

Manitou Springs Parking Plan

Parking Plan Options Workshop Results June 20, 2011

Category: On-Street Parking in High Demand Commercial Areas

Option	Individual Group Ratings	Total Rating Score	Mean Score	Median Score	Group Comments
Paid on-street parking Option A: Year-round <u>OR</u> Option B: Seasonal only (240 downtown core)	Option A 0,0,0,0,0,1,2,2,9,10 Option B 0,0,1,2,2,3,4,7,10,10	24 39	2.4 3.9	.5 2.5	Option A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern with loss of tax revenue (group ranking: 2) - <u>No meters/kiosks!</u> Will reduce sales tax, will not come (group ranking: 0) - Don't like progressive—why can't it be just \$1/hour? (group ranking:0) - Meters in town will destroy uniqueness (group ranking: 0) - We are a year around tourist destination (group ranking: 10) - Will discourage people from coming; penalizes businesses (group ranking: 0) - Unfriendly to visitors—need a free option (group ranking: 1) - Adjust for demand (weekends, seasonal) (group ranking: 9) Option B: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>No meters/kiosks!</u> If meters/kiosks, then should take cards and be inexpensive, not progressive, unreal (group ranking: 0) - Seasonal/free after 5 p.m./free on Sundays (group ranking: 10) - But definitely need expanded remote parking (group ranking: 0) - Give a break to off-season people (group ranking: 0) - Less revenue from seasonal equals longer time to pay off financing, etc. (group ranking: 7) - Include year-round weekends and special events (group ranking: 2) - Suggest free resident ½ hour (group ranking: 2)
Option C: No fee with time limit (current)	0,2,3,5,7,8,8,10,10	61	6.1	7.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Businesses' support working well (group ranking: 8) - Keep streets free, build more lots (group ranking: 10) - If it's not "C", afraid of other options, especially "A" (group ranking: 3) - Not working! (group ranking: 2) - Signage needs to be clear re. not just moving car to other spot (group ranking: 8) - May need to review time limit (group ranking: 8)

Option	Individual Group Ratings	Total Rating Score	Mean Score	Median Score	Group Comments
Loading/unloading policy for use of Manitou Avenue center lane by: Option D: A permit program to restrict users <u>OR</u> Option E: Hours of use restrictions	<p style="text-align: center;">Option D 0,0,0,1,2,8,9,10,10,10</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Option E 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 (group ranking: 1) - Permits for business use (group ranking: 8) - What about 15-minute spaces in front of certain business where people just go in and out, like Spice of Life, Swirl? (group ranking: 0) - No permits for local business use! (group ranking: 0) - Permit allows time of delivery (group ranking: 10) - Not practical (group ranking: 0) - Ensure that cars aren't running engines. Commercial vehicles only, 15-minute time limit (group ranking: 9) - Reduce congestion and stopping (group ranking: 10) - Enforce current rules (group ranking: 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 (group ranking:10) - Customer loading and business delivery priority. <u>No</u> restrictions (group ranking: 0) - Permit allows time of delivery (group ranking: 10) - Need restrictions (group ranking: 9) - Reduce congestion and stopping (group ranking: 10) - Enforce current rules (group ranking: 2)

Additional suggestions regarding On-Street Parking in High Demand Commercial Areas category:

- Option B: Plus special event days
- Option C: Shorten time to two hours so folks who need more go to paid lot

Category: Off-Street Commercial Parking

Option	Individual Group Ratings	Total Score	Mean Score	Median Score	Group Comments
Option F: Construct 3-level parking structure on the Wichita lot (80 spaces currently)	0,3,7,7,8,9,9,10,10	72	7.2	8.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eyesore, expensive, some support if whole town pays, not just businesses—add residential (group ranking: 9) - Cost estimates are likely low but could be done nicely (group ranking: 9) - One level below? (group ranking: 10) - Doesn't work now. Too intensive a solution (group ranking: 0) - Long-range option (group ranking: 3) - Multiple funding—bond/sales tax. Structure complements our ambiance (group ranking: 10) - Close in/build one level not but build base for more (group ranking: 9) - Bus parking needed. Stage 2 levels expandable. High costs (group ranking: 7) - Demand—pre-lease (group ranking: 8)
Purchase 10 Old Man's Trail and: Option G: Rehab the building and parking lot (149 parking spaces) <u>OR</u> Option H: Demolish the building; entire property becomes parking (191 parking spaces)	<p style="text-align: center;">Option G 0,5,5,6,7,8,8,8,9,9</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Option H 0,1,3,4,5,5,5,7,9,9</p>	65	6.5	7.5	<p>Option G:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes—community center. Be careful because tourists may not walk. Needs a shuttle every 15 minutes (group ranking: 8) - Would like to see building rehab but good for special events—have special fees for events (group ranking: 6) - What if we leased the property? Get a business (income-producing) in the building. Base station for the trolley. Bathrooms/information center (group ranking: 7) - Price sensitive; too high priced! Offer \$600 K or walk (group ranking: 5) - Future land town growth (group ranking: 9) - Multiple funding (group ranking: 9) - Needs shuttle; distance (group ranking: 8) <p>Option H:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trolley from lot might be viable. Would be good for special events (group ranking: 0) - People don't like going to <u>just</u> a parking lot (group ranking: 3) - Could be a free option to paid street parking (group ranking: 9) - Get a shuttle to the spa building (group ranking: 5) - Building has potential uses (group ranking: 4)
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 (group ranking: 7) - Good with additional capacity from other options (group ranking: 8) - Idea is good but so confusing; not user-friendly; businesses paying less to City (group ranking: 2) - Machines fail, too complicated for customer (group ranking: 2) - Residents are getting a good rate to park extra vehicles (group ranking: 8) - Better permit hours for employees (group ranking: 9) - Consider high costs? Advertise availability (group ranking: 9) - Need better instructions (group ranking: 7)

Option	Individual Group Ratings	Total Rating Score	Mean Score	Median Score	Group Comments
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 (group ranking: 10) - S/b (?) subsidized for/by employees/employers. Need additional capacity (group ranking: 8) - It's <u>NOT</u> working (group ranking: 6) - With permits (group ranking: 10) - Need this for employees (group ranking: 8) - Takes away from tourist parking (group ranking: 3) - Too valuable (group ranking: 0) - Better emergency or better lighting (group ranking: 0)
Option K: Shared parking agreements for use of private/public parking assets (e.g. churches, schools)	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 (group ranking: 10) - Messy—not very feasible (group ranking: 4) - Where feasible/need coordination (group ranking:10) - Great idea!!! (group ranking: 10) - Not practical (group ranking: 4) - Low cost (group ranking: 10) - Ask—request (group ranking: 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 (group ranking: 10) - Bring significant revenue for restaurants (group ranking: 9) - Is this even an issue? (group ranking: 0) - Yes! (group ranking: 10) - Limited load/unload time with out-of-downtown parking (group ranking: 8) - Downtown passengers in designated area, not main street core area (group ranking: 10) - Tied to purchase of Tajine Alami (group ranking: 10)
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 (group ranking: 10) - Duh! Why doesn't this exist already? (See comments on G &H) (group ranking: 10) - Definitely!! (group ranking: 10) - Special events have shuttles (group ranking: 10) - Shuttle for event days (group ranking: 7) - SHUTTLE!! (group ranking: 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	Option N: – Rather have fee-based than none. Fee would need to be nominal, <\$100/year/permit (group ranking: 7) – Small cost—costs <u>only</u> , not to make money (group ranking: 0) – Minimal fee for residents (group ranking: 9) – Max fee of \$10/year (group ranking: 2) – \$5/year max number per address, voted by neighborhoods (group ranking: 7) – Reasonable costs—administration (none extra for other programs) (group ranking: 10) – Leave all as is. Let residents adapt (group ranking: 0) Option O: – Make free for residents and a fee for non-residents (group ranking: 10) – Really, really need permit!!! (group ranking: 10) – Residents get 1 permit per car per year; 3 hour non-permit (group ranking: 8) – With a permit—visitors of residents get a temporary permit (group ranking: 10) – Leave all as is. Let residents adapt (group ranking: 0) Option P: – Especially on Ruxton. What about guests? What about parties? Stickers would be best (group ranking: 10) – Not explained well (group did not rank this option) – Tailored—certain areas (group ranking: 10) Option Q: – Business owners want flexibility during winter (group ranking:8) – Better than nothing (group ranking: 8) – Not explained well (group did not rank this option) – Leave all as is. Let residents adapt (group ranking: 0) Option R: – Some neighborhoods further from business district & Incline might not need (group ranking: 6) – It's not needed in Crystal Hills!! (group ranking: 0) – Not explained well (group did not rank this option) – Leave all as is. Let residents adapt (group ranking: 0) Option S: – No change in details only if permit or not (group ranking: 10) – Not explained well (group did not rank this option) – Some areas have it bad! (group ranking: 10) – Leave all as is. Let residents adapt (group ranking: 0)
<u>OR</u>					
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	
<u>OR</u>					
Option Q: Seasonal	Option Q 0,0,0,0,0,0,(2),4,8,8	20 + (2)=22	2.2	0	
Option R: Consistent across all neighborhoods	Option R 0,0,0,0,0,1,(2),5,6,8	20 + (2)=22	2.2	0	
<u>OR</u>					
Option S: Tailored to specific neighborhood needs	Option S 0,5,7,(8),10,10,10,10,10,10	72 + (8)= 80	8.0	10	

*Beginning with Options P through S and Options X and Y, only 9 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: Alternative Transportation

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

Additional suggestions submitted for Alternative Transportation category:

- Shuttle/trolley seasonal and special events
- Consider partnership with “save the Flats”, Inc. to develop available area for parking and install funicular incline to Smishny lot or other Avenue landing, shuttle connection

Category: Parking System Management

Option	Individual Group Rankings	Total Score	Mean Score	Median Score	Group Comments
Option X: Revision of land use codes/regulations to consider fees in lieu of parking	0,0,0,0,(4),5,5,10,10,10	40 + (4) = 44	4.4	4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes—for change of use (\$10,000 WAY TOO much); not necessarily business-friendly (group ranking: 5) - Sucks...unanimous (group ranking: 0) - Not enough info. (group did not rank this option)
Option Y: Public/private partnerships for facilities development	0,5,5,(7), 8,8,10,10,10,10	66 + (7) = 73	7.3	8.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prefer a private company to build and to operate a garage (group ranking: 10) - Bad idea (group ranking: 0) - Inexpensive and immediate solution. Good temporary solution; would need good marketing (and who's going to do it?) Encourage to walk, "walkable community" (group ranking: 8) - Reduces public cost (group ranking: 10) - Not enough info. (group did not rank this option) - Can't force the issue; <u>needing more info.</u> about the partner (group ranking: 5)
<p>Improved signage and technology for information about availability of parking spaces</p> <p>Option Z: Within the downtown and to surface lots</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OR</u></p> <p>Option AA: East of downtown core to encourage use of free parking within ¼ mile of downtown core</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Option Z</p> <p>8,9,9.5,10,10,10,10,10,10</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Option AA</p> <p>8,8,9,9,10,10,10,10,10</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">96.5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">94</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">9.7</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9.4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">10</p> <p style="text-align: center;">10</p>	<p>Option Z:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make signs seasonal; NO ELECTRIC SIGNS (group ranking: 10) - Both signage: traditional, app and electronic not needed (group ranking: 8) - Especially at the bottom of Ruxton (group ranking: 10) - Not too many signs (eyesores) (group ranking: 9.5) - Not electronic streaming signs (group ranking: 9) <p>Option AA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Especially at the bottom of Ruxton (group ranking: 10) - Yes! (group ranking: 10) - No electronic streaming signs (group ranking: 9) - No (?) (group ranking: 10)

Additional suggestions submitted for Parking Management System category:

- Option AA: More signage or equal signage on west side. Signs on Washington St.