



Study Session Memo

TO: Members of City Council

FROM: Jane S. Brautigam, City Manager
Mary Ann Weideman, Assistant City Manager
Molly Winter, Director, Department of Community Vitality
Michael Sweeney, Director, Public Works, Transportation
Bill Cowern, Transportation Operations Engineer, Public Works, Transportation
Kurt Matthews, Parking Manager, Department of Community Vitality
Donna Jobert, Financial Manager, Department of Community Vitality
Sandra Llanes, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Amanda Nagl, Neighborhood Liaison, City Manager's Office
Lisa Smith, Communications Specialist, Department of Community Vitality

DATE: February 2, 2016

SUBJECT: Neighborhood Parking Permit Program

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this study session is to:

- Provide background, context and information on the Neighborhood Parking Permit program (NPP)
- Present issues associated with the NPP raised by council members, residents and staff and seek feedback on next steps
- Provide status of 2016 related work plan items and seek feedback on staff's work plan:
 - Chautauqua Access Management Plan (CAMP); feedback from Council on options
 - Parking pricing recommendations for residential and business permits as part of the Access Management and Parking Strategy (AMPS)

A number of these issues are currently in the staff work program; namely increased enforcement, the CAMP process, and consideration of permit pricing increases, including visitor permits. Some issues such as reduction of zone hours could be integrated into staff's existing work plan. However, a major review, analysis and overhaul of the NPP such as changes to how zones are created, i.e. the spillover issues, and revision of the regulations to allow for new tailored zones would require a larger work effort and are not currently within the scope of the existing work plan. Several Community Vitality staff positions will be filled by the third quarter and could be assigned to the work effort with consultant assistance. Based on input from Council, staff could develop a revised work plan and return to Council for their recommendation.

QUESTIONS FOR COUNCIL:

1. Does Council have any feedback on the issues for which staff currently intends to proceed with the current approach and within the existing work program? (VRBO, permit pricing and issuance, process for reducing unrestricted hours, etc.)
2. What is Council's feedback on issues related to additional NPP resident requests, such as review of NPP regulations to consider a wider range of tools for residential parking issues; changes to zone creation procedures, etc.?
3. Does Council have any further questions regarding the NPP intent and program or have additional issues for review and consideration?
4. Does Council have any feedback on staff's operating assumptions concerning the development of the CAMP and which option would Council prefer for development of the CAMP as it pertains to the historic parking data and the recent Chautauqua visitation numbers?
5. Should staff cease processing NPP applications if council desires a review of the Neighborhood Parking Permit program?

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Boulder's local laws reflect and value a common legal concept known as the public trust doctrine. This doctrine supports the idea that public highways and streets are acquired and held by the state (or cities) in trust for everyone's use. Streets primarily are for the use of the people as a whole, and cannot be diverted for merely local, or private use, nor can the rights of the public in them be unreasonably curtailed or abridged.

This doctrine is reflected in the city's charter section 115 "Revocable Permits" which reads as follows:

The council may grant a permit at any time, in or upon any street, alley, or public place, provided such permit is revocable by the council at its pleasure at any time, whether such right to revoke be expressly reserved in every permit or not.

The doctrine can also be found in Boulder Revised Code Chapter 23, Section 2-2-15(a) "Neighborhood Parking Zone Permits" which describes the legislative intent of Neighborhood Permit Program (NPP) permits and recognizes that there may be health, safety, and public

welfare reasons to regulate the use of public rights of way. The challenge is to fairly and equitably balance those varied uses. The section reads as follows:

Restricting parking on streets in certain areas zoned for residential uses primarily to persons residing within such areas will reduce hazardous traffic conditions, promote traffic safety and preserve the safety of children and other pedestrians in those areas; protect those areas from polluted air, excessive noise, trash and refuse; protect residents of those areas from unreasonable burdens in gaining access to their residences; preserve the character of those areas as residential; promote efficiency in the maintenance of those streets in a clean and safe condition; preserve the value of the property in those areas; and protect the peace, good order, comfort, convenience and welfare of the inhabitants of the city. The city council also finds that, in some cases, residential streets serve an important parking function for nonresidents in the public and commercial life of the city. Some accommodation for parking by others may be appropriate in these cases.

There are certain portions of our code that are very definitive as to what can and cannot be permitted. For example, BRC 2-2-15(b) prohibits NPP parking restrictions on Sundays or holidays. Boulder Revised Code 2-2-15(e) also provides authority for the manager to create by regulation additional standards and criteria for the implementation and administration of NPP permits that are consistent with the intent of the code. The existing regulations for NPP standards were created in 1997: [LINK Neighborhood Permit Parking Zone Regulations](#) and [LINK NPP Procedures](#).

NPP BACKGROUND

In 1986, the Boulder City Council adopted the Residential Permit Parking (RPP) program as a mechanism to relieve spillover parking in residential areas adjacent to the downtown commercial district, University of Colorado or high schools. The RPP program was designed to give preference in the use of on-street parking spaces in the public right of way to residents or businesses located within a designated zone, by restricting long and short-term nonresident parking on neighborhood streets. The program was first implemented in 1993 when RPP zones were established in the Mapleton Hill and University Hill neighborhoods. The RPP program restricted nonresident parking on neighborhood streets to two hours, Monday to Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Concerns about the impacts associated with RPP implementation led city council to request an evaluation of the RPP program before proceeding with further zone implementation.

The Neighborhood Permit Parking (NPP) program in its current format was adopted by council in May 1997 as an improved version of the RPP program. The NPP was designed to improve the balance between preserving neighborhood character and providing public access to community facilities. The new program provided for greater flexibility and new features not available under the RPP program, including:

- The availability of commuter permits within permit parking zones;
- The ability to tailor the time and duration of restrictions to meet the needs of the neighborhood;
- The one time only, per day, short-term parking component; and,
- Providing [LINK annual updates](#) on the program.

NPP parking restrictions limit on-street parking for vehicles without a parking permit. Vehicles without an NPP permit may park one time only, per day, per zone for the posted time limit and may not re-park in that zone again on the same day. Vehicles with a valid permit are exempt from these posted parking restrictions. The baseline restriction on parking without a permit in an NPP zone is no less than two hours without moving the vehicle from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. Actual neighborhood zone restrictions may vary from this baseline.

Currently there are 10 zones in the City of Boulder: Whittier, Mapleton, University Hill, East Ridge, Columbine, Fairview, Goss Grove, Sunset, University Heights, and West Pearl ([LINK map](#)). This represents 330 block faces. The new Aurora zone and expansions in West Pearl, Whittier and Mapleton are in the process of implementation which is scheduled to be completed in February 2015. In 2015, 2,469 resident permits, 32 business permits and 349 commuter permits were sold across the ten zones.

Permit Types

Residents who live within an NPP zone may purchase up to two **resident** permits and receive up to two **visitor** passes per residence per year. Visitor permits are to be used by visitors to residents while they are on the premises, are to be used within a one block radius and shall not exceed use of 24 hours. There is no additional fee for visitor passes. Businesses located within a zone may purchase up to three **business** permits for use by employees and may apply for additional employee parking permits if necessary. [LINK Resident](#) permits are \$17 per year; [LINK business](#) permits are \$75 per year.

The NPP ordinance stipulated that up to four **commuter** permits may be issued per block face within an NPP zone to nonresidents with a sunset on Dec. 31, 2002. Commuter permits are issued on block faces where the average daily percentage of unoccupied parking spaces (“white space”) exceeds 25 percent (15 percent in Goss/Grove). In December of 2002, Council reauthorized the commuter permit program until Dec. 31, 2007. In 2007, the sunset to review commuter permit policy was lifted by Council and commuter permits became a permanent part of the program. The current fee for commuter permits is \$90 per quarter. Not all blocks within NPPs have commuter permits issued. For example, 22 block faces in the Whittier zone do not have commuter permits. Staff responds to requests to monitor blocks that may not have enough “white space” to justify commuter permits, and removes commuter permits if necessary; and when a zone is created it is first monitored to see if there is enough “white space” to issue commuter permits.

Zone Creation Process

The [LINK code and regulations](#) (section 2-2-15 and regulation 2-2-15J (97) adopted May 9, 1997) lay out a very specific process for zone expansion and creation. There are two ways to initiate the creation of an NPP zone: (1) by neighborhood residents through a petition or (2) by the City Manager. Upon receipt of a request for an NPP zone, staff conducts studies to determine whether an NPP zone shall be established in that neighborhood and what its boundaries should be.

Secondly, the City Manager may initiate this process without any request if the City Manager finds that it is in the public interest to do so. There are a variety of factors that the City Manager

may consider in evaluating whether initiation is in the public interest, including without limitation, the extent to which parking spaces are occupied during working or other hours, the extent to which parked vehicles are registered to persons not apparently residing within the neighborhood, and the impact that businesses and facilities located within or without the neighborhood have upon neighborhood parking within the neighborhood. Moreover, according to code section 2-2-15 (e), “The manager may by regulation prescribe additional standards, not inconsistent with those set out in this section, which must be met before the manager designates a neighborhood permit parking zone, or adds or deletes territory from an established zone.”

The zone proposal process includes sending out a mailing requesting feedback to all addresses both within the proposed area as well as those within a block. Public meetings are held to gather public input and a public hearing at the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) is required. TAB will either recommend to the manager that the zone be established, that it be established with certain modifications, or that it not be established. The manager shall communicate to council the manager’s final plan; if council does not call up this plan within thirty days, the manager may establish the zone by proceeding with a notice of proposed regulation.

All existing NPPs, including new and expanded zones, have been initiated by resident request.

Staff has received requests for NPP zones from residents in the Steelyards neighborhood and in the University Hill area near Chautauqua. However, these requests do not fit into the existing NPP regulations. This is addressed in more detail below. Also, residents from the Columbine, Goose Creek and Aurora neighborhoods have contacted staff about the potential for either expanding existing zones or creating a new zone.

Enforcement

With staffing of 12 parking services officers, up to seven officers a day are assigned (if fully staffed) to the task of NPP enforcement. Remaining officers are assigned to meter districts and to a “calls car” which responds to parking issues throughout the city. In many cases enforcement is covered by doubling up adjoining NPP districts for efficiency. NPP enforcement is in place daily from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., but not necessarily in every NPP. The Whittier nighttime zone is enforced every weekend, alternately Friday and Saturday. Generally, the level of enforcement is influenced by the level of compliance.

Resident Surveys

Staff has conducted two NPP resident surveys, one in [LINK 2000](#) and another in [LINK 2010](#). In general the majority of respondents to the 2000 survey felt the conditions in their neighborhood as a result of the NPP program either stayed the same or improved and that the ease of finding a parking space for oneself or a visitor had increased. The follow up survey in 2010 was consistent with the results of the previous survey: 75% found either that the NPP improved parking availability (29%) or that availability remained the same (46%), while 8% felt it had worsened. Staff will be conducting public outreach as part of the permit pricing discussion and an updated survey could be a part of the communication to understand the current satisfaction levels with the program and any other associated issues.

NPP ISSUES

A number of issues have been raised by Council members, community residents and staff regarding the NPP. The issues fall into two categories: **operational** and **policy-related** and are described below. This section provides background on the issues and staff recommendation on next steps. A summary chart is provided below.

OPERATIONAL ISSUES

Impact of VRBOs

With the rise in vacation rental by owner properties in residential areas with NPPs, staff has received numerous requests from owners of these properties for resident parking permits. In order to qualify for an NPP resident permit, proof of residency is required. This can come in the form of a current (within 90 days) utility bill, lease, bank statement, cable/phone bill or voter registration. The permits are not issued to the property owner since they may not reside at the address. This is consistent with the procedures of issuing permits to residents in rental properties. The purpose of the NPP program is to provide resident permits for those living at the property.

Proposed next steps: Staff plans to continue this policy and will not be issuing permits without proof of residency unless council requests a policy change.

Misuse of Permits

A city council member and some residents raised the issue of misuse of NPP resident and visitor permits.

Resident Permits:

Staff recently audited resident permits issued in two of the largest NPPs (Whittier and University Hill) and found that staff was issuing the appropriate number of resident permits. Addresses with multiple apartments were the only ones with more than the three to four allowable permits. Based on the review, staff believes the resident permits are being issued according to the regulations.

Visitor Permits:

Two visitor permits are issued per residence or unit. As noted above visitor permits are to be used by visitors to residents while they are on the premises; are to be used within a one block radius; and shall not exceed 24 hours. Staff has received several complaints regarding the alleged misuse of visitor permits; either the visitor permits are being used by residents for their own vehicles or they could be used by other parkers such as commuters. The visitor permits are included within the price of the resident permit. It is difficult for staff to enforce the provision of visitor permit users being on the premises. One option to consider is to change how the visitor permits are issued: i.e., continue to offer one visitor permit with the resident permit and charge an additional fee for the second visitor permit.

Proposed next steps: Staff seeks Council feedback on potential changes to visitor permit issuance. This could be considered within the AMPS permit pricing analysis.

Commuter Permits

Residents within the Whittier NPP have raised an issue regarding the issuance of commuter permits. As the program is designed, up to four commuter permits can be issued per block face if there is sufficient “white space” or unoccupied parking spaces. When a new or expanded zone is created, staff monitors to see if there is sufficient unoccupied space to allocate for commuter permits. Once a zone is established and commuter permits are issued, staff is responsive to citizen complaints and monitors the block face for compliance. Staff believes the current procedures fulfill the intent of the shared street approach.

There are 36 total blocks or 72 block faces in the Whittier NPP. Please see table below for data on commuter permits issued in the zone:

Maximum commuter permits allowed per block face in Whittier	Number of blocks with maximum commuter permits allowed
0 commuters allowed	22 block faces
1 commuter allowed	11 block faces
2 commuters allowed	7 block faces
3 commuters allowed	8 block faces
4 commuters allowed	26 block faces

Proposed next steps: Staff will proceed with the existing practice unless otherwise directed by Council to modify the process for issuing commuter permits.

Enforcement Levels

Residents have expressed desire for increased parking enforcement within their NPP zones. In the last quarter of 2015, the staffing level of the parking enforcement officers was increased from ten to 12 officers. Currently, there are 11 officers and one position is posted to be filled. This has allowed increased enforcement focus in the NPP zones.

Proposed next steps: Staff levels are increased and staff will continue to analyze the data and trends to ensure enforcement resources are allocated appropriately.

Reducing number of Non-permit parking hours

Residents in the Whittier and Mapleton NNP zones have submitted a petition to reduce the duration of the unrestricted parking hours from three to two hours. This type of zone change is permitted in the current regulations. The reduction of hours of unrestricted parking would impact all parkers; those visiting the downtown as well as those visiting residents.

Proposed next steps: Staff will proceed with an outreach process to all residents within the zones to seek their feedback on the proposed change. The unrestricted time limit could be changed if a majority agrees. If the change is approved, there will be a minimal cost to the city to modify the signage.

Status of NPP Requests in 2016

In addition to the Chautauqua and Steelyards neighborhood requests which are addressed below, within the last several months, staff has received inquiries from residents in the Columbine, Aurora and Goose Creek area neighborhoods regarding the potential for NPP zone expansion and creation. Staff has scheduled meetings with the residents about the program criteria and public process.

Proposed next steps: Staff seeks guidance from council regarding whether to proceed with the NPP analysis and public process for these requests as outlined in the existing regulations or to issue a moratorium on processing any requests until there is an opportunity to conduct a program assessment, which would take up to six months to complete.

POLICY ISSUES:

Process for Zone Formation and Expansion: Dealing with Spillover

City Council members and others have raised the issue of how zones are formed and expanded. This has often been called “spillover:” once a zone is formed the parking impacts spread to adjacent areas without parking regulations. The concern is the unpredictable nature of how the NPP zones are formed and the lack of a comprehensive, proactive approach rather than the current resident initiated incremental aspect of the program.

In the past, staff has raised the issue of spillover with residents in designing the boundaries of a zone. It is staff’s experience that it is difficult to convince residents in the surrounding area to join the NPP since they are not yet experiencing a parking problem. Also, it is difficult to predict where the parking issues will go, or which blocks will be affected. The incremental approach ensures that the solution addresses the specific problem area. In some areas, such as the University Hill NPP, staff believes that stasis has been reached; i.e. that the zone has reached the appropriate boundaries to address the issue of parking impacts from the university. Staff believes the current approach balances the intent of the code and provides ample opportunity for public input.

Proposed next steps: If council wishes to consider major changes to the NPP formation process, staff will scope the work effort. Community Vitality will be filling vacant positions by the end of the second quarter who would be devoted to this project and a consultant could be brought on to assist.

Potential NPP Regulation Changes

The NPP ordinance and regulations were created in the mid-1990s to primarily address specific impacts to residential areas: the impacts from downtown employees, high school students and CU. The parking impacts addressed are during the work and academic week: generally Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. In the last several years, residents have approached staff regarding parking issues within their neighborhoods that were not envisioned in the original program inception (e.g. the mixed use zone of Steelyards) or parking impacts to residential areas near parks and open space that have escalated (e.g. the University Hill area north of Baseline). The current NPP regulations do not solve these types of residential parking issues.

Zoning of Areas Inconsistent with NPP Regulations

The regulations limit the NPP to specific areas primarily zoned for lower density residential uses: RH, RM and RL. During the last 20 years, Boulder has developed new zoning categories such as the mixed use zone in the Steelyards neighborhood. The traditional NPP focuses on the **horizontal** relationship of different uses such as the relationship of downtown or CU adjacent to the Whittier or University Hill neighborhoods. In an area such as Steelyards the mix of uses – commercial and residential – has a **vertical** relationship and share the public street immediately in front of both uses. Hence the design of the existing traditional NPP does not meet the needs of this mixed use neighborhood. For example, the current NPP regulations regarding business permits do not address the situation in Steelyards.

The residents of Steelyards have approached staff to find more tailored solutions to their parking challenges particularly with the opening of the Depot Square RTD station and potential spillover impacts of the developing Boulder Junction Area.

Exclusive Use/Day of the Week/Proximity to Open Space and Parks

The current code and regulations support a shared street approach and do not contemplate exclusive use by neighborhood residents; prohibit parking restrictions on Sundays and holidays; and with regard to neighborhoods adjacent to parks and open space, do not allow night time and weekend restrictions.

These are the types of requests and inquiries staff has received from community members that are not allowed by the current regulations. As an example, residents adjacent to Chautauqua initially requested a zone in which only residents with permits (and their guests and business invitees) would be allowed to park in that zone. This request does not meet the intent and rules of Neighborhood Permit Parking Zones found in Boulder Revised Code 2-2-15 and Regulation 2-2-15J(97). As mentioned in the legal framework section of this memo, the legislative intent of the code supports the concept of shared streets, emphasizing the need for non-resident parking as an additional consideration and priority.

In addition, the neighborhood group states that residential parking and associated nuisance issues are most extreme on weekends and holidays. However under our current code, a NPP cannot restrict parking on Sundays and holidays. (Boulder Revised Code 2-2-15(b))

Lastly, the group states that their neighborhood “has become a public parking lot for the crowds who use Chautauqua for climbing, hiking, dining and attending cultural events.” However pursuant to regulation 2-2-15J(97), nighttime and weekend restrictions are prohibited for areas adjacent to parks and open space and specifically for Chautauqua.

Additional Neighborhood Impacts and Correlation to NPP Requests

Parking-related and other nuisance issues have been identified in the neighborhood near Chautauqua: parking too close to or in front of driveways, stop signs, and hydrants; litter and dog waste; speeding and u-turns; general disrespect and noise; overuse of resource/environmental impacts and parking enforcement. Staff and residents have worked both independently and together in an effort to identify potential solutions. A group of residents north

of Chautauqua, called Sustainable Chautauqua, have been proactive and have suggested some solutions to the parking issues which staff is considering. Some solutions have already been implemented – such as trash receptacles and enhanced enforcement in the area; others are still being considered and others could become part of CAMP.

Proposed next steps: Scoping changes to the NPP regulations or the development of new tools, policies, regulations and programs to address neighborhood parking issues are currently not within staff’s work plan and would require a moderately high work effort. As mentioned above, vacant Community Vitality staff positions will be filled by the end of the second quarter, and this staff could be dedicated to this effort along with consultant assistance. The Chautauqua related issues will be addressed during the CAMP process, as well as ongoing discussions with Sustainable Chautauqua and other residents. Staff requests Council’s direction and feedback.

Pricing of the NPP Permits

As part of the AMPS project, short term parking pricing, overtime at meter fines and the NPP residential and business permits will be reviewed. The commuter permit rates were increased from \$82 to \$90 per quarter in the 2016 budget. The AMPS consultant, Kimley Horn, will be conducting research on permit rate comparisons with Boulder’s peer communities.

Proposed next steps: Staff is planning to include the analysis and review of the NPP resident and business permits in the AMPS parking pricing work effort. Review of visitor permit pricing could also be included.

“Revenue Neutrality” of NPP Program Costs

When the NPP program was evaluated during the mid-1990s, a concern raised by zone residents was that the resident permit rates be kept low and the pricing of the permits be kept “revenue neutral”(i.e. that the revenues brought in by permit sales cover the cost of the administration of the program). There was concern that the city would view the NPP program as a way to increase its revenue. While this is not codified in the ordinance or in the regulations, staff has monitored the program’s revenues versus expenses to maintain an overall cost recovery approach. Since expenses vary each year depending on the number of new zones or expansions, the expenses versus revenues have been monitored over multiple years. The residential permit rate was increased once in 2006 from \$12 per year to \$17 per year. The primary source of NPP program revenues has been from the commuter permits, ranging from 54% to currently 72% of total NPP program revenues. As NPP zones have increased along with the regular rate increases of the commuter permits, the revenues from the program are currently exceeding the cost of the administration.

It is important to note that the cost of enforcement is not included in the program administration expenses. The revenues from tickets written for NPP violations do not cover the cost of the time the enforcement officers spend in the zones.

Proposed Next Steps: Staff would like Council feedback on the appropriate approach for pricing of all the permits in the NPP zones, including program “revenue neutrality” as a factor. Currently there are a number of factors that influence parking pricing which will be analyzed as part of the AMPS parking pricing project.

Chautauqua Access Management Plan

The **LINK** [lease](#) between the City of Boulder and the Colorado Chautauqua Association (CCA) was renegotiated in 2015. New language in the “Access and Parking Management” section of the lease stipulates the development of a Chautauqua Access Management Plan (CAMP). The CAMP is intended to be a tailored access management strategy to balance the access of the variety of users and modes while also maintaining the natural, built and historic environments.

In 2012 the City and the CCA partnered to evaluate parking and access issues in the leasehold area. As a part of this project, the partnership collected **LINK** [parking utilization and parking duration data](#) on all available parking within the leasehold area and in the neighborhood to the north of Chautauqua on three separate days. The **LINK** [results](#) of that data collection showed some areas of high parking utilization within the leasehold area, but very few areas of high parking utilization in the neighborhood north of Chautauqua.

Using the data and analyses from this study, a series of pilot programs for the leasehold area were advanced by staff for City Council’s consideration but none of these pilots were adopted for implementation. Council members’ biggest concerns at that time seemed to be the concept of restricting parking on streets near open space and park property. Following the council meeting it was determined by the partnership that this issue should be addressed through the upcoming lease renegotiation rather than through a pilot program at that time.

The parking utilization and duration data and corresponding analyses could form the foundation of the development of the 2016 CAMP. However, recent data from **LINK** [an Open Space and Mountain Parks Chautauqua Study Area Visitation Monitoring Report](#) suggest that visitation to Chautauqua has increased substantially since 2005. Whether this increase occurred since the 2012 CAMP study is unclear; however, the substantial increase over time suggests that parking utilization within the leasehold and in the surrounding neighborhood potentially could be higher than previously studied. Consequently, some decisions will have to be made about how the city proceeds with the development of the 2016 CAMP.

Staff has made some operating assumptions concerning the development of the CAMP. These are as follows:

- Options for the development of the CAMP could include some degree of managed parking within the Chautauqua leasehold area; and possibly in the surrounding neighborhood as well. This could include parking restrictions similar to those provided by the NPP Program.
- Options for the development of the CAMP could include some degree of paid parking, possibly in the Ranger lot, on the loop surrounding the park and/or on Baseline Road.
- Options for the development of the CAMP could consider enhancements to other modes of transportation including but not limited to restoration of transit service to the Chautauqua area.

Staff is interested in Council’s feedback on these operating assumptions.

Concerning the process for development, one option would be to move forward with developing a CAMP for implementation in the summer of 2016, recognizing that it would be developed using historic parking utilization and duration data that may be different today because of increased visitation to Chautauqua. This would have the advantage of providing mitigation this summer, but would have the disadvantage of being based on data that may be out of date and may be questionable to use as baseline data for future comparison. Another option would be to collect new data in the summer of 2016, and then using that data to develop the CAMP later this year with the goal of implementing and studying the effects of the CAMP in the summer of 2017. This option would provide the best data and analyses of effectiveness but would also delay mitigation until 2017. Staff recommends the second option which would have us collecting new data this summer, followed by the development of a CAMP for implementation in 2017. Staff is interested in Council's feedback on these CAMP development options.

Proposed next steps: Staff would like council feedback on the appropriate approach to developing the CAMP. Currently, staff is planning to begin a process with the public in the Chautauqua area concerning the CAMP but we wanted to obtain Council's initial feedback on the options for development and operating assumptions before beginning that process.

Communication and Outreach

City staff is already engaged in communication and outreach with stakeholders interested in the NPP process. Tools already in use include email and newsletters coupled with email lists organized by individual neighborhoods and in the aggregate; these lists are made up of property owners, renters, local businesses, landlords and other community members. In addition, a communication plan based on past outreach efforts, including open houses, car flyers and press releases coupled with social media and new media tools is under development. Communication Department staff are coordinating across work groups and working with the city's Neighborhood Liaison to reach stakeholders.

Staff recognizes that parking and particularly neighborhood parking is of consistent interest and concern to our community, and will continue to work to provide robust communication and opportunities for engagement on this topic.

Summary of NPP Issues

ISSUE	SOURCE	OPTIONS	NEXT STEPS
OPERATIONAL			
VRBOs	Staff & Residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain current approach Change regulations 	Proceed with current approach unless otherwise directed
Permit Mis-Use: Residents	Council & Residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain current approach & increase monitoring Change regulations 	Maintain current regulations
Permit Mis-use: Visitors	Council & Residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain current approach Reduce number &/or increase cost 	Include within the AMPS pricing analysis
Commuter Permits	Council & Residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain current approach Change the regulations 	Proceed with current approach unless otherwise directed
Enforcement	Residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional parking officers hired 	Increase NPP enforcement
Reduction of Unrestricted Hours	Residents - Whittier/Mapleton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate into the staff work plan. Proceed with public outreach as per regulations Hold off on response to consider broader NPP review 	Proceed with public process unless otherwise directed
Status of New Resident initiated NPP Requests	Staff & Residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proceed with discussions with residents as per current policy Institute a moratorium until broader policy discussion 	Council feedback and direction requested
POLICY			
Spillover Impacts/Zone Creation	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain current citizen-initiated approach Scope work plan to conduct analysis of NPP and return with recommendations 	Council feedback and direction requested
Not Addressed in Regulations: <i>Zoning - Steelyards</i>	Residents & Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain current regulations Scope work plan, conduct analysis and return with recommendations; includes resident outreach 	Council feedback and direction requested
Not addressed in Regulations: <i>Exclusivity, Proximity to Open Space, etc.</i>	Residents & Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain current regulations Scope work plan, conduct analysis and return with recommendation; includes resident outreach 	Council feedback and direction requested
Permit Pricing: Residents/Visitors	Council, TAB and Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider within AMPS 	Include in AMPS Parking pricing analysis
Program Revenue Neutrality	Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain current approach Consider within AMPS 	Include in AMPS parking pricing analysis
CAMP	Required by lease	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement in 2016 with past data Collect data in 2016 & implement in 2017 	Council feedback and direction requested

Note: Staff is seeking council feedback on items highlighted in light blue.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff will proceed with the existing 2016 work plan items (CAMP, NPP permit pricing including visitor permits and revenue neutrality through AMPS), the current approach to implementation of VRBOs, resident and commuter permit issuance, enforcement, and proceed with the request for reduction of unrestricted hours.

Based on Council feedback on the other policy issues (i.e. zone creation/spillover, changes to the code and/or regulations), staff can scope the work effort and develop a revised work plan to incorporate these additional items. Key vacant Community Vitality staff positions will be filled by the beginning of the third quarter. Those staff can be dedicated to this effort along with consultant assistance. Regarding CAMP, staff recommends the second option which would have us collecting new data this summer, followed by the development of a CAMP for implementation in 2017.

QUESTIONS FOR COUNCIL:

1. Does Council have any feedback on the issues for which staff currently intends to proceed with the current approach and within the existing work program? (VRBO, permit pricing and issuance, process for reducing unrestricted hours, etc.)
2. What is Council's feedback on issues related to additional NPP resident requests, such as review of NPP regulations to consider a wider range of tools for residential parking issues; changes to zone creation procedures, etc.?
3. Does Council have any further questions regarding the NPP intent and program or have additional issues for review and consideration?
4. Does Council have any feedback on staff's operating assumptions concerning the development of the CAMP and which option would Council prefer for development of the CAMP as it pertains to the historic parking data and the recent Chautauqua visitation numbers?
5. Should staff cease processing NPP applications if council desires a review of the Neighborhood Parking Permit program?