

Chautauqua Access Management Plan (CAMP) Working Group Meeting #3
Wednesday Nov. 30, 2016

MEETING SUMMARY

The City of Boulder is in the process of developing recommendations for trial (pilot) short-term measures to be tested in summer 2017, as well as longer-term recommendations to be included in a final Chautauqua Access Management Plan. ***The charge of this community working group is to help city staff recommend to respective city boards and city council which short-term measures could be implemented and evaluated in 2017.*** Beyond that, additional community process will help craft the final plan.

Attendees:

CAMP Working Group members – Patrick Casey, John Kenyon, Joel Koenig, Mary Ann Mahoney, Roni Chen Maloney, Michael McCarthy, Mary Price, Sara Pritchard, Tara Winer (Absent: Curt Brown)

Facilitator – Heather Bergman

City of Boulder staff – Susan Connelly, Bill Cowern, Deryn Wagner

Observers – Ned Andrews, Susan Balint, Deb van den Honert, Kip van den Honert, Annie McFarlane, Andrea McGimsey, Susan Osborne, Cindy Schmidt

The meeting was convened at 6 p.m. Facilitator Heather Bergman welcomed all assembled to the third meeting of the CAMP Working Group (CWG). She referred to the project timeline handout and noted the constrained schedule to complete the work necessary to implement any pilots in summer 2017. Heather said the goals for today’s meeting are to start to bridge from the key data findings to a statement of the major issues and then to potentially feasible summer 2017 pilot projects, and that staff is looking for the CWG members to add their ideas for mitigation strategies to the list of possibilities identified by staff so far.

Heather briefly recapped the second CWG meeting on October 27, 2016, including: the Fox Tuttle Hernandez transportation consultants’ and city Open Space and Mountain Parks’ staff presentations re: summer 2016 data collection and what staff identified as key data results; CWG members’ initial consideration of the significance of various key data findings; and opening the CAMP webpage on the meeting room screen to enable all to see what is included and how to access the public comment link. Heather reiterated that all public comment submitted will be aggregated and forwarded to CWG members on a weekly basis. She noted that all materials discussed at the second CWG meeting had been posted on the CAMP webpage and that several CEG members had sent communications to the entire CWG. Heather said that staff had sent a Survey Monkey instrument seeking responses from CWG members re: (1) desire to extend CWG meetings by 30 minutes to add an opportunity for public comment at the end of each meeting and (2) inviting all CWG members to revisit the significance/priority for action exercise with more time to consider and more opportunity to state preferences anonymously.

Heather noted that in preparation for this third CWG meeting, the members had received an agenda, a draft issues statement, a matrix that starts to identify the range of possible summer 2017 pilot projects and considerations related to each, and results of the CWG survey. Heather noted that Bill Cowern had sent to the CWG today a clarification of the city's data collection approach re: parking utilization along with an offer to meet separately with anyone interested in further discussing the data.

Moving to CWG discussion of the draft issues statements:

Issue A (summarized): The vast majority of visitors to the Chautauqua area arrive by automobile which, combined with the popularity of the area, creates traffic congestion, parking congestion and greenhouse gas emission levels that do not meet the city's transportation mode choice or environmental goals.

- CWG concurrence that this articulation of the issue resonates.

Issue B (summarized): Parking demand within the Chautauqua complex exceeds supply, resulting in the surrounding neighborhood streets (within the CCA leasehold and north of Baseline) becoming overflow parking for the site and creating a variety of concerns for the residents of those streets, including lack of access to on-street parking for their own homes, illegal parking that limits sight distance to conflict areas, and issues with trash, noise and verbal conflicts.

- Some CWG members voiced concerns about the accuracy of data re: parking utilization.
- Some CWG members voiced concerns about accuracy of parking citation data.
- CWG agreed that there are significant parking utilization issues.
- Some CWG members think speeding is an issue.
- CWG members would like to focus on solutions tonight rather than debate the data.

Issue C (summarized): On streets within the National Historic Landmark itself (i.e., the Colorado Chautauqua Association (CCA) leasehold area, the city park commonly referred to as "The Green" and the Ranger Cottage parking lot), pedestrians walking in the street (no sidewalks) are in conflict with motor vehicles, including those looking for parking spaces.

- Even if no one's been hurt, it's still important, especially on Kinnickinik.

Issue D (summarized): Chautauqua Auditorium event night shuttle buses become problematic for the neighborhood east of Chautauqua because Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements mean more than half the nightly trips access the Auditorium via Columbine vs. regular drop-off on Baseline, creating noise and odor for residents and concerns about conflicts with pedestrians and other vehicles along Columbine.

- Most agree it's an issue, not as impactful as parking (especially because it has more limited impact re: time) but still important. Agreed that we need to be mindful to not let transit problems replace parking problems.

There was agreement to add as an issue speeding on residential streets within and outside of the historic district.

Regarding Other Key Findings:

- (#1) Some CWG members thought the survey results indicating that approximately one-third of visitors to Chautauqua are Boulder residents and about 60% are Boulder County residents understates the number of out of town visitors.
- (#3) There was general agreement about the significance of the OSMP data indicating that visitors living outside of Boulder are the largest component in the more than doubling of visitation at Chautauqua between 2004 and 2015.
- This is important in terms of potential strategies to reach specific user groups.?

Moving to discussion of the staff draft matrix of potential summer 2017 pilot projects and considerations for each, CWG members identified the following **additional ideas for possible summer 2017 pilots**:

- Let people know there is more on-street parking east of Chautauqua.
 - Would appeal to those who are able-bodied to walk up the hill.
 - Disseminate info at the Ranger Cottage
- Lower tennis court lot – could add 20 to 30 spaces in “overflow” lot.
- Assign high-occupancy parking spaces to encourage carpooling.
- Set aside drop-off / pick-up space(s).
- Re-stripe parking in Ranger Cottage lot to become angled parking
- Consider re-naming Chautauqua trailhead – coordinate with Google to optimize searches and encourage visits elsewhere. Disperse visitation through changes to city website and Denver hiking sites.
- Provide more info on how to access open space from other areas, e.g., Chapman Drive, NCAR. Encourage parking at NCAR to access Chautauqua through signage on US36 to exit at Table Mesa.
- Lights and photo radar on Baseline.
- Train volunteers for enforcement.
- Change city logos to remove Flatirons.
- Electric bike share system.
- Make parking permits expensive along with providing transit as access for those who can't afford to pay for expensive parking.
- Make parking violations expensive.
- Parking for CCA, Chautauqua Dining Hall (CDH) and Colorado Music Festival (CMF) staff in lower tennis court lot.
- Guide signs re: parking (static)
- Modified speed limit on Baseline.
- Create nose-in parking around The Green vs. parallel.
- More underutilized bike racks to high use area by trailhead.
- Encourage “slug lines” (organized hitch hiking).
- Create B-cycle stations/system.
- Develop traffic forecast / parking forecast to disperse use.
- Given doubled visitation over 10 years and seemingly insatiable demand to visit the area, push back on vehicles even if that is unpleasant for some.
- Develop permit system that provides resident permits, with visitor permits limited by daily volumes (capped) – available online, printable PDFs.

- Develop parking preference system for Boulder residents.
 - Avoid preferences for Boulder residents. So many Boulder workers can't afford to live in town. People who don't live in town but are overnight or day visitors also contribute sales tax to city general fund and open space.
- Seasonal approaches
- Try to reach a balance – and make an impact in summer 2017.
- Try to change behavior.
- Seek to divert visitors to other trailheads.
- Restrict dogs.
- Permit-only parking for residents (with visitor passes).
- Look at satellite parking options, including University Hill Elementary and New Vista High School.
- Find ways to clearly advertise where to park - strong marketing strategy including social media. Communicate to avoid visitor frustration.
- The problems continue past summer, but might start to change behaviors in those periods, too, by experience of alternatives in summer peak.

How would we measure success?

- Multiple strategies would influence one another, making it hard to measure/differentiate success of individual projects but we know what metrics we are measuring.
- Data and metrics are known, but what council and community think may be more important.
- The city's Transportation Master Plan (TMP) metrics provide guidance.
- Reducing parking density by "striping" parking spaces with Ts and Ls using a different calculation of parking space length in the neighborhood north of Baseline may be an interim measure of success for that area.

CWG members' discussion of considerations relative to possible summer 2017 pilot projects included:

- Protect residents' reasonable interests but don't treat "outsiders" poorly – be fair, do not provide a "preference for Boulder residents".
- Consider implications of parking preference for city residents – look for the sweet spot.
 - It's uncomfortable to consider preference for those who are fortunate enough to own a house.
- Anyone should be able to walk within Chautauqua.
- Be careful to price permits so it's fair for everybody.
- Transit is the other part of any parking management strategy.
- Concern that a marketing strategy will attract more and more people.
- Focus on high-use days and months.
- Sales tax income from workers and visitors who don't live here totals ~\$15 million to city's general fund, some of which goes to OSMP. We must balance impacts to residents with impacts to visitors.
- People want to go to iconic location – hard to divert away.
- Neighborhood parking permit (NPP) program could push parking impacts elsewhere.
- Inside versus outside Chautauqua historic district needs different treatments.

- Keep in mind where people are coming from.
- Consider “buddy system” strategies that work together.

CWG discussion of the four categories of potential summer 2017 pilot strategies included:

Parking Management strategies:

CWG Likes

- Ts and Ls (parking space “striping”): simple, no signage needed – but won’t work in historic cottages area
- NPP: works for residents, would help reduce GHGs; would change behaviors
- Time Restricted Parking: flexible
- Advance reservation parking only: to reduce trolling for parking
- Parking meters on Baseline: outside **NHL** boundary
- Daily capped visitor parking permit system, especially in concert with Ts and Ls that reduce parking density
- What staff identifies as “High Feasibility” options, in general, especially those that are code-based because council may like those

CWG Dislikes

- Short Time Restrictions: too short for long hikes
- Any options that eliminate resident parking
- Pay Stations: not likely feasible within Chautauqua historic district because of Landmark Alteration Certificate (LAC) requirements and not likely desirable in neighborhood because of visual impacts or feasible because of expense

Multimodal strategies (not yet considering transit, which will be discussed at next meeting):

CWG Likes

- Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) with subsidy: linked with offsite parking to reduce parking demand onsite; encourage carpooling to save cost and vehicle miles traveled (VMTs)

CWG Dislikes

Infrastructure strategies:

CWG Likes

- HOV Parking: hard to enforce, but could be effective
- B-cycle: students without bikes would use and extend the hiking experience
- Signs: dynamic variable messaging and/or static guide signage offering alternatives
- Some traffic-calming: to address speeding

CWG Dislikes

- Electric vehicle parking: social justice concern, doesn't reduce parking demand
- Semi-diverters: would worsen traffic on other streets
- Traffic-calming: would it be effective?

Programmatic strategies:

CWG Likes

- Shared Streets: could reduce speed but it's vague
- Educational materials
- Signs: variable and/or static - still welcoming but needs to be clear, accessible info.
- Some traffic-calming: help change behavior

CWG Dislikes

- Reducing events at CCA: would impact mission, community enjoyment and CCA, CDH and CMF finances

Bill Cowern previewed the agenda for CWG meeting #4 to occur on Jan. 19, 2017 to include discussion of transit and preliminary recommendations for summer 2017 pilots with more cost information. Bill said he and consultants Fox Tuttle Hernandez will schedule a data discussion meeting with interested CWG members and public. Michael McCarthy of the CWG, Susan Balint and Andrea McGimsey expressed interest.

Heather addressed a few "housekeeping" items, including:

- A reminder to the CWG and the interested public to send all comments to CAMP@bouldercolorado.gov to be batched and communicated to the CWG in advance of the meetings, not at the last minute.
- Follow-up on the CWG's desire to continue to schedule opportunity for public comment at the end of its meetings
- Possible rescheduling of the final CWG meeting on Feb. 23, 2017
- Likelihood of joint boards and commissions meeting on CAMP moving up from current date of Feb. 4, 2017.

Public input included:

Ned Andrews, a resident of the neighborhood north of Baseline, said there are two areas of existing Ts and Ls around the Chautauqua Community House and Auditorium. Ts and Ls defining parking spaces require 23 feet of parking space length per city code. “Success” would be if parking density in the neighborhoods is consistent with city policy and practice elsewhere.

Susan Balint, a resident on 9th Street north of Baseline, read from a list including:

- Speeding also occurs on 9th Street. The speed limit should be reduced to 20 mph.
- Density, speed and overuse are the priorities for neighborhood residents.
- Chautauqua should be treated differently from other city neighborhoods, with some paid parking appropriate in parts of the Chautauqua area and a combination of approaches.
- There should be restricted parking in the neighborhoods north of Baseline on weekends between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. with duration-limited two-hour parking the rest of the time to promote turnover and access, including for the neighbors themselves.
- Duration-limited parking in the area on Chautauqua Auditorium evenings would force event-night bus use.
- If parking meters are considered on Baseline, also need signs re: alternative free unlimited duration parking locations.
- Co-op housing should not be permitted near public attractions like Chautauqua because it will exacerbate the existing parking problems.
- Despite robust marketing and communications, should expect complaints in the first year of changes.
- Coordinate with County Parks and Recreation, not just city, and boulderhiking.com.
- The data is important because it will drive acceptance at Council – must have correct assumptions.
- The assumption that parking utilization is typically 2 to 3 hours does not reflect that the parking is continuous throughout the day.
- Chautauqua and its neighbors are Yosemite Valley. We must design incentives for visitors to go elsewhere.
- Encourage continued public engagement, at the beginning and end of meetings.

Deb van den Honert, a resident on Boggess Circle within the Chautauqua historic district, urged that each issue be addressed with a solution, noting three types of visitors needing different solutions: (1) those coming for the photo opp with the iconic Flatirons, (2) locals taking a hike, (3) those coming for Chautauqua activities.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.