



Parking Technical Advisory Group

728 St. Helens; Room 16

Meeting #79 – February 20, 2014, Notes

4:10 Meeting called to order by Co-Chairs

Rollie Herman, one of the co-chairs, called the meeting to order.

The PTAG reviewed the 2/6/14 meeting notes, but did not take action.

The PTAG did not make any adjustments to the on & off street rate recommendations from the prior meeting.

4:20 RPZ Discussion: Current Status

Dana Brown, from the City of Tacoma, gave an overview of the timelines and tasks associated with the restricted parking zone [RPZ] discussion/decision.

Currently, the City is not establishing new RPZs. When they were establishing them, it required 100% participation/opt-in from the property owners impacted. To support the expenses with the program, the signs were charged at cost to the zone proposer and unlimited term permits were sold at \$2.00 each.

The City is now looking to establish guiding principles for a revamp of the permit program.

In examining the areas where permits exist and are requested, the areas are those areas where residential and non-residential uses co-exist – particularly around single-family detached homes.

This includes the following areas:

- Around the hospitals
- Stadium District
- 6th Avenue District

These areas highlight some of the discrepancies between zoning and uses.

- Around Tacoma General Hospital there are both R4 (residential) zoning as well as HM (hospital/medical) zoning that are currently being used the same way with high-density residential across the street from each other.
- In the Stadium area, both RCX (residential) & NRX (residential) are being used for very different types of residential.
- Along 6th Avenue there is both NCX (commercial) & NRX (residential) being used similarly.

Bill Timmer, a consultant to the City, introduced some of his research and background on RPZs. Some of the key things he recommended keeping in mind included:

- Thresholds/Criteria for establishing an area:
 - Parking density
 - Proximity to parking magnet
 - Hunting permit v. guaranteed stall
 - Additional criteria on locations?

[DB] noted that there are 8 locations that have requested a RPZ that are on hold pending the outcome of this process. These include 6th Avenue, near Stadium High School, near Tacoma General, and at 8th & Sprague.

[BT] suggested the advisory group consider some of the following questions in putting together a program:

- Zoning (residential, commercial, mixed use...)
- Street Type (local, arterial...)
- Parking Occupancy (50%, 85%, 100%, at what time...)
- Minimum RPZ size (1 block face, 30, 50...)

The advisory group needs to keep in mind a process for decommissioning the current system.

In the vein of the advisory group's guiding principles, [BT] recommended the following principles for RPZs in residentially zoned areas:

- The right-of-way is a resource for the common good
- Residential parkers are the priority
- All parkers should be allowed
- Simple to use system
- System must consider the fiscal & systemic impacts (including price & enforcement)

He also noted that this system becomes much more complex in mixed use areas.

When considering zone eligibility, an example could be an area that is 85% parked over 62 faces with 70% of the property owners supporting it.

The group discussed whether property owners, car owners, residents, or some other criteria should have the ability to vote on the creation of the zone. The group came to no conclusions.

Some questions from the advisory group and discussion (summarized):

- Should we be considering off-street stall availability?
 - Undetermined. May alter the ability to get support within an area.
- Any ideas on how to sunset existing system? How to extinguish a newly created area if it's not working for residents?
 - Still working on it.
- We should allow permit OR time limited both. Why would we only allow resident only?
 - Agree, allow all users, but priority for residents.
- How would we define a parking generator?
 - Tough question. Much easier to just base it on occupancy. However, creating a RPZ where there are only residents would have no impact on the parking availability. Local residents should be educated on this rather than spending the money on an RPZ when they won't receive any benefit.

- Discussion of what areas would be open to receiving an RPZ. The zoning is the cleanest, but the advisory group was hesitant to support zoning without seeing the repercussions/applications.
- Consider the implementation in Santa Rosa, CA.
 - Will look into it.
- The needs may be different between day & night and different seasons. Can we limit the hours/days of applicability?
 - Yes, but we also don't want to make it too complicated.
- Guest passes should be something physical.
 - Likely to be the case, but also looking into license plate tie ins.

The City will:

- Propose a framework for a program
- Identify some appropriate on-the-ground examples
- Look at zoning options as the foundation for a system
- Create a proposal for sunseting the existing system

5:50

What's Next

[RH] reminded the group that we would need to wrap up the rates conversation at our next meeting. This should include a conversation about capacity of the off-street system and potential impacts of pricing. In particular, how a reduction in the off-street rate will impact occupancy.

There was also a reminder that the City was hosting a parking system branding discussion next Thursday, 2/27 from 5-7PM at the Wells Fargo Building's Fountain Court. Advisory group members are invited to attend and participate.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 with the next meeting on March 6th.