

The primary purpose of this spreadsheet is to provide the Community Working Group (CWG) a list of potential strategies that could be tested in 2017 as part of a pilot to address transportation access concerns in the Chautauqua area. Members of the CWG are welcome to propose additional ideas. Using the lessons learned during the summer of 2017, some of these strategies may also be considered in the future as the longer-term Chautauqua Access Management Plan gets developed. This spreadsheet provides a brief description of each strategy, which issues these data address (see separate document), as well as the associated considerations, implementation needs and potential impacts to the historic landscape. Based on all of these inputs, city staff has also provided an initial evaluation on the feasibility of implementing each of these strategies in 2017 as part of the pilot.

PARKING MANAGEMENT						
Potential Strategy	Description	Issue(s) Addressed	Considerations	Implementation Needs*	Potential Impacts to Historic District/Landmark*	Feasibility for 2017 Pilot Project?
Time Restricted Parking (unpaid)	Signs limiting all parking on the street to a time limit (i.e. 2 hours), location would need to be determined	A, B	Eliminates long-term parking on-street (including residents). Will not change behavior for people parking less than time limit already. Difficult to enforce (officer must view vehicle twice over time period). Small up front cost for sign installation and maintenance over time.	Signs, Enforcement, Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district, low cost	New signing	High
Time Restricted Parking (paid)	Same as above except there are also pay stations present and a driver must pay the station for the time they will park, location would need to be determined	A, B	Eliminates long-term parking on-street (including residents). Large up front cost for pay station installation and routine maintenance needed over time. Potential social justice concerns (only the wealthy can park here).	Pay Stations, Signs, Enforcement, Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district, medium cost	New signing and pay stations	Medium
Variable Pricing (free or low cost sometimes based on use)	Metered (paid) parking except that the pricing is variable (free or lower priced sometimes) depending upon the usage, location would need to be determined	A, B	Eliminates long-term parking on-street (including residents). Very large up front cost for pay station installation and routine maintenance needed over time.	Pay Stations, Signs, Enforcement, Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district, high cost	New signing and pay stations	Low
Neighborhood Permit Parking (NPP)	Parking allowed by NPP permit (provided to nearby residents, guests or purchased by commuters). Vehicles without permits must follow signed time restrictions (typically 2 or 3 hour limits). Full time or different by day or different by date, location would need to be determined	A, B	Eliminates long-term parking on-street (excluding residents). Will not change behavior for people parking less than time limit already. Difficult to enforce (officer must view vehicle twice over time period). Small up front cost for sign installation and maintenance over time. Administrative costs to manage the district. Yearly cost to residents to purchase permits.	Signs, Enforcement, Administration, Regulation changes, Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district, low cost	New signing	High
Combined NPP and Paid parking	Similar to NPP except that those without permits must pay at pay stations to park and follow time restrictions, location would need to be determined	A, B	Eliminates long-term parking on-street (excluding residents). Large up front cost for pay station installation and routine maintenance needed over time. Potential social justice concerns (only the wealthy can park here). Administrative costs to manage the district. Yearly cost to residents to purchase permits.	Pay Stations, Signs, Enforcement, Administration, Regulation changes, Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district, medium cost	New signing and pay stations	Medium

\*Approval by the full Landmarks Board may or may not be required. On a case by case basis, staff review (COB and CCA) or approval by the Landmarks Design Review Committee may be sufficient.

Potential Strategy	Description	Issue(s) Addressed	Considerations	Implementation Needs*	Potential Impacts to Historic District/Landmark*	Feasibility for 2017 Pilot Project?
Permit ONLY parking	Parking on street is allowed only for vehicles with permits. For example, permits could be available only to local residents; only to COB residents; or only to Boulder County residents. Permits could be free or they could require payment. Location would need to be determined.	A, B	No policy or legal precedence for this type of parking in the public ROW. May require code change. Eliminates long-term parking except for permit holders. Administrative costs to manage the district. May be costs to purchase permits.	Signs, Enforcement, Administration, Code changes, low cost	New signing	Low
Increase parking supply (nearby)	Add additional parking either around the green and/or in the adjacent meadow and/or expand the Ranger lot	A, B	High construction costs. Impacts to adjacent public land (open space or parks). Concern that this may be Inconsistent with the City's TMP goals by still facilitating high number of motor vehicles into the Chautauqua area.	Construction and signing, Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district, high cost	Only if located within historic district	Low
Increase new parking supply (remote)	Theoretically tied to a shuttle or similar service, this would provide a place for people to park and then take another mode up to Chautauqua. A possible New Vista redevelopment was one option. Making use of existing parking on the CU campus is another.	A,B	High construction costs. High land acquisition or rental fees. Value would be connected to ease of access to the Chautauqua from this point and difficulty of access by other means.	Third party lease agreement / signing, Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district, high cost	None	Low
Neighborhood parking restriction signing/stripping	Maintain "L" pavement markings and/or provide No Parking signs to reinforce legal parking requirements, location would need to be determined	A,B	Provides guidance to drivers about where to legally park. Currently in place as a temporary treatment on several blocks. Not consistent with City signing and striping practices. Some cost associated with installation and maintenance.	Pavement Markings, Enforcement, low cost	None (already done in historic district)	High
Neighborhood parking space designation	Provide both "Ts" and "Ls" to designate specific parking spaces on-street in certain neighborhood blocks, location would need to be determined	A,B	Provides guidance to drivers about where to legally park. This is already done on some blocks within the leasehold area. Not consistent with City signing and striping practices. Some cost associated with installation and maintenance. Would decrease parking supply resulting in potential redistribution of parking to other blocks.	Signs, Pavement Markings, Enforcement, low cost	None (already done in historic district)	High

\*Approval by the full Landmarks Board may or may not be required. On a case by case basis, staff review (COB and CCA) or approval by the Landmarks Design Review Committee may be sufficient.

Potential Strategy	Description	Issue(s) Addressed	Considerations	Implementation Needs*	Potential Impacts to Historic District/Landmark*	Feasibility for 2017 Pilot Project?
<b>MULTIMODAL IMPROVEMENTS</b>						
Gondola service	Connecting an external parking supply to Chautauqua green/lot with an aerial gondola service, location would need to be determined	A, B, D	High construction and long-term maintenance costs. Potential ROW acquisition or private land use agreements. Large footprint impacts at both landing spots, including impacts to open space resources. Value would seem to be connected to ease of use and difficulty accessing Chautauqua area by other means.	Gondola entry/exit stations, Gondola aerial infrastructure, Administration by third party vendor or new city employees, Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district (such as signs, shelters), high cost	Gondola infrastructure including aerial devices and entry/exit stations	Low
Trolley service	Connecting an external parking supply to Chautauqua green/lot with a trolley service that runs either up Baseline or up 9th Street or both, location would need to be determined	A, B, D	High construction and long-term maintenance costs. Potential relocation of parking impacts to points along the trolley route. Value would seem to be connected to ease of use and difficulty accessing Chautauqua area by other means. Impacts to open space resources would need to be evaluated and mitigated.	Trolley car(s), Administration by third party vendor or existing transit service provider, Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district (such as signs, shelters), high cost	New signing	Low
Uber/Lyft/Bridj services	Use of transportation network companies to and from Chautauqua to encourage drop-off rather than parking. Possible City and/or other subsidy.	A, B, D	Financial cost associated with any subsidies. Administrative cost associated with any subsidy program. Value would seem to be connected to ease of use and difficulty accessing Chautauqua area by other means.	Potential Admin support of subsidy program (such as signs, shelters), medium cost	None (unless new pickup/dropoff zone and then New signing)	Medium
Modification of HOP transit service	Modify the existing HOP transit routing so that it continues south on 9th Street and drops off/pickups up at Chautauqua before rejoining it's original route (year round or seasonal). Determined by CAMP transit study underway.	A, B, D	To be Determined "Transit Study" (Impacts to open space resources would need to be evaluated and mitigated.)	To be Determined "Transit Study", Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district (such as signs, shelters)	To be Determined "Transit Study"	
New City seasonal transit service	Create a new transit route funded by the City that will connect to external parking and/or allow high frequency transfers which will travel along Baseline and/or 9th Street and connect to Chautauqua. This could involve working with transit providers like Via or it could involve a partnership with the University of Colorado to use their buses and drivers in the summer.	A, B, D	To be Determined "Transit Study" (Impacts to open space resources would need to be evaluated and mitigated.)	To be Determined "Transit Study", Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district (such as signs, shelters)	To be Determined "Transit Study"	

\*Approval by the full Landmarks Board may or may not be required. On a case by case basis, staff review (COB and CCA) or approval by the Landmarks Design Review Committee may be sufficient.

Potential Strategy	Description	Issue(s) Addressed	Considerations	Implementation Needs*	Potential Impacts to Historic District/Landmark*	Feasibility for 2017 Pilot Project?
New RTD transit service	Create a new transit route provided by RTD that will connect to external parking and/or allow high frequency transfers which will travel along Baseline and/or 9th Street and connect to Chautauqua.	A, B, D	To be Determined "Transit Study" (Impacts to open space resources would need to be evaluated and mitigated.)	To be Determined "Transit Study", Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district (such as signs, shelters)	To be Determined "Transit Study"	
Hotel Shuttles	Work with City hotels and BVCB to create a shuttle service that will connect their facilities and the Chautauqua area. Shuttle would stop at several hotels and then go straight to Chautauqua and then return.	A, B, D	To be Determined "Transit Study" (Impacts to open space resources would need to be evaluated and mitigated.)	To be Determined "Transit Study", Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district (such as signs, shelters)	To be Determined "Transit Study"	
Collaboration with CU transit service and parking areas	Theoretically, this would involve connecting available CU campus parking and the Chautauqua area with available CU buses and drivers only during the summer when they were not being used for the school year.	A, B, D	To be Determined "Transit Study" (Impacts to open space resources would need to be evaluated and mitigated.)	To be Determined "Transit Study", Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district (such as signs, shelters)	To be Determined "Transit Study"	
Additional Bicycle Parking close to the trailhead	Provide additional bicycle parking racks close to the trailhead where they are over used currently	A, B	Small cost for purchase and installation of racks. Bikes are not allowed on OSMP trails in this area, which may create enforcement issues if more biking to the trailheads is encouraged.	New Bike Racks, Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district (such as signs, shelters), low cost	None	High
Add B-Cycle Station	Work with B-Cycle to find a location to construct a new B-Cycle station within the Chautauqua Area.	A, B	High cost for constructing and maintaining new B-cycle station. Hill will likely result in one-directional riding which will require significant rebalancing efforts to keep B-cycles available at the site. Bikes are not allowed on OSMP trails in this area, which may create enforcement issues if more biking to the trailheads is encouraged.	New B-Cycle Station, B-Cycle rebalancing efforts, Landmarks Board Approval for physical changes inside historic district (such as signs, shelters), medium cost	New B-Cycle Station	Low
<i>Need all transit options to allow dogs and strollers in order to be Chautauqua friendly.</i>						

\*Approval by the full Landmarks Board may or may not be required. On a case by case basis, staff review (COB and CCA) or approval by the Landmarks Design Review Committee may be sufficient.

Potential Strategy	Description	Issue(s) Addressed	Considerations	Implementation Needs*	Potential Impacts to Historic District/Landmark*	Feasibility for 2017 Pilot Project?
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE CHANGES</b>						
Dynamic Variable Message Signs (VMS) signs with parking occupancy	Placing VMS signs on 9th Street, Baseline and/or Highway 36 which are tied to sensors tracking parking in Chautauqua and which tell drivers whether the lots are full or not.	A, B	Large up front cost for installation of VMS sign(s) and significant cost to maintain over time. Could be issues with locating the VMS sign(s). Could be concerns from adjacent properties or any location in the Historic District.	VMS boards, Administration, historic review, medium cost	None (unless located in Historic District)	Low
Parking Camera(s) to show occupancy	Permanent Cameras which show images of parking lots and areas and are linked to the City's website so that people can see how full the lots are ahead of time.	A, B	Large up front cost for installation of cameras and some cost to maintain over time. Could be concerns about cameras and new poles in the Historic District.	New Cameras and poles to elevate them and Administration, historic review, medium cost	New Cameras and poles to elevate them	Medium
Traffic Calming - leasehold	Traffic mitigation (i.e. speed humps, circles, semi-diverters, islands, etc...) to slow vehicle speeds in the leasehold area. Potentially used in conjunction with designation of "Shared Streets". Location would need to be determined.	A, B, C	Could be concerns about speed humps in Historic District. Would have some localized emergency response impacts. Small up front cost and small maintenance cost over time.	Traffic calming devices (humps, etc...), signing and pavement marking, low cost	Treatments if in the Historic District	Medium
Traffic Calming - other surrounding streets	Traffic mitigation (i.e. speed humps, circles, semi-diverters, islands, etc...) to slow vehicle speeds on neighborhood streets near Chautauqua. Location would need to be determined.	A, B	Would have some emergency response impacts. City criteria for installing such devices in the public ROW is not met. Small up front cost and small maintenance cost over time.	Traffic calming devices (humps, etc...), signing and pavement marking, low cost	Treatments if in the Historic District	Medium
Semi-Diverters for NH access control	Place semi-diverters at intersections with Baseline Road which preclude vehicle movements from Baseline onto those roadways. Location would need to be determined. There are similar closures on Balsam Avenue (near the old hospital) at 10th and 11th Streets.	A, B	Would have some emergency response impacts. Would impact resident access to those streets, diverting to other streets. May result in diversion of additional traffic from people still seeking to park in the neighborhood. High potential for compliance issues.	Temporary (bumper blocks) or permanent (concrete) infrastructure, signs and enforcement, medium cost	None (locations would be outside the Historic District)	Medium
Parking for Electric vehicles	Designated parking on-site for electric vehicles after they have charged (freeing up the charging station for another vehicle). Location would need to be determined.	A	Eliminates general purpose or otherwise managed parking space to accommodate an electric vehicle. Intent would be to prioritize access and increase capacity of charging station so more electric vehicles come to the Chautauqua area.	Signs, Enforcement, low cost	New signing	High
<b>PROGRAMMATIC CHANGES</b>						
Shared Streets in the leasehold area	Signing these streets as "Shared Streets" would give legal priority to pedestrians and remove a lot of the requirements pedestrians have for their use. Potentially used in conjunction with vehicle speed reduction measures to achieve the slower speeds necessary for a shared street environment.	C	Issues of pedestrian safety Small up front cost for sign installation and maintenance over time. May be some concern about new signing in Historic District	Signs, low cost	New signing	High

\*Approval by the full Landmarks Board may or may not be required. On a case by case basis, staff review (COB and CCA) or approval by the Landmarks Design Review Committee may be sufficient.

Potential Strategy	Description	Issue(s) Addressed	Considerations	Implementation Needs*	Potential Impacts to Historic District/Landmark*	Feasibility for 2017 Pilot Project?
TDM for Chautauqua area employees	Programs which encourage Chautauqua area employees to minimize their vehicular impact on the area (i.e. using other modes, tele-working, carpooling, etc...)	A, B, C	Requirements for the Colorado Chautauqua Association and related employers (like the dining hall) to follow the TDM requirements.	CCA Staff, TDM coordinator, medium cost	None	Medium
Educational materials	Providing carefully crafted messaging using social media, videos, brochures, etc to provide key messages to the public (i.e. "consider other trailheads", "use other modes to get there", "respect the neighborhood", "come on weekdays or before sunrise", etc...). These could be coordinated and distributed through the Convention and Visitors' Bureau, hotels, websites, etc.	A, B, C, D	Time spent by staff developing and maintaining these messages.	Partnerships, City OSMP and Communications staff time, low cost	None	High
Static electronic messaging	Use electronic systems to warn visitors of busy times and potential delays, and to encourage alternative locations or times to visit. These are not necessarily tied to parking sensors (as above). Static messages can be displayed on VMS trailers already in use throughout the city, and/or coordinated with CDOT to display on existing electronic signs along Highway 36	A, B	No up-front costs. Requires staff time and partnerships to coordinate with partner projects and agencies.	Coordination, administration, low cost	None	High
Parking for Pool or Car-share vehicles	Designated parking on-site for specific vendor Car-Share vehicles.	A, B	Eliminates general purpose or otherwise managed parking space to accommodate a pool or Car-share vehicle. Intent would be to prioritize access to people using Pool or Car-share vehicles.	City Sign Shop and/or CCA, Enforcement, low cost	New signing	High
Work with Colorado Music Festival and Colorado Chautauqua Association (CCA) to adjust programming intensity	Decrease the frequency or intensity of music events at Chautauqua over the summer	A, B, D	This reduces the number of opportunities for community members to enjoy these events. Decreased revenue to people associated with promoting/hosting these events.	CCA Staff, low cost	None	Low
Work with Parks and Recreation to modify programming and permitting on the green	Reduce permitted uses (camps, weddings, etc) of the green by shifting them to other parts of the parks system when possible	A, B, C	Community members are often looking to use this specific location in order to experience an iconic location. Difficult to find other attractive locations.	Staff time, low cost	None	High
Work with Open Space and Mountain Parks to coordinate educational groups and permitted uses	Already underway. Involves close coordination with staff from Parks and Rec, OSMP, and CCA to avoid overbooking at high-use times and to communicate transportation limitations/requirements to group leaders	A, B, C	This area is in high demand and is specifically sought-after by teachers, professional photographers, trip leaders, etc. Difficult to find other attractive locations.	Staff time, low cost	None	High
Modify the routing of HOP to Chautauqua buses to decrease impact in the adjacent neighborhood	Have some HOP to Chautauqua buses drop off or pick up participants on a route which doesn't take them through the neighborhood.	D	Potentially drop off or pickup passengers at a location less desirable in proximity to the theatre. Potential ADA issues dropping off in a location that is not accessible.	CCA Staff and GO Boulder Staff, low cost	None	Medium

\*Approval by the full Landmarks Board may or may not be required. On a case by case basis, staff review (COB and CCA) or approval by the Landmarks Design Review Committee may be sufficient.

