



## **Parking Technical Advisory Group**

**728 St. Helens; Room 16**

**Meeting #106 – September 1, 2016, Notes**

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

Joe Loran, one of the co-chairs, called the meeting to order.

Eric Huseby from the City of Tacoma gave an overview of some of the things the City has been working on recently.

- The Restricted Parking Program was moving forward and being placed on Council's agenda. As a reminder, this will not address the challenges surrounding mixed use centers.
- The Parking Services will be moving into a new space on the Pacific Avenue side of Park Plaza North before the end of the year. It will be shared with Republic Parking to encourage more shared conversations around the on-street and off-street systems.

### **4:30 Parking System Updates – Budgets**

[EH] explained that the City of Tacoma is going through its biennial budgeting process. The focus of much of this process is on the City's general fund which pays for many of the non-fee for service type services throughout the City. This includes police, fire, libraries, social services, economic development and other departments. As a reminder, the general fund does not include the parking enterprise fund.

When paystations were installed in Tacoma, a separate enterprise fund was established to ensure that all monies collected by the parking system were spent only to operate and maintain the parking system. This is not the case in many other cities, where the parking system is often turned to in order to support other general government services.

Long term this should protect the parking system from outside demands, however, in the short term, the parking enterprise fund has a large amount of debt. The debt payments are coming due over the coming years.

The parking fund is budgeting these debt service payments for facilities and equipment. Thankfully, the parking services fund has been able to outperform recently, in large part to

substantial subscriptions in off-street facilities. This has meant that the City's general fund has not needed to subsidize the parking fund as originally projected. However, maintaining this path is also dependent on continued monthly permit sales to major tenants.

[EH] answered some questions from the PTAG regarding finances and schedule. The City Council is expected to approve the budget by the beginning of December.

#### **5:00 Discussion: Mixed Use Centers [MUC]**

David Schroedel, a consultant, discussed the success of the Restricted Permit Parking Program designed to support the residential areas that have influxes of outside parkers. He noted that it did not address parking issues in mixed use centers [MUCs] where both residential (often times higher density residential) and non-residential uses are expected to co-exist. Over the next few months, the PTAG would be approaching the issue of how to balance competing needs in a mixed use environment.

In developing both the downtown parking principles and the residential parking principles, there was a great deal of discussion around who was the priority user and how to make the system work best for them. In the MUCs the priority user is likely not so clear-cut, particularly as the MUCs vary widely in type, current use, potential for growth, and neighborhood vision. [DS] suggested PTAG members visit some of the MUCs before next meeting.

#### **5:15 Discussion: Proctor MUC Parking Analysis**

[EH] shared the data collected in the Proctor MUC as a result of community interest and concerns around recent and future development. The data was collected daily for about a week to evaluate day time use as well as during the Saturday farmer's market. In short there is not a district-wide parking problem – as defined as exceeding the 85% parked rule.

As [EH] drilled into the on-street data at finer and finer levels, it became clear that there were some very minor hot spots stretching for two blocks down the south side of Proctor Street from N. 24<sup>th</sup> to N. 26<sup>th</sup>.

The 2400 block of this stretch had 6 stalls and a large bus zone. These stalls were unregulated and likely were parked up with employees within the district. If the neighborhood wanted to address these, time limits could be put in place.

The 2500 block had another 6 general stalls. These had 2 hour time limits, but were consistently parked. Additional enforcement would be the next step if this was considered a problem, but would need to include more than 6 stalls.

After reporting these findings to stakeholders in Proctor, most thought that no additional action or changes were needed to parking in the Proctor MUC.

The PTAG felt that the exercise was valuable to get an understanding of current parking conditions, particularly as the conditions may change as more development occurs. There was some limited discussion around obtaining more parking counts in MUCs going forward.

**The meeting was adjourned at 6:10PM with the next meeting on 10/7.**