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
answered question	5	5	19	1	3	26
skipped question						0

2. If yes, how would you rank the severity of the problem?

		Are you a: (check all that apply)					
		business owner	business employee	resident	visitor	emergency responder	Response Totals
Parking is a...	Very Minor problem	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	
	Minor problem	20.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	
	Medium problem	0.0% (0)	40.0% (2)	16.7% (3)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (1)	
	Major problem	40.0% (2)	40.0% (2)	55.6% (10)	100.0% (1)	66.7% (2)	
	Biggest Issue facing community	40.0% (2)	20.0% (1)	27.8% (5)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	
rating average		4.00 (5)	3.80 (5)	4.11 (18)	4.00 (1)	3.67 (3)	4.00 (25)
answered question		5	5	18	1	3	25
		skipped question					1

3. What are the type(s) of parking problems? (check all that apply)

	Are you a: (check all that apply)					
	business owner	business employee	resident	visitor	emergency responder	Response Totals
visitors to downtown core	80.0% (4)	100.0% (5)	78.9% (15)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (3)	80.8% (21)
visitors to residential areas	40.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	57.9% (11)	100.0% (1)	33.3% (1)	46.2% (12)
residents in residential areas	40.0% (2)	20.0% (1)	52.6% (10)	100.0% (1)	33.3% (1)	50.0% (13)
residents in commercial areas	100.0% (5)	20.0% (1)	47.4% (9)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (1)	46.2% (12)
employees in commercial areas	80.0% (4)	60.0% (3)	52.6% (10)	0.0% (0)	66.7% (2)	53.8% (14)
employees in residential areas	40.0% (2)	20.0% (1)	36.8% (7)	0.0% (0)	66.7% (2)	34.6% (9)
Seasonal	80.0% (4)	60.0% (3)	63.2% (12)	100.0% (1)	66.7% (2)	61.5% (16)
Year-round	40.0% (2)	60.0% (3)	31.6% (6)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (1)	42.3% (11)
Other (please specify)	0 replies	0 replies	4 replies	0 replies	0 replies	4
answered question	5	5	19	1	3	26
skipped question						0

4. Are you a: (check all that apply)

	Are you a: (check all that apply)					
	business owner	business employee	resident	visitor	emergency responder	Response Totals
business owner	100.0% (5)	0.0% (0)	21.1% (4)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	19.2% (5)
business employee	0.0% (0)	100.0% (5)	5.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (1)	19.2% (5)
resident	80.0% (4)	20.0% (1)	100.0% (19)	0.0% (0)	66.7% (2)	73.1% (19)
visitor	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	3.8% (1)
emergency responder	0.0% (0)	20.0% (1)	10.5% (2)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (3)	11.5% (3)
answered question	5	5	19	1	3	26
skipped question						0

5. Where are you from?

	Are you a: (check all that apply)					
	business owner	business employee	resident	visitor	emergency responder	Response Totals
Manitou Springs	100.0% (5)	20.0% (1)	100.0% (19)	0.0% (0)	66.7% (2)	76.9% (20)
Out of Town	0.0% (0)	80.0% (4)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (1)	33.3% (1)	23.1% (6)
answered question	5	5	19	1	3	26
skipped question						0

6. If you are from Manitou Springs, what part of town?

	Are you a: (check all that apply)					Response Totals
	business owner	business employee	resident	visitor	emergency responder	
Downtown Core	20.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	15.8% (3)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	15.0% (3)
Ruxton Corridor	20.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	26.3% (5)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	25.0% (5)
West Manitou Avenue	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	5.0% (1)
East Manitou Avenue	40.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	5.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	10.0% (2)
Neighborhoods north of Downtown	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21.1% (4)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	20.0% (4)
Neighborhoods south of Downtown	20.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	26.3% (5)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	25.0% (5)
Plainview Neighborhood	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
Crystal Hills	0.0% (0)	100.0% (1)	15.8% (3)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	15.0% (3)
Neighborhoods around Beckers Lane	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.0% (1)
Other (please specify)	0 replies	0 replies	0 replies	0 replies	0 replies	0
answered question	5	1	19	0	2	20
skipped question						6

7. If you are not from Manitou Springs, where?

	Are you a: (check all that apply)					
	business owner	business employee	resident	visitor	emergency responder	Response Totals
Colorado Springs or the Pikes Peak Region	0.0% (0)	75.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	83.3% (5)
Colorado Resident	0.0% (0)	25.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (1)	33.3% (2)
Out-of-State Visitor	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
answered question	0	4	0	1	1	6
skipped question						20

8. Please add anything else you'd like to convey to the Parking Authority Board:

	Are you a: (check all that apply)					
	business owner	business employee	resident	visitor	emergency responder	Response Count
	1 reply	0 replies	7 replies	1 reply	0 replies	8
answered question	1	0	7	1	0	8
skipped question						18

Please add anything else you'd like to convey to the Parking Authority Board (verbatim responses):

While parking and traffic congestion in the downtown core are a major problem for three months of the year, paying exorbitant rates will chafe people, especially during slow season. Please take that into account, that seasonal demand should be reflected in pricing

Close to the Incline

I personally do not believe residents/visitors check out this web site regularly to know about this survey. You are assuming everyone has a computer – many elderly don't even know how to use a computer.

Due to the amount of pedestrians in crosswalks and parallel parking the traffic barely moves downtown. It is nearly impossible to make a left turn from El Paso, Park Ave., Old Man's Trail, or Mayfair.

The traffic in Manitou is terrible...a lot of it is because people can't find parking. I would say that traffic /parking is the biggest issue Manitou has...not just parking. Opening the Incline without a valid parking plan is insanity! I don't see how Manitou can keep promoting major events such as the Wine Festival and Commonwheel Fair without an enforceable parking plan in place. I have lived in Manitou 35 years and am thinking of moving because traffic and parking have become such a nightmare.

We should seriously look "outside the box". Think about communities like MS that don't allow cars period. Or only allow cars in the off-season. These communities end up attracting even more visitors who love the uniqueness of community that is "horse, bike and foot traffic only"! Buy the huge lot and Tajine Alami; build a parking structure there and have trollies, horse drawn wagons, etc. into town. BAN Harleys in downtown Manitou.

PLEASE no parking meters!

You must come up with solutions tailored to not only seasonal variations but weekly and even daily as well. A "one size fits all" approach will not work!

Incline users take all the spaces on weekend mornings and don't shop or eat in Manitou.

The Loop employees park on the street, not in the lots—they have permits! At least 10 cars every day. Make them park in the LOTS they have permits for.

Something has to be done about Incline and Barr Trail users. They park in the downtown commercial area and residential areas for hours, don't get tickets, and don't shop Manitou.

On-Street Survey Results

Manitou Springs On-Street Survey

Conducted Sunday, May 15, 2010

1. Did you have a problem parking in Manitou Springs today?

No 81 (77%) Yes 23 (22%) Not answered 1 (1%) N=105

Comments from "No" respondents:

*Working; pay for parking pass; although problem with hours; biased; had to pay for extra hours
But ask me this summer it might be a different answer
Usually do, but not today
Beautiful town
Paid tickets by owner
Unless there is a ticket over there
Easy on side street
Not today with rain
No problem on the side street
Nice that you don't have to pay meters
Very easy
Got that parallel thing down
No problem in paid location
It was easy and big enough for a Mini Cooper to fit behind*

2. If you answered "Yes" above, please indicate below all that apply:

I had a difficult time finding an available space

19 of 23 respondents (83%)
19 of 52 total responses (37%)

I couldn't find a free (without cost) space

14 of 23 respondents (61%)
14 of 52 total responses (27%)

I had trouble with the paid parking kiosk

5 of 23 respondents (22%)
5 of 52 total responses (10%)

I needed to park longer than the 3-hour limit allows

4 of 23 respondents (17%)
4 of 52 total responses (8%)

I had to park too far from where I wanted to go

9 of 23 respondents (39%)
9 of 52 total responses (17%)

(Added response) Problem with size of space

1 of 23 respondents (4%)
1 of 52 responses (2%)

Comments from "Yes" respondents:

*Cater to the locals
Paid parking on street would be great
Shouldn't have to pay in the town parking down there
Always difficult!
Take the f____n' time thing off, man
She thinks it might have just been her (respondent indicated trouble with the paid parking kiosk)
All of the above
Why pay for parking if I live here?
More spaces
Make free (?)*

3. I'm in town today for:

"Yes" (had a problem parking) respondents:

Birthday party
Browsing(2)
Food / Lunch (5)
Fun / Pleasure (2)
More dog socialization and dog park close
On vacation
Showing a friend around
The afternoon
The bar
The girls to kick around
The Glassblowers Shop
Visiting / Visit / Touristy stuff (3)
We're not from here
No answer

"No" (did not have a problem parking) respondents:

AFA graduation (2)
Bar / beer (3)
Birthday party
Browsing / Just browsing (2)
Camping
Eat at the café
Eating / Food (10)
Eating / shopping
Family over there
Fixing violin
Fun / Have fun(2)
Hanging out
Just for fun
Live here (4)
Looking around (3)
Look at a car for sale
Military
No answer (3)
R and R
Shop – see – spend money
Shopping (10)
Shopping and custard ☺
Sightseeing (3)
Soda Springs Park
Taking out friends
To escape babysitting
Tourists / Visiting / Just visiting (12)
Vacation / Weekend vacation (4)
Warrior games
We don't have time for that
Working (3)

Respondent who did not indicate whether he/she had a problem parking:

Shopping

May 25th Verbatim Group Responses

Manitou Springs Parking Plan

Parking Problems Potluck May 25, 2011

Group Responses

(Comments are organized according to each small group's responses)

Task #1

Our group hopes these things can be achieved by implementing a comprehensive parking plan:

- More parking for all; close-in parking for employees
- Better publication of mapping
- More efficient striping
- Move "downtown" farther west
- Better signage

Same number of people but fewer cars

More consideration for residents' needs (for example, closing Wichita lot in summer and ripple effect on neighborhoods)
Provide for tourists but preserve integrity of town

Less congestion

Happy residents and happy shop owners—strike a balance between the two
Sharing of existing resources such as school parking lots
More pedestrians, less traffic

Multi-parking structure—Tajine; solar panels on top

Town plan

Bicycles

Golf carts

No motors

Quiet

Ten space (?)

West side

Our group's worried about:

Lack of communication on implementation

Not providing free parking

The look of a structure

Cost of solution

Residents being thrown "under the bus" for the sake of business/tourism

Rental properties causing a "squeeze" on the parking inventory

Shifting parking problems from one area to another

Use Prospect lot for Incline parking and turn that area into another "Ruxton"

Shop owners would be worried about meters on the street

Don't want super large structures in the historic district

Emergency vehicle access

Shuttles from remote lots don't seem to work

How do you pay for "real" solutions?

Community apathy/ 27 people taking some time (?)

Financing

Master plan and impact

One lane and roundabout

Zero way to go through town

Task #2

Our community expects that parking solutions will:

Retain current ambiance

Broad-based payment scheme

More foot traffic/less car traffic

Solved in a timely fashion

Real-time parking information (parking app., signage, phone number)

ALL parking will be managed

Maintain our small town feel

Give them (meaning residents) a place to park

Find another place for them (meaning visitors) a place to park

The community might have an unrealistic expectation that it is not going to cost them

Events—planners determine parking plan

Residential permits to park on your block

Eliminate main street parking

Expectation for a timeline (for a plan)

Baseball field, school, pool—utilization of those parking lots (Iron Springs Chateau land swap cost us parking)

Comprehensive residents and neighborhood

May 25th Verbatim Individual Responses

Manitou Springs Parking Plan

Parking Problems Potluck May 25, 2011

Individual Responses

Is there anything related to parking solutions that you want to make sure the Parking Authority Board understand?

Please consider the residents. There is a fear that they will be “thrown under the bus” for the sake of business/tourists and the Incline

Enforcement has changed—in my neighborhood new policies have decreased already limited parking, e.g. residents not allowed to parking in front of their own garages or driveways

The necessity of good communication—signage, publications—where existing parking is, rates, hours permit availability

Would like to see the streets striped, better signs and maps of lots. Public parking signs

Fair and managed parking for the entire town, benefiting residents and tourists. Controlling the high impact/low gain crowd who hike the Incline daily. This impact lessens the positive tourist experience along with residents quality of life

No meters

Obtain Tajine Alami

Residential passes

West end structure for Incline and zipline

Comprehensive, don't push the problem around. Have a plan where it makes more sense for tourists to pay for parking in lots or in town and not park in residential areas, meaning residential parking-only areas

Utilize Carl Walker study and work developed by consultant. Our parking in downtown is backwards—we pay to park far away in the Metro lots and it's free on the Avenue. Paid parking will help with turnover, generate revenue, allow us to bond to build a parking structure, shuttles, etc.

“One size does not fit all”. Our own data shows that not only is there a seasonal issue but day-to-day and even hour-to-hour trends that need to be addressed. Without factoring this in, I fear there will be unintended consequences. For example, \$5 might be fine on the weekend but too much on weekdays

Buy the Tajine Alami and burn down the structure

In formulating a plan that impacts both residents and visitors, please keep in mind that employees at local businesses have needs that differ from most “visitors.” Our work hours are longer than 3 hours and the 5-month blackout for lot permits hurt us and adds us to the broader problem

The need for downtown employees to have fairly close-in parking. Better communication about all available lots. Keeping all residents and businesses in the loop

When talking “parking enforcement” they say rule applies to all but warning tickets are given without common sense and unfair logic, e.g. snow, dead end street versus dangerous roads—school, child safety

I am representing the Community Congregational Church as the Chair for the Board of Trustees. We would like to offer the church parking lot as a solution, most likely for employees. As always, there are issues:

Catering to the church schedule

Sundays

Occasional funerals/weddings

Enforcement

Liability

Expenses

Thanks,
Mike Casey

Please describe what was of greatest value to you in attending this workshop:

The facilitation provided by KezziahWatkins
Hearing opinions of others
Hearing other people's ideas
Opened to other thoughts and ideas
Looking at all aspects of the issue
To be involved in the process
I hate to say it but I learned a lot of people complain about parking but not many want to help fix the problem
Open discussion
Perspective
Understanding more of the City's problems in implementing some of the solutions and ideas

Please suggest anything you'd like to see done differently in future workshops:

Although it was a creative suggestion, I think the "potluck" kept people away. Providing food (pizza or donuts, etc.) would be more of a draw, in my opinion
Would like to see more people attend
Free beer
Shorter work time
Maybe no potluck, just free refreshments
Do something NOW—comprehensive plan
I do not know how to address apathy
I like potlucks but we were wondering if people stayed away tonight because the GP (general public) is intimidated by "potlucks"
Do not do a potluck. Free pizza or donuts
This was fine. I thought it worked fine