PARK CITY
1884

PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
OCTOBER 16, 1997

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of Park City, Utah will hold its regularly scheduled meeting in the Work Session Room, Main Level, at the Marsac Municipal Building, 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah for the purposes and at the times as described below on Thursday, October 16, 1997.

AGENDA

Work Session

3:00 p.m.	Council questions and comments
3:30 p.m.	Parking and Transportation Task Force operations policy recommendations
4:30 p.m.	Old/Town Olympic Urban Design Charette Report

PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
OCTOBER 23, 1997

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of Park City, Utah will not hold its regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, October 23, 1997.

Posted: 10/13/97

PARK CITY 1884

PARK CITY WORK SESSION NOTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
OCTOBER 16, 1997

Present: Mayor Brad Olch; Council members Hugh Daniels, Roger Harlan; Chuck Klingenstein; Shauna Kerr; and Paul Sincock

Toby Ross, City Manager; Jodi Hoffman; City Attorney; Myles Rademan, Public Affairs Director; Hope Bleecker, Transportation Director; and Mark Harrington, Assistant City Attorney

Parking Task Force Members Sheila Haloff, Barb Clark, Mary Demcowicz, and Russ Wong; Residents Frank Normile, Mike Andrews, and Dave Rosenbloom; Consultant Bill Hurrell, Wilbur Smith

1. **Council questions and comments.** Paul Sincock complimented the Design Charette held earlier this week. He felt there are many ideas that the City will use and thanked Myles Rademan for his efforts. He recommended that adjacent property owners receive notice if the tennis bubble is installed before November 1. In response to a question from Chuck Klingenstein about the Mike Hale dealership parking its vehicles in the lot adjacent to the park, the City Manager explained that when the City is anticipating parking demands, it requests that Mike Hale Chevrolet move its vehicles. The City doesn't regulate the lot. The Mayor added that Mike Hale will be relocating in the near future and has broken ground in the County for a new dealership.

Chuck Klingenstein reported that he visited with Ken Bullock about the Salt Lake Organizing Committee and the Utah League of Cities and Towns feels strongly about his appointment to the Executive Board as there is an absence of a representative from local government. The meetings are open to the public, although since 1989, $34,346,276 has been collected from sales tax from cities of which Park City's portion is $428,017. He felt it is time to get a representative on the Executive Board. Hugh Daniels interjected that his only question is whether Ken Bullock is the right person; he emphasized that he would like that person to represent Park City's interests which may be very different from other communities. The Mayor explained that Ken Bullock attends all of the Executive Board meetings and he wants to make sure that Mr. Bullock's motives are appropriate. The Council discussed having him attend a work session. Roger Harlan pointed out the difficulty in someone representing everyone's concerns. Mr. Klingenstein stated that communities have a financial investment, and in time, the Executive Committee will be making more independent decisions.

Ms. Kerr congratulated Mr. Rademan on a great Design Charette and reported on the success of a recent community fund-raiser. Mr. Daniels reminded Council of an open house to be hosted by UDOT and a ULCT legislative meeting when he will be out-of-town. He added that there will be a Chamber\Bureau social tonight at 350 Main Street. Council agreed that November 12 or 13 would be good dates for a joint meeting with the Salt Lake Council; the City Manager will follow-up. The Council agreed on December 1, 3 and 29 for the town meeting dates.

2. **Old Town/Olympic Urban Design Charette Report.** Myles Rademan thanked the Council for its support. He reported that there were about 25 designers and the combination of out-of-town and local professionals worked well. He explained that the urbanization of Park City was a key theme among teams. Mr. Rademan displayed some work of the designers. People were encouraged to be creative and the only guidelines were that projects promote pedestrians, and aesthetics. Mr. Rademan pointed out all of the competing values in Park City, including historic, residential, affordable housing, open space, commercial, etc. He stated that staff will hold a debriefing next week and categorize the work, which will be cataloged and photographed. They will be displayed here in the Marsac Building and later at the Library. Paul Sincock suggested using the newly remodeled Council Chambers. As a follow-up to the Charette, Mr. Rademan suggested appointing a Blue Ribbon Committee to recommend potential projects and an action plan. Mr. Klingenstein asked about the Prospector area. Mr. Rademan indicated that there was not enough time to focus on other areas other than the downtown area. Another consideration was the funding available through the Main Street Redevelopment Agency. Chuck Klingenstein believed that the City will have to look at rehabilitation of other areas in Park City at some point and is pleased at the momentum of interest. Mr. Harlan discussed coordination of ideas with the trails master plan or the recreation master plan but the difficulty with current staff's and commissions' work loads to undertake another project. Myles Rademan added that this is a part of the Olympic master plan and agreed that the boards, commissions and staff have full agendas, and consultants will probably have to be hired. He emphasized that the Olympics are the focus for the plans, but projects should not be implemented just for the games. Paul Sincock remarked on comments from designers about the impacts of the widening the highways, and there were suggestions about median strips and lighting improvements on Deer Valley Drive as a part of the Charette. He suggested that the Council consider taking over state roads within the City limits and although it would be more expensive, the City would have control of its highways. Toby Ross commented that it is possible, but it would warrant a great deal of investigation.

Ms. Kerr suggested that a sign-up sheet be available with the display of these renderings, to solicit interested people for membership on the Blue Ribbon Committee. Jodi Hoffman recommended a description with the work of what was trying to be accomplished.

3. **Parking Task Force operations policy recommendations.** See attached staff report. Sheila Haloff, committee member, stated that she doesn't agree with the implementation of paid parking. It is not timely and Council did not listen to public input, but since the Council approved it, she is participating on the committee.

Hope Bleecker, Transportation Director, explained that the advisory committee is represented by Sheila Haloff, Barb Clark, Steve Hooker, Russ Wong, Andrea Nass, Mary Bradley, Paul Brown, Peter Tomai, and Mary Demcowicz. The committee was formed to develop a program, make recommendations to the Council, and to track the success of the management of the program. She continued that the committee will follow up with the operations of the enforcement contract as it relates to residents and lodging guests in the district and delivery policies. These will be reflected in the parking code amendments. Paul Sincock asked if these recommendations will be presented in a public meeting. The City Manager relayed that it is anticipated that there will be public comment at this meeting. Although there is Main Street merchant representation, Mr. Sincock stated that he would like to have input from other areas of town. Shauna Kerr agreed with Mr. Sincock and noted that there was a lot of input at the meeting held in July. She stated that at that time, the Council indicated to the public that there would be a process for implementation; this has been discussed with the Main Street merchants, but the community at large has not been included. Ms. Kerr stated that she would feel more comfortable holding a public hearing if there is support from other Council members. Sheila Haloff interjected that the committee has some constructive recommendations with regard to paid parking and suggested that the Council listen to these and then make a decision on the public hearing.

Hope Bleecker explained that the goal is to manage parking to assure efficient use of parking and encourage turn-over on Main Street. A main focus was to maximize utilization on the third and fourth levels of China Bridge and the Sandridge lot. The committee will also monitor receptiveness of various groups to rates and regulations. Ms. Bleecker emphasized that there is not a goal to build up a tremendous reserve to generate funds for a garage in the first year of the program, but rather measure utilization by maximizing efficiencies. It is very important that the program not run into deficit. She continued that they are working very hard to mitigate the impacts of paid parking, i.e., "scavengers" seeking parking in the residential districts. There needs to be a decision on the number of months of operation, time limitations in each zone, zone sizes, and associated zone fees. She emphasized that employee policies has always been a concern. Since maximum utilization is a goal, the start-up plan in January is basically to use Zone 3 as unregulated which includes 267 spaces of free parking. This is not sufficient for free parking for all as there are currently 600 cars going into the downtown area. She added that the rates of turn-over are unknown and that needs to be determined before a permanent program is put into place. Shauna Kerr pointed out that the Film Festival will be held when this is implemented and asked if the employees will have reserve parking, and Ms. Bleecker indicated that the committee has considered special events.

Bill Hurrell of Wilbur Smith, through illustration of a diagram, discussed the peak months in Park City and the recommendation of a six month program. Ms. Bleecker stated that the program has changed very little from the July 31 presentation. Forty spaces will be added with the completion of the Sandridge lot. It is proposed to charge $1 per hour on Main Street, lower Main Street, and some spaces on Park Avenue in front of the Dakota. Swede Alley, the Brewpub lot, China Bridge 1 and 2 would be $.50 per hour. The Gateway garage could be a shared with $.50 per hour City parking. The free zone is China Bridge 3 and 4, north Marsac lot, Sandridge lot, and the south lot of the Miner's Hospital which provides another 80 spaces as a park and ride lot. She explained that the south Marsac lot is a City Hall parking area and not in the program. She felt that its management is an internal operating issue, although there should be some time limits and enforcement.

Paul Sincock understood that the hangers could be used in any zone and residents can obtain a 20% discount when time is purchased. Hope Bleecker referred to the proposed time limitations, and pointed out there was a lot of public input on extending Main Street to three or four hours. The committee deliberated and decided there is an advantage to assigning short term parking on Main Street as there will be better turnover, which will increase the perception of available spaces. To allow four hour parking is probably something Council would not want to do and it will cut into revenue. She explained that the one issue with the two hour limitation is that parkers can "feed" the meter again. The long-term zone is designed to attract people by offering a 24 hour time limit. There is a 20% discount for locals and employees and over a five month season, fees amount to about $330,000 and with a 20% discount, results in approximately $265,000. Paul Sincock suggested that Swede Alley be reduced from 24 hours to 12 hours and allow 24 hours for residents and lodging guests. Ms. Bleecker noted the difficulty in identifying tourist guests and it is important to use consistent signage with a shared use. The City Manager explained that the 24 hour parking basically provides overnight parking where the 12 hour doesn't. Overnight is not the time where there is a demand for parking and it allows residents to park overnight. Hope Bleecker explained that there are 40 residents in the Main Street area and the committee is currently assessing the situation to formulate a final recommendation.

Bill Hurrell, consultant, stated that it is difficult to project revenues when going from free to paid parking. One of the things considered is price elasticity, which is how people react to the fee itself, seasonality issues, variations from year to year including special events and ski conditions. How long people want to park, hours, total demand, mix of visitors and employees are also very important considerations. Mr. Hurrell explained that the basic principle in price elasticity is that if a fee isn't charged, there is a certain number of people parking which is what we have today. If you charge fees, there is a decline in how many will pay that fee and park. In the proposed system, people have choices and through illustration of a graph, explained that the six month plan is a break-even situation. The forecast is a little over $400,000 in revenue which is split between Zones 1 and 2; the operating cost of the program is about $330,000. This is assuming that the program operates for a full six months. He pointed out that for the first month or so, there won't be strict enforcement and there may be other measures that will tend to reduce the revenues. He emphasized that a break-even situation is the goal and felt confident that it can be accomplished. Paul Sincock asked why the City would only want to break even. Mr. Hurrell explained that ultimately that wouldn't be the goal, but the City is taking a big step from free to paid parking. There should be some flexibility as there are unknowns. Paul Sincock asked if the operating costs include capital costs. Hope Bleecker interjected that the machines are amortized over ten years. In response to a question from Roger

Harlan regarding the calculations, Mr. Hurrell explained that all of the spaces were counted but there were adjustments for occupancy. The average occupancy throughout the winter months were reduced by a factor that takes into account the number of people that will be displaced off of Main Street by the program.

Paul Sincock expressed that there is no reason to do this unless there is a surplus to help fund a parking garage. Toby Ross explained there is a reason to have paid parking without a surplus and that is to manage the existing resource, which is the primary purpose of the parking program. If at the end of this evaluation, it is concluded that there is enough parking, there would be no need to explore a parking structure and there would be no particular reason to generate more revenue. On the other hand, after a year of operation, it is determined that with all of this management, there is still a shortfall, then there will be a target of what needs to be generated for a garage. The City Manager continued that this is a step-by-step evaluation process. Ms. Kerr emphasized that this is not our "cash cow" and there shouldn't be false illusions that paid parking is going to fund a parking garage as it would fall well short of that. Toby Ross stated it probably could not fund a $12 million parking structure, but a sizeable amount could be generated. Paul Sincock wanted the public to know that the fees are not set in stone and things could change in the future.

Chuck Klingenstein relayed that he received concerns from seniors that may be displaced; Ms. Bleecker stated that this can be considered. In response to a question from Sheila Haloff, the Transportation Director explained that the meters will be painted at a cost of $4,000. Ms. Haloff felt that is a waste of money. Ms. Kerr explained that the Historic District Commission felt it was important that they be the same color as the light poles. Ms. Haloff asked what the City will do for businesses that decline because of the program. Hugh Daniels felt that if that happened Council would look at the problem and the troubled areas as that is an important part of our economy. Roger Harlan discussed the one-way on Main Street attempted a few years back, and pointed out that the Council was very responsive to the wishes of the merchants. Chuck Klingenstein emphasized that the City has a huge financial stake in this as well. Ms. Haloff relayed that the Council is experimenting with their lives and businesses.

Committee member Barb Clark expressed that there should be consideration for late night employees and that late shuttles be added from remote lots. There was discussion about contracting this service. Hope Bleecker added that there are 257 spaces of free parking. As a part of the valet parking program, there was a bus running until 1 a.m. which was rarely used.

Dave Rosenbloom, Main Street merchant, explained a situation where paid parking was implemented at Princeton University. Meters were damaged, and a rape occurred at a remote parking lot and the victim sued the University. He discussed the escalation of rents which in the long term put many local businesses out of business and were replaced by franchises. He believed that people quit shopping in the downtown area, traveled out of the area, and Princeton was never the same. Mr. Rosenbloom warned that although the short-term effect may appear good, the long-term effect may not because the locals may be lost.

Frank Normile criticized the seasonal graph as it doesn't represent cars, but occupancy rates. He argued that tourists use a transportation system. The City Manager responded that this was used to illustrate seasonability and were not the only figures used. There were parking surveys and there is a rough correlation between parking demand and the number of people in town. Bill Hurrell added that Wilbur Smith has been conducting parking surveys for two years and the graph corresponds fairly well. In response to a question from Mr. Normile, Ms. Bleecker explained that the revenues of $415,000 include Main Street and Swede Alley meters, and fines. The City Manager explained that this does not assume an increase in fines.

There was discussion about forgiving initial fines for the first offender. Paul Sincock asked how enforcement of this program compares with enhanced enforcement last year. Hope Bleecker clarified that the chalking will not be done, and explained the proposal from Ampco being another staff manager and six officers. Ampco has hand held equipment for reading hangers which the City would not have to purchase. In summary, there are three additional personnel and an adjudication officer. Ms. Bleecker explained that the appeals process is being discussed.

Mike Andrews pointed out that the Ampco contract is due for renewal on November 15 and was accepted for renewal by Brian Anderson on October 9. He asked if Ampco will be the administrator for the next two years. Mark Harrington, Assistant City Attorney, explained that the City requested and received a 30 day extension and has not given notice of renewal. Mike Andrews expressed that he felt that last year, the City got "hosed". He added that there were things it didn't do, which were requested in the RFP and which it based its billing on, like 4,000 pictures which were never taken. He noted that he has spent a lot of time on this issue and will share information with the City. In response to a question from Paul Sincock, Mark Harrington explained that Mike Andrews is addressing the parking enforcement aspect as there would be a separate authorization from Council for a change order or a separate contract for the vendor for the new service.

Committee member Mary Demcowicz pointed out that she was not aware that this meeting was a public input session. She suggested that there be another public hearing and warned that Council really needs to think about this. As a 21 year business owner, she noted that she has seen businesses come and go on Main Street, and finally everyone seems to be doing well. Ms. Demcowicz explained that is why she got involved. She feared that paid parking will send more people to the mall and urged Council to consider this thoughtfully.

Committee member Russ Wong agreed with Ms. Demcowicz's comments. He stressed that the office businesses contribute a lot to the economy and it would be a mistake to drive them away. He stated that he visited Aspen with the City Council where there was also fear about paid parking. However, he believes we are different than Aspen as the rents there are substantially higher. As a landlord, he doesn't mind high rents, but would hate to see small businesses driven out of Main Street. There was a discussion about the average price per square foot for commercial space. Dave Rosenbloom agreed that Aspen is different and high rents drive out small businesses. Mr. Wong reiterated that he is also worried about office businesses on Main Street and it is important to protect employees and residents and make it affordable for them to park.

There was discussion about discounted tokens for shoppers. Frank Normile suggested that a public hearing be advertised and a room reserved that can accommodate the public. Sheila Haloff relayed that the committee recommended that the parking be free until 11 a.m. Paul Sincock asked if the delivery times should be limited. Ms. Haloff emphasized the importance of deliveries to businesses being made until noon, and felt Council members should visit Main Street more often.

Roger Harlan recommended increasing the 20% discount to 30%, so that the transition from free parking to paid parking is more acceptable. Ms. Kerr expressed concerns that there is no handicap parking on Main Street and there needs to be more designated and signed. She added that there should be some cab zones. Hugh Daniels encouraged that residential permits be visible as sometimes they are difficult to spot with tinted windows. He felt that it is fine to hold another input session, but then Council needs to make a decision on all of the policies.

Paul Sincock pointed out that the teams of the Design Charette anticipated a parking structure downtown. He would expect that our visitor counts will be increasing and there will be a need for a garage which could be subsidized with paid parking. As a result, he does not agree with all of the free parking and personally believes that there should be paid parking in the Historic District. He suggested that in Zone 3, employees purchase a pass for $10 per month or some low price. Everyone pays except for those who live in the Historic District who get two free passes per residence; the third one could be $100 per year. It makes no sense to have 267 free parking spaces; it should cost something. The City Manager explained that is where staff was headed until the committee deliberated and it was determined that maximum use of the under-utilized parking should be a goal. To accomplish that for employees, selling $10 permits is a tremendous burden and would cost the City probably $100 to sell a $10 permit. Paul Sincock insisted that the principle is that everyone pays, and it may not remain free parking in the future. Mr. Sincock urged staff to make a complete presentation at the public hearing, including a detail of the budget and projections.

Chuck Klingenstein pointed out that all of the resort communities are having this same experience, it's not just Aspen, and everyone is dealing with the same economic success. They are all looking at paid parking, parking structures, and parking solutions. Mr. Klingenstein added that he has been following this for years. Aspen has been years ahead of everyone else and he asked why not learn from other communities. Rents are rising everywhere and will continue to rise, because that is the price of success. He felt that whether there is paid parking or a parking garage, rents will continue to increase. With regard to the aesthetics of the meters, there are meters in cities in Europe that are thousands of years older and they look good. Mr. Klingenstein emphasized that new developments will draw more people to Main Street and it is important to protect the jewel of Old Town. Roger Harlan suggested that candidates spread the word about the public hearing on October 30 while campaigning door-to-door.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott

PARK CITY

COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT

DATE: October 16, 1997
DEPARTMENT: Public Works
AUTHOR: Hope E. Bleecker, Transportation Director Hope 10/16/97
TITLE: Winter Parking Operations
TYPE OF ITEM: Work Session Discussion

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Review options presented in this analysis of parking policy and winter operation of the paid parking project in the Main Street Core. Approve policies for program length, duration, parking fees, zone size, and employee parking.

A. Topic. Winter Paid Parking Policies.

B. Background.
As part of an overall parking management strategy, the City Council authorized implementation of a paid parking program in the Main Street Core. The area affected by the project is the Main Street business district bordered by Marsac Avenue on the east, Hillside Avenue on the South, 9th Street on the north, and Park Avenue between 9th and Heber Avenue. Council authorized the purchase of 31 electronic pay-and-display meters in July 1997. Prior actions to supplement and manage parking supply have consisted of valet parking and privatized enforcement. Current steps include the construction of the Sandridge Lot, continuation of the enforcement program, and the paid parking project. Future plans include an addition to the China Bridge Garage and enhancements to the transportation system.

The Mayor recently formed a Parking Advisory Committee to review critical operating elements of the paid system and to evaluate the program. The committee convened on September 26 and October 6. They are also scheduled to meet again on October 15. Any updates to the committee recommendations will be presented at the October 16 meeting.

C. **Analysis**.

Based on the Council's prior discussions of paid parking, staff recommends that Council endorse the following objectives for the first year of the paid parking program:

First Year Objectives

a) **Manage parking to assure efficient use of the existing parking in the Main Street Core.**
- Enhance customer access to businesses during peak periods with strategies such as charging for the more convenient spaces; designating short-term parking, and providing discounts to frequent users.
- Provide low-cost parking for employees in the Main Street Core.
- Encourage visitors (customers and employees) to use alternatives to the single passenger automobile.
- Discourage use of parking in the Main Street Core by people with destinations outside of the area (for example, Silver Lake or Park City Municipal Residents)

b) **Monitor and assess the receptiveness of the various user groups to parking rates and regulations and adjust the program accordingly.**

c) **Design and operate the parking program to generate at least sufficient revenue to pay for program costs including parking enforcement.**

d) **Mitigate the unintended impacts of paid parking.**
- Manage parking in the residential areas surrounding the Main Street Core to assure that limited parking is available to residents and visitors.
- Retain flexibility in the management of parking; authorize administrative adjustments to enforcement, rates, program design and permit requirements.
- Design the initial program for ease of administration and monitoring.
- Develop a comprehensive public information program.
- Monitor any impacts of the parking program on circulation and transit and adjust the program as needed.

These objectives are intended to guide the parking management program in the first year of paid parking. They likely will be modified and expanded in future years to respond to long-term requirements such as incorporating financing strategies to pay for construction of new parking; integrating circulation and transit programs and facilities; and addressing deficiencies in the program for the first year.

The Council should hear the recommendations of the Parking Advisory Committee on the following items and render policy decisions for each element of the plan:

1) **Number of months per year paid parking will remain in effect;**
2) **Duration of Main Street Core paid parking areas;**
3) **Number of spaces in each zone;**
4) **Parking rates by zone; and**
5) **Employee parking.**

Item 1: Number of Operational Months

Background

The peak season in Park City is active slightly less than five months per year depending on snowfall amounts. The true peak period, during which the 900 space deficit occurs, begins in late December and concludes during the first week of April. Following this period, there is a shoulder season of approximately two and a half months, and another peak summer period which commences in July and extends through Labor Day. Staff does not recommend year-round paid parking during the first year since deficits are not experienced throughout the entire year.

Analysis

The available options for enacting paid parking in the first year are:

1) Five months to include the winter ski season only;
2) Six-Seven months inclusive of the winter and the majority of the summer seasons;
3) Nine months of the summer and winter seasons, excluding May and October, and
4) Twelve Months.

Option	***Implications***
5 months Dec 1-April 30	• no parking charges for shoulder and summer visitor • eases into the program • requires varied sign types or sign covers • does not generate sufficient revenues
6 months Dec 15-April 15 July 1-September 1	• no parking charges for shoulder visitors • generates sufficient revenues • ensures efficient peak period summer utilization • requires varied sign types or sign covers
9 months Dec 1 - April 30 June 1-September 30	• no parking charges for the shoulder visitor only • higher revenue generation • requires less guest education • requires varied sign types or sign covers
12 months	• parking charges for all visitors • may become inevitable with future growth • provides the basis for a consistent program • highest revenues

One of Council's goals is to generate enough revenue for the program to break even. In the initial start-up period it is very important to balance this goal with objectives of achieving public acceptance and measuring program performance. Both goals could be appropriately achieved by selecting the six month option because the choice will allow for a break even revenue balance and will operate long enough to demonstrate the merits of peak season utilization. This is less aggressive in comparison than the nine and twelve month approaches. Terms of the operation can be altered in subsequent seasons in order to achieve more consistency or higher revenue streams. **The 6 month recommendation is supported by the Parking Advisory Committee.**

Item 2: Time Limitations

Background
The current time limit on Main Street is two hours which has remained in effect for several years. The present time limits for Zone 2 Swede Alley Spaces are four and twenty-four hours. The four-hour spaces were implemented in 1993. Staff originally recommended a discounted rate of 50 cents with no time limit for the entire area.

Analysis
Efficient paid parking space turnover can be achieved by choosing reasonable rates and by placing restrictions on the amount of time a user is allowed to remain in an area.

Proposed Time Limitation Main St.	***Potential Outcomes***
2-hour	• promotes turnover and improves utilization/fosters perception of available parking spaces • increases parking revenue income • reduces potential shopper browsing time
4-hour	• decreases turnover and utilization unless there is a rate high enough to promote turnover • allows a longer Main Street experience
Proposed Time Limitation on Swede Alley	***Potential Outcomes***
4-hour and 24-hour	• allows short and long-term use • difficult to sign because of parking lot design
24-hour	• allows short-term and long-term use • increases availability • allows affordable long-term customer parking

Main Street Duration
The Historic Main Street Merchants' Association requested the Council to consider a four hour time limit for the premium spaces on Main Street adjacent to storefronts. The reason for this recommendation was their belief that most parkers desire to park in close proximity to shopping and dining. Whereas most business owners understand that the two hour limit opens up additional access to the street, they repeatedly claim that the enforcement consequences of limited two hour duration limits do not encourage visits to Main Street.

Since retaining the two hour limit will be easily achieved if there is a rate differential of 50 cents per hour between Main Street and Swede Alley, staff recommends compliance with the merchant's request. Over 70% of all parkers now park for one and a half hours, and it is likely that this trend will continue with paid parking. **Staff now recommends signing Main Street as a 2 hour parking limit, and allowing meter feeding. The committee concurs with this recommendation.**

Swede Alley Duration

Staff's recommendation to place a time limit on Zone 2 of twenty-four hours is due to several reasons: 1) The average duration in the area is 6 hours or more 2) The area must accommodate resident parking 3) The alley spaces should accommodate parkers who want to park all day and enjoy shopping amenities. The area frequently functions as a long term use lot for shoppers and should continue with this pattern after paid parking. Paid parking will achieve some increased space utilization and availability on Main Street because of the rate structure. **Staff's recommendation is to sign the area with 24 hour limits. The committee concurs with this recommendation.**

Item 3: Number of Spaces in Each Zone

Background

In the March 1997 presentation, staff recommended a tiered rate structure in which the premium on street spaces would be most expensive and remote areas located adjacent to the core would be free. Feedback from the businesses on Main Street indicates concern for the paid parking plan and its effect on area hiring patterns. For this reason, the recommendations for reserved car-pooling spaces on the first level of the China Bridge Garage and the importance of free spaces should be retained as options for employees of the Main Street core.

Analysis

Zone 1 The parking advisory committee and staff concur that 200 spaces on Main Street and Park Avenue between 9th Street and Heber Avenue should be placed in Zone 1.

Zone 2 All lots with access off of Heber or Swede Alley should be considered a part of Zone 2. However, because of the potential shortage of employee parking, the third level of China Bridge Garage should be used as free parking in order place some additional parking into the system for employees. If the third level is removed from the pay system, it reduces annual revenue income. However, the program will still break even. There are two options for third level as specified below.

China Bridge Garage Level 3 Options	***Potential Implications***
Place Level 3 in Zone 2 (50 cents per hour)	eliminates confusion to guests increases parking for guests and patrons
Place Level 3 in Zone 3 (free unlimited parking)	provides more parking that can be utilized by employees

If too many employee spaces are set aside, there will be no incentive for employees to use the rideshare program and the Miner's Hospital Lot. Conversely, if there are not enough free spaces, there will be insufficient employee parking and little public acceptance of the program.

Because of the need to create enough employee spaces, staff recommends that China Bridge Levels 3 and 4, as well as the Sandridge Parking Lot, and the North Marsac lot should be free parking. According to previous studies of peak period employee forecasting, this should create enough parking to accommodate 400 employees. In the event that there are frequent complaints from employees, staff could easily institute a permitted system which would ensure shared parking for both shoppers and employees. However, until the problem develops, staff recommends retaining these areas as free lots so as to ensure peak utilization and available free guest parking.

Item 4: Parking Rates by Zone

Background

The recommended rate structure follows the principle that the premium on-street spaces are the most expensive ($1) and the Swede Alley spaces are more moderately priced (50 cents). The purpose of this rate structure is to provide Main Street customer access to the prime spaces while allowing "off-Main" parking for longer shopping and dining trips.

Analysis

Market rate and duration should be considered concurrently along with their effect on utilization. Market rates for hourly customer parking for an available sample of peer groups indicates ranges of 25 cents to $1 per hour. Resort areas are more likely to have higher rates and to accommodate longer duration periods than large municipalities. Larger business districts typically encourage low rates with a short term duration in order to accommodate access for large populations with wider varieties of trip purposes which are business related.

Peer Group Respondents

City	*Hourly Rates*	*Employee Discounts*
Aspen, CO	$1 on-street, 75¢ garage	30% in garage
Boise, ID	$0.50	33% in garages
Breckenridge, CO	$1.00	undecided
Chapel Hill, NC	75¢	50%
Charleston, SC	50¢ on-street, 75¢ garages	none
Danbury, CT	25¢	none
Helena, MT	25–50¢	15%
Monterey, CA	25¢ Downtown, $2 Cannery Row	30%, 1½-block walk
Salt Lake City, UT	50¢	30%
Santa Barbara, CA	90-min. free, then $1/hr up to $9	75%, 1-block walk
Santa Fe, NM	75¢	none
Tempe, AZ	75¢	100%, permitted areas

Based on the existing high winter demand, the proposed Park City rate structure will achieve increased utilization in all Zones. The $1 per hour premium fee is within the market rate for resort communities. It can be adjusted in the summer according to winter revenue income and according to recommendations from the advisory committee. **Staff recommends $1 per hour for Main Street and 50 cents per hour for Swede Alley Zone 2 spaces. Zone 3 will be free. The advisory committee concurs with this recommendation.**

Item 5: Employee Parking

Background
As is evident from the preceding table, a variety of approaches to employee parking can be rendered. Three fundamental questions for permit pricing should be answered.

1) Should there be discounted employee parking permits?
2) Should there be designated and permit parking areas for employees?
3) How do the options offered to employees affect the amount of available customer parking?

Analysis
Most resort communities do provide employee discounts and provide for shared utilization among employee lots depending on deficit size and regional transit service availability. Since so many Main Street employees drive to work from Salt Lake City, and other outlying areas, staff has recommended that at least 200 spaces within the system be dedicated to free parking for shared use among employees and shoppers. Until employee demand can be adequately measured, staff recommends against dedicated spaces for employees in Zone 3.

In the event that employee parking were to become a more serious issue, adjustments would be made mid-season and some of the lots could be reserved as permit parking for employees. An alternative measure would be to implement permits that could be issued for 10-hour employee parking in Zone 3. The employee could pay an administrative cost of $25 for the winter season. This would allow transportation staff to successfully track trip patterns of the employees and provide an incentive to enter a rideshare bank so that they would be encouraged to car pool. In the initial term of the parking project, Level 3 of China Bridge Garage should remain as free parking. If the employee deficit proves insignificant, the Level 3 of China Bridge could be turned into paid parking in subsequent seasons.

Since the overall goal of the project is to maximize utilization of the upper lots, it would be preferable to direct employees into the free zone. The lots should not be designated as permit only, as employee peaks occur during the midday hour and cease at times when peak customer use increases at night.

Within the Zone 2, employees should be able to purchase hang clocks at the recommended local discount rate. The market rate to park for eight hours in Zone 2 per day is $4.00. In the first season, if the average forecasted 84 day use by the employee occurred over a four month period, the market rate for the permit would be $336 over a winter season. A twenty percent discount equates to approximately $265 for the winter season. Staff recommends use of the clock as a simplified mechanism to permit employees willing to pay the market rate. Additional discounts may be recommended by the committee to ensure sound marketing of the program in its first season. Those discounts will be designed within the budgetary limitations of the program. The hang clock ensures value for employees who frequently come and go from Main Street because the cost is only drawn in the event that they the clock is turned on. Therefore, they would realize more of a value than a hang tag sold for $265, and could be allowed to cash in remaining time at the end of the season. Additionally, if free parking is available in Zone 2, employees who typically park in Zone 2 would have an alternative to park in Zone 3 without using their in-car meter, thereby "freeing up" customer parking in Zone 2. This system would therefore allow both employees and customers access to the free lots and would maximize utilization among all zones.

Staff's recommendation is to allow free 24 hour parking in Zone 3 and to allow unlimited sales of local hang clocks to all employees and visitors at a 20% discounted rate. The committee concurs with this recommendation.

D. Department Review. This proposal has been reviewed by the City Manager, The Director of Public Works, the Director of Public Affairs, and the Mayor's Advisory Committee on Parking.

ALTERNATIVES:

A. Endorse the Advisory Committee's Recommendations

B. Modify the Advisory Committee's Recommendations

C. Continue the Decision on Implementation of the Program

SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:

A. The recommended plan is expected to generate sufficient revenue to at least offset program costs including enforcement. The costs and revenues are compatible with budget projections.

B. Accepting the Committee Recommendations would establish a policy direction for the winter schedule only. The program will be evaluated throughout the winter season and revised accordingly for the following season. The significant impacts of the recommendations are that utilization in Zone 3 will significantly increase, turnover on Main Street will increase, and break even revenues will be achieved.

CONSEQUENCES OF NOT TAKING THE RECOMMENDED ACTION:

A. The Committee has carefully considered the recommended terms of the project, recommended zone sizes and corresponding fees, time limitations, and employee parking. Any modifications to one or more of the committee recommendations may affect the system as a whole.

B. Continuing the decision to implement these policies could delay implementation of the program.

C. Adopting goals different from the goals that the staff and committee have outlined in this memorandum could result in different implementation recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Council should review the Advisory Committee's Recommendations; entertain public questions and comments; and endorse implementation of the Advisory Committee's Recommendations. The general scope includes a six-month operation of paid parking in the initial term which would:

- Allow two hour time limitations with meter feeding and 24 hour time limits in Zones 2 and 3.
- Provide levels 3&4, the Sandridge Lot, and the North Marsac Lot for free unregulated parking for both customers and guests.
- Define and implement performance measures for the program which track revenue, complaints, utilization, turnover and total traffic entering the area.
- Evaluate comprehensive operation of the program at the end of the winter season and design policy for summer recommended changes.