



Parking Technical Advisory Group

728 St. Helens; Room 16

Meeting #119 – October 5, 2017, Notes

4:10 Meeting called to order by Co-Chairs

Judi Hyman, one of the co-chairs, called the meeting to order. The attendees introduced themselves.

Rachel Lindahl from the City of Tacoma gave a brief update on some of the parking related items the City has been working on:

- Parking Day was very successful with the Parking Services Group doing a dunk tank.

[JH] gave an update on the Transportation Commission, noting that they are thinking about how to plan for parking in new developments.

4:30 Discussion: RPZ Establishment Thresholds

[RL] gave an update on what the current thresholds are for the establishment of an RPZ. The petition process was originally built with a 30 day signature gathering timeline, but that has been extended as getting engagement from residents has been challenging.

There are three active applications to establish an RPZ with between 44 and 200 residences in each. Currently, residents and response rates for each of the areas is as follows:

Proposed RPZs	Residences	Response Rate to Date
S. 8 th & I	201	13%
Stadium District	111	18%
26 th & Alder (no existing RPZ)	40	52%

Current standards require an affirmative petition from at least 60% of the eligible residences. Despite having repeatedly extended the window for response, none of the three proposed zones are close to having the minimum number of responses.

The group took some time to discuss various options including:

- Moving from residents to property owners as eligible petitioners.
- Requiring separate thresholds for responses and supporters.
 - This idea was evaluated in terms of voting responses where the people who choose to participate are the ones who make the decisions. For example, even if only 10% of the eligible residents respond, should the 60% reply to those who responded?
 - Is there a minimum response rate that should still be required? Is the super majority of respondents still appropriate?
 - One idea that was explored was having a minimum number of responses or % of eligible respondents, whichever is greater. This would allow small zones to have a set number, while larger zones would see a higher absolute number, but a lower percentage.

Regardless of methodology, the PTAG strongly felt that effective communication and ensuring petitioners were aware, was critical to ensuring an opportunity to participate.

5:30 Public Comment

There were two members of the public who provided comments:

- A resident of The Ansonia at Tacoma Avenue and North 3rd Street expressed concerns about converting Tacoma Avenue to short term parking as it is currently parked up all day and evening. This concern extended to using 2-hour parking as a tool overall since most residents are parking for more than 2-hours. Finally, there were concerns about limited hours of enforcement since Stadium District has high levels of activity throughout the day & night.

Staff let the commenter know that the system was designed to be flexible and respond to parking demand. Early in the process, it would be difficult to identify vehicles from the area as opposed to those from outside the area. But it should be possible to adjust enforcement to the highest demand times.

- A property owner had concerns about a few of her properties. At 4th & Yakima, she was concerned about MultiCare employees taking all the on-street parking. Currently, there is no RPZ option. Another property on North Pine is impacted by parking around the E9 restaurant. This area is residentially zoned and would be eligible for an RPZ, assuming enough neighbors were also interested. The final area was near 6th & S. I Street. This is an area that is currently collecting petitions for an RPZ. Unfortunately, the property owner was unaware that petitions were being collected.

The meeting was adjourned at 6PM with the next meeting on 11/2.