

ATTACHMENT A to White Paper: Central City Transportation Plan Update-Issues and Considerations (June 3, 2015)

KEY OUTCOME: The primary desired outcome will be to establish a more relevant and market sensitive CCTMP that continues to support the values of the original foundation elements and can be organized into a more usable, efficient and streamlined format.

#	Issue	Consideration - Solution
1	Maintain the policy framework that structures parking regulations to support goals for Air Quality, Economic Development, Mode Split Goals and Historic Preservation.	No change. This is a basic premise of plan.
2	Adjust or "recalibrate" parking ratios	<p>There is likely a need to recalibrate ratios within Central City parking districts to both reflect evolved transit/bike/walk capacities and true market economics for parking development. This could result in potential increases in maximum ratios in the core and corresponding reductions in current maximums on the edges to achieve a net loss of new parking in the future.</p> <p>Consider adjusting current maximum residential ratios to a more uniform Central City standard and introducing maximum ratios in Central City districts where there are no maximums today. Initial data suggests that few residential developments in the Central City are building more than 1.0 per unit.</p> <p>Recalibration of ratios downward could be used to justify allowing more flexible operation within approved parking types that is currently not allowed (e.g., shared use of residential and limits on specific monthly pass sales in Preservation Parking).</p> <p>Consider reducing the number of parking sectors from 26 to fewer as part of a code simplification effort facilitated by standardizing ratios across the Central City where possible.</p>
3	Surface lots with no new development	Continue (reaffirm) the prohibition on new surface parking that is not associated with the creation of new building area.
4	Surface lots with new development	<p>a. Not allow new surface lots with new development. More flexibility in the use of parking (see issue #5 below) would be allowed so long as new parking is built in a structure or underground. [Maybe landscaping requirements in the code are no longer needed.]</p> <p>b. Move all districts to the current downtown standard (33.510.263 A.2.)</p> <p>c. Couple with maximum ratios for all uses (Issue 2, above) and elimination of "accessory" operating restrictions on residential, hotel and Preservation parking [see Issue 5 below].</p> <p>d. There is a need to clarify the role of the 200,000 sf of "capped" surface parking stalls in the South Waterfront district regarding: (1) City's ability to build surface parking beyond cap, (2) the ability to move "capped" stalls around the district as redevelopment occurs, and (3) define whether "capped" stalls are permanent or sunset.</p>
5	Operating restrictions: Accessory and Shared parking (allowing all approved parking to share uses)	<p>a. Eliminate "accessory" restrictions on all parking approved under a maximum ratio and in a structure.</p> <p>b. Eliminate reporting/monitoring requirements for all parking approved under a maximum ratio and in a structure.</p> <p>c. Consider similar flexibilities for existing parking facilities (e.g., Central Eastside, Lloyd District).</p>
6	Transferring Parking Entitlements	<p>a. Set all Preservation parking ratios at the same level as those for new development.</p> <p>b. Eliminate Preservation operating restrictions and allow all parking approved under maximum ratios to operate as Growth Parking.</p> <p>c. Consider Preservation entitlements for Residential and Hotel.</p> <p>d. Eliminate Eligibility List and Preservation Parking Reserve.</p> <p>e. Consider a more efficient approach to accounting for approval of parking entitlements in the future.</p>
7	Visitor Parking	<p>a. Reconsider on-going need for Visitor Parking – i.e., parking not associated with particular developments.</p> <p>b. Consider reevaluation of current "demand criteria" for determining visitor need.</p> <p>c. Evaluate more realistic options for approving future visitor facilities, particularly City owned and operated SmartPark garages.</p>
8	Parking manager and monitoring	a. Simplify regulations in general. Consider whether Parking Manager role is needed, and if so, what would be a good role for it and what would be the right, implementable and enforceable monitoring requirements, if any.