



## Parking Technical Advisory Group

728 St. Helens; Room 16

### Meeting #88 – November 6, 2014, Notes

#### 4:10 Meeting called to order by Co-Chairs

Steph Farber, one of the co-chairs, called the meeting to order. The October 2nd Meeting Notes were approved as presented.

Eric Huseby, Parking Services Manager for the City of Tacoma gave an update on the impact of changes made to the system in August/September. These changes include rate adjustments in the paid parking area for on- & off-street stalls. On-street paystation rates went from \$0.75 per hour to \$1 per hour. Off-street rates were substantially reduced for short and intermediate transient parking moving from \$7.50 for 3 hours to \$2 for 3 hours. However, the rate change was expected to likely deter all day transient parking. The full off-street change was as follows:

Time Stay	Old Off-Street Rate	New Off-Street Rate
0-1hr	\$2.50	\$2.00
1-2hr	\$5.00	
2-3hr	\$7.50	
3-4hr	\$10.00	\$4.00
4-5hr	\$12.50	\$8.00
5-6hr		\$12.00
6+hr		\$16.00

[EH] led the group through a review of a shortened occupancy count, on-street transaction data and parking information from the garages. In short, there was a small drop in on-street occupancy with the rate increase – exactly as was hoped for when implementing the rate change. However, the caveat was made that this is very limited data since the change was made so recently.

The garages have continued to be full, but there was insufficient data to determine the impact of the rate change. There was a robust discussion within the technical advisory group about possible approaches to capacity challenges at Pacific Plaza. Currently Pacific Plaza does not have capacity to accommodate transient parkers despite one of the foundations of the off-street system being that it never turns away short-term parkers.

[EH] also shared data on the roll out of paystations and more consistent time stays around the County-City Building on Tacoma Avenue. The paystations have lowered occupancies, but only minimally. With additional changes anticipated around the County-City Building it will be interesting to see how the parking situation changes moving forward. Of significant note to the

PTAG, [EH] noted that the City was still on track to end the paper jury permits 1/1/15. The court system was continuing to look for alternatives and was unhappy with the January changes.

#### **4:35 Review: Residential Parking Program Feedback Review**

The PTAG has been gathering feedback on a residential parking program for some time. Bill Timmer, a consultant to the City, drafted a proposal for the PTAG to review and provide some additional feedback on. After reviewing the outline, which followed the public comment and PTAG recommendations from prior meetings closely, [BT] asked the group to take up some outstanding questions:

- **Parking Study Fee:** The City was looking at options to defray some of the costs of the parking occupancy study associated with a request for a residential parking zone as well as set a small barrier to make sure residents were serious at the time of application. The proposal was to charge a nominal fee of \$250 per application. It was noted that any applications would need to include 10 block faces, which would likely be at least 25 homes for a cost of less than \$10/home. **The City suggested reimbursing the application fee if approved, however while the PTAG supported the fee it recommended against that due to challenges in reimbursing the “right” party and the fact that the review of an application would likely run about \$2,000.**
- **Unlimited Visitor Passes:** Some concerns were raised about making unlimited visitor passes available. This had the potential to encourage more stalls to be sold than were available and could result in potential abuse of the permit system. **After some discussion about rates and potential approaches to “limiting the number of friends someone could have over,” the PTAG affirmed its recommendation to offer unlimited visitor passes at \$1/day.**
- **Non-Passenger Vehicles:** When considering how to handle vehicles that are not passenger vehicles – commercial trucks, recreational vehicles, boats, etc – the group was torn on whether or not residents should be allowed to park these types of vehicles on the street when they both took up more than one stall and were often parked for multiple days at a time. This question really came to a head when examining an area with already constrained parking. **Since the residents themselves would choose to implement the residential parking program, the PTAG felt that these vehicles should not be allowed to have residential parking permits, but could use visitor passes.** This would allow for short term stays, but charge a higher rate if someone was parking for multiple days. However the PTAG asked the City to look at some comparable cities to see how other areas handled this issue.

City staff took these recommendations with the intention of integrating them into the Residential Parking Program. They would gather feedback from the community between now and the January PTAG meeting.

The PTAG discussed meeting dates looking forward and decided to meet on 12/4 to discuss the 2015 work plan. The January PTAG meeting was moved to 1/8 rather than 1/1. At this meeting, they hoped to wrap up the recommendations on the Residential Parking Program

**The meeting was adjourned at 6PM with the next meeting on 12/4/14.**