

RPZ NEWS BULLETIN

"Residential Parking Zone" Information

September 1992

The RPZ News Bulletin was prepared by Carol Eychaner, with assistance from Lynn Poser, and in consultation with the ECC Board and Residents' RPZ Committee. Both Carol and Lynn are on the Residents' RPZ Committee, which was formed in August to assist with the final stages of the RPZ and to address RPZ issues. Other members of the Committee include Dick Arnold, Janis Ellis and Tim Yeager. Direct general questions about the RPZ to Carol (324-1716) or Lynn (323-9257).

Little Known Facts about RPZ's

Did you know...

...that residents living north of Roanoke will have the cost of their RPZ permits subsidized by the University of Washington?

...that blocks which do not submit enough signatures supporting the RPZ will not have to participate in the RPZ?

...that eight neighborhoods in Seattle already have RPZ's?

...that many of Eastlake's retail and customer service businesses support the 2-hour daytime RPZ restrictions as well as the nighttime restrictions?

...that an RPZ was earlier promoted by developers and the City as a way to help mitigate the parking and traffic impacts of Eastlake office buildings and other commercial projects?

...that some of the office buildings proposed to be built in Eastlake in the mid-1980's were projected to have as many as 80 to 142 cars parked on Eastlake's residential streets?

...that in 1986, a survey of 163 employees in the Northwest Management Building showed that 88 of these employees regularly parked on the residential streets?

...that the owners of commercial properties and businesses can change the parking status of abutting streets without any petitions, public hearings or comment from the residential neighborhood, even though the change may inhibit or prevent residents from parking on the street?

You can learn about all this and more on the following pages of the RPZ News Bulletin.

RPZ PUBLIC MEETING

WHAT: A public meeting focused solely on the RPZ. In attendance will be members of the Residents' RPZ Committee and the ECC Board, Seattle Engineering Department staff, and residents from other RPZ neighborhoods. The purpose of the meeting is help residents understand the RPZ and the upcoming RPZ approval process, and to hear residents' opinions on RPZ issues, especially the newly-proposed, two-phase RPZ recommended by the Residents' RPZ Committee.

WHEN: Tuesday, September 29, 1992
7:00 to 9:00 pm

WHERE: Police Officers' Guild
2517 Eastlake Avenue East

GREETINGS. This special RPZ News Bulletin is produced by the Eastlake Community Council to inform Eastlake residents of the status of the RPZ and of the upcoming RPZ public meeting. Importantly, the newsletter also introduces a new, two-phase RPZ proposal by the Residents' RPZ Committee.

But we hope the Bulletin will do more. Discussion about the RPZ among Eastlake residents, business owners and employees has been stimulated in recent months by the successful RPZ petition drive, which culminated in the City-determination that the Eastlake area qualified for an RPZ. Numerous meetings have been held, neighbors have talked on the sidewalk, employees have written to the City and some residents and property owners have written letters to local newspapers. While there may be differing opinions about the RPZ, it became apparent from these meetings, discussions and letters that many of us do share a lack of understanding and information about the history of the RPZ and about Eastlake's parking problem.

So we hope that the Bulletin will help to answer some of the questions that have been raised about the RPZ, correct some of the mis-statements that we have heard, and otherwise heighten public awareness of the history of the RPZ and of factors contributing to the parking problem.

RPZ? TMP? SED?

DOES ANYONE KNOW WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT?

Sometimes after working with an issue for awhile, we forget that not everyone knows the particular jargon and terms associated with the issue. So here is a list of the most commonly abbreviated RPZ terms and their definitions. You'll see them throughout this Bulletin.

RPZ ("Residential parking zone"):

Areas where residents and their guests are given preference for on-street parking. RPZ's are established in areas where the non-resident parking demand (such as that from office development, a hospital or the University of Washington) seriously affects residents' ability to park on their own residential streets. Parking for the general public is prohibited or restricted, freeing up the City streets for residents and guests with permits. Restrictions vary from zone to zone as well as within zones.

TMP ("Transportation management program"):

Programs designed for commercial and institutional uses to help reduce the number of employees that drive alone to work, thus reducing the overall traffic and parking congestion on the streets. The emphasis of the programs is to get employees to carpool, vanpool, ride the bus, bike or walk to work.

SOV ("Single occupancy vehicle"):

Generally refers to a commuter who drives alone to work.

SED ("Seattle Engineering Department"):

The City department that helps develop, monitor and enforce RPZ's and TMP's. SED is also involved in reviewing development projects to determine parking and traffic impacts and mitigation for such impacts.

DCLU ("Department of Construction and Land Use"):

The City department that is responsible for reviewing, permitting, and enforcing the permit conditions for development projects. Works closely with SED on traffic and parking impacts and mitigation.

IMPORTANT! New Two-Phase Proposal by Residents' RPZ Committee

More than 1000 Eastlake residents signed the RPZ petitions supporting the 2-hour daytime and split nighttime restrictions that were discussed and approved by residents attending last spring's RPZ meeting. The ECC and Residents' RPZ Committee continue to support these restrictions because they best address the most serious parking impacts and still allow for customer parking that is essential to Eastlake's retail and service businesses. However, in response to some employers' concerns that businesses and employees will not have enough time to adjust to the RPZ restrictions (if implemented immediately as desired by residents) and in order to get SED support for Eastlake's 2-hour daytime RPZ, the Residents' RPZ Committee recently developed and is now recommending a two-phase RPZ (the proposal has not yet been reviewed by the ECC Board). **WE ABSOLUTELY NEED TO HEAR YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT THIS PROPOSAL**, so please attend the RPZ meeting or call Carol (324-1716) or Lynn (323-9257) with your opinions.

Phase One: ONE YEAR ONLY. This phase would be implemented immediately upon approval by City Council, which would be no later than March of next year. The restrictions would be exactly the same as the restrictions that were circulated with the petition *except the daytime restriction for blocks with parking on both sides of the street will be split, 2-hour on one side and 4-hour on the other.* Streets with parking on only one side of the street will have the 2-hour restriction. Nighttime restrictions will remain as circulated in the petition: streets with parking on both sides will be split (no parking without a permit on one side of the street, and unrestricted parking on the other.) Phase One will be in effect until exactly one year after the RPZ program begins, and is dependent upon acceptance of the conditions in Phase Two.

| | |
|---|--|
| 2 | HOUR PARKING |
| | 7AM - 6PM <small>Except Sun-Hol</small> |
| | NO PARKING |
| | 6PM-5AM |
| | EXCEPT BY ZONE 8 PERMIT |

| | |
|---|--|
| 4 | HOUR PARKING |
| | 7AM - 6PM <small>Except Sun-Hol</small> |
| | EXCEPT BY ZONE 8 PERMIT |

Phase Two: PERMANENT. One year after the implementation of Phase One, the split 2-hour/4-hour daytime parking restrictions on all blocks will be automatically converted to the 2-hour daytime restrictions that were agreed upon at the residents' spring 1992 meeting and that were subsequently circulated with the petitions. (No change to nighttime restrictions). Conversion to these restrictions will not require any additional approvals from City Council, SED or any party.

| | |
|---|--|
| 2 | HOUR PARKING |
| | 7AM - 6PM <small>Except Sun-Hol</small> |
| | NO PARKING |
| | 6PM-5AM |
| | EXCEPT BY ZONE 8 PERMIT |

| | |
|---|--|
| 2 | HOUR PARKING |
| | 7AM - 6PM <small>Except Sun-Hol</small> |
| | EXCEPT BY ZONE 8 PERMIT |

The 2-hour restriction can only be changed by the residents on blocks participating in the RPZ, and then only after careful evaluation of the SED survey of residents (which is to be prepared in consultation with the ECC and performed 6 months after the initial RPZ implementation) and preparation of a plan with alternative restrictions that ultimately receives approval by SED and the residents participating in the RPZ.

The above conditions must be specifically included in the legislation adopted by City Council for Eastlake's RPZ.

Office Buildings, TMP's and the RPZ

A Brief History Lesson (in Small Print)

Eastlake's parking congestion is created, in part, by overflow from old and new houses, apartment buildings and condos that do not have enough on-site parking for residents and their guests. However, long-term, non-resident vehicle parking is increasingly occupying Eastlake's residential streets throughout both the day and night.

Why do we have a non-resident parking problem? Long-term, non-resident parking has several sources. UW students and staff use Eastlake streets (particularly those to the north) for free parking because of the short walking distance and convenient bus routes to the UW. Eastlake also has numerous, small businesses, which often have little or no on-site parking. Each of these businesses, taken individually, has a negligible impact on the overall Eastlake parking supply, but when considered together, they create a substantially greater cumulative demand for on-street parking spaces.

And, of course, we have all witnessed the commuter who drives to Eastlake and hops a bus downtown. The downtown commuter is often cited as Eastlake's primary parking villain, but there are no studies to support this. It simply appears more egregious for a downtown commuter to park on Eastlake streets than for an Eastlake commuter to do so; after all, at least the Eastlake commuter works in and contributes to the neighborhood.

While Eastlake's small businesses and the UW and downtown commuters all contribute to parking congestion on residential streets, many of the non-resident vehicles come from Eastlake's larger office buildings. This is particularly true in Eastlake's "core" between Hamlin and Newton, where most of the office buildings and residents are located and where the RPZ is generally proposed.

Office development parking impact. Several studies demonstrate the full extent of the parking demand and impacts from office building development. Most of these were prepared in the mid-1980's, when Eastlake was experiencing a surge of proposed office and other commercial development that proved to have overwhelming impacts on the community's on-street residential parking supply.

At that time, daytime parking on Eastlake's residential streets was (as it is now) already at capacity, due primarily to projects that had been allowed to be constructed without any mitigation of parking impacts. The parking overflow from the new proposals (several of which have now been built) simply could not be accommodated in the neighborhood without further displacing resident and short-term customer vehicles.

The April 1986 Eastlake Corridor "Transportation Impact Analysis" prepared on behalf of the developers of the proposed office buildings, analyzed the parking demand from many of the buildings. For example, the office buildings at 2825 Eastlake (Eastlake Center Phase I and II) were projected to have 62 to 142 cars overflowing onto the nearby streets. The office building at 2324 Eastlake (which now houses Children's University Physicians and Gilmore Research) would have an overflow of 45 to 80 cars. Remember, these were not community-generated numbers, but projections by the developers' own expert consultants.

In addition, Eastlake resident Jules James conducted a survey of an office building that was already built at 2323 Eastlake. The 1986 survey of 163 (out of 409) employees in the Northwest Management Building showed that 85% of those employees drove to work alone. 88 of the 163 employees surveyed parked on neighborhood streets.

To give the above parking demand numbers some meaning, consider that overflow from the Northwest Management Building employees that were surveyed in 1986 would have filled the entire block of Franklin between Louisa and Lynn, plus 1/2 the block to the south.

TMP mitigation. The developers wanted to build their buildings, but permit approval would necessarily require mitigation of the significant parking impacts. Both the City and the developers looked for and found mitigation that would allow the buildings to go forward without requiring building reductions or more parking spaces: the TMP.

(Continued on page 5)

("History Lesson", continued from page 4)

The idea was that employees in Eastlake's new office buildings would, in large numbers, take the bus and carpool to work, thus reducing the demand for parking on residential streets. TMP goals would be set, employers would offer financial incentives to carpool and take the bus, and SED/DCLU would carefully monitor the buildings to make certain TMP goals were met. Existing office buildings would voluntarily join the new buildings in a neighborhood-wide TMP effort.

The TMP goals that were contemplated during the office building permit review process, and that were subsequently incorporated in the City/developer TMP contracts, were necessarily aggressive and high, as the goals were based on the need to eliminate parking overflow rather than reflect what each building could realistically achieve. For instance, the TMP for Eastlake Center Phase I required that 47% of the employees commute by carpool, bus, etc.; Hart-Crowser (at 1910 Fairview) had a non-SOV goal of 53% of the employees.

The RPZ would make the TMP work. Many Eastlake residents questioned what would happen if the optimistic TMP goals were not met. The City assured residents that it would strictly enforce the TMP goals and extolled the benefits of a neighborhood-wide, transportation management group that would also attract existing office development that was already permitted and could not be retroactively required to reduce parking impacts. And, importantly, in case none of this worked, both the City and developers said Eastlake would have an RPZ by 1989 that would all but eliminate the impacts of proposed and existing office development on the residential street parking.

While DCLU did not require that an RPZ be in place before any of the new office development could occur, it was clear that the City and the developers embraced and promoted the RPZ as being an important factor in reducing employee demand for parking and increasing the effectiveness of the required TMP's. The DCLU Analysis and Decision for each of the proposed office developments, including the Hart-Crowser and Eastlake Phase II buildings, stated the following:

- that "on-street parking availability will be absolutely precluded in the adjacent residential zone with the implementation of the Residential Parking Zone (RPZ) proposed to be established in 1989;"
- that "available on-street parking is essentially used to capacity and the 1989 RPZ would drastically reduce the on-street parking supply available to employees and visitors of the proposed projects;" and,
- that "the effectiveness of a cooperative Transportation Management Program is enhanced when SOV reliance is less possible with strict parking limitations," such as those imposed by the RPZ.

In addition, the Hart-Crowser building, which was one of the last projects to be permitted, was approved with a condition stating "support shall be given [to] the Residential Parking Zone to be instituted to the north."

The message was clear. The existing and future parking demand from commercial development was a significant impact on residents who relied on residential street parking. The City genuinely believed that the TMP's and neighborhood transportation management group would substantially reduce or eliminate that demand. But, in the event the TMP's did not work, residents would not have to worry because an RPZ was imminent (scheduled for 1989) and that would solve not only the parking problem created by the new buildings but also address the impacts from projects already constructed.

TMP performance. So, now that three of the office buildings have been constructed and occupied for several years, how are the TMP's working? Consider the following. Eastlake Towers (214 Galer) has a non-SOV goal of about 28 employees; that is, 28 employees are to take the bus, carpool, vanpool, bike, or walk to work. As of March 1992, there were only 5 non-SOV employees. Hart-Crowser (1910 Fairview) has a non-SOV goal of more than 89 employees, but as of March 1992, there were only 35. Only Walker, Richer & Quinn at Eastlake Center (2825 Eastlake) is coming close to or exceeding its TMP goals, with 106 out of 199 employees identified in its March 1992 report as non-SOV. *(End)*

RPZ Notes

Offices Make Parking Proposal. Since the public meeting on the RPZ last spring, Eastlake residents circulated petitions and collected sufficient signatures in support of restricted parking on residential streets to qualify for an RPZ. But during the summer months, businesses concerned about losing the free, long-term parking on residential streets that is used by their employees, convinced the Seattle Engineering Department (SED) to postpone the RPZ hearing tentatively scheduled for August/September so they could develop an alternative proposal. This proposal and others have been discussed in numerous meetings involving the ECC (and the Resident's RPZ Committee), some of Eastlake's businesses and/or the Engineering Department.

Business representatives from Eastlake's large and small office buildings developed a parking proposal with the goal of eliminating the need for an RPZ. The No-RPZ proposal seeks to remove 95 Eastlake employee cars from the residential streets with the idea that, if the cars are removed, Eastlake will no longer qualify for an RPZ.

The businesses propose to do this primarily by promoting non-SOV use through new TMP's (which would include coordinating commuter information with other businesses, and working to encourage businesses to subsidize bus passes, car pools and van pools), lobbying METRO to improve bus service to the area, and creating new parking lots. According to the proposal, if the above strategies removed 95 Eastlake employee cars off the residential streets within two years, there would be no RPZ. If not, a 4-hour RPZ would be established but only in conjunction with the creation of 208 business parking permits, which would be issued to Eastlake employees so they could legally park within the RPZ.

The ECC and Residents' RPZ Committee have reviewed the office proposal and have prepared a response. Copies of both the proposal and response will be available at the RPZ meeting.

RPZ Schedule. Although the RPZ process was delayed during the summer months in response to concerns raised by office representatives, SED now appears to be willing to move forward with Eastlake's petitions. Eastlake residents will be making final decisions about the two-phase RPZ proposal, and some residents will no doubt be gathering additional signatures for blocks that did not qualify for the RPZ during the first door-to-door canvas. If Eastlake residents agree with the two-phase RPZ, SED has indicated that it will recommend approval of the restrictions, and will begin its field work (required for posting signs) this fall. Two hearings will be scheduled for the RPZ: the first in front of the Street Use Committee, which SED estimates would occur by the end of the year, and the second in front of City Council, which would be at the beginning of next year. The addresses for writing to Street Use Committee and City Council members will be distributed at the October 29 RPZ meeting. If City Council approves the RPZ, SED has agreed to post RPZ signs soon thereafter. Although we have not yet received a formal response from the office representatives about the two-phase RPZ, their initial reaction was not supportive (we have been told to expect major opposition from at least one business owner).

Other Neighborhood RPZ's. Neighborhoods that restrict parking for non-residents are Montlake, University Park, First Hill, and the neighborhood around Providence Hospital (all with a 2-hour, daytime parking limit and unrestricted nighttime parking), Wallingford (no parking without a permit 5pm to midnight), Fauntleroy (no parking without a permit 2-5am), Yesler Terrace (no parking anytime except by permit) and the neighborhood around Group Health, which has two zones (2-hour daytime parking limit close to Group Health and 3-hour limit farther away from the Hospital).

RPZ Notes (continued)

RPZ Permit Fees. RPZ permits are renewed every 2 years for a \$27 fee, which pays for administering the RPZ program. A neighborhood may opt for annual permit renewal but because SED charges the full \$27 for each renewal period, such a program would actually be more expensive (\$54 for two years).

UW RPZ Subsidy. Thanks to the hard work of CUCAC (City/University/Community Advisory Committee) and neighborhood representatives that follow UW expansion activities, particularly Bob Klug (Laurelhurst) and Marilyn de Guzman (Eastlake), the cost of the RPZ permits for Eastlake households north of Roanoke Street will be subsidized by the UW.

This area is designated as a "secondary impact zone" in the UW's 1990 General Physical Development Plan (GPDP), which was approved earlier this year by the City Council and the UW Board of Regents. One of the hard-fought conditions of GPDP approval was that the UW must subsidize existing and future RPZ's in the primary and secondary impact zones. As a result, the UW will, at each two-year renewal period, pay for 75% of the first RPZ permit purchased by each household north of Roanoke. Thus, a household purchasing one 2-year resident permit will only have to pay \$6.75, instead of the normal \$27 fee (any additional permits must be paid in full by the resident).

Retail Businesses Support 2-Hour RPZ. Not all businesses in Eastlake oppose the RPZ. Many of the retail and service oriented businesses, such as the restaurants and deli's, support the RPZ restrictions because they will make more on-street spaces available for both resident and short-term (2 hour) customer parking.

Like the residents, these small, customer-oriented businesses are adversely affected when a substantial number of the available on-street parking spaces are occupied by employee vehicles for the entire day. While the retail/service businesses can, where possible, help their own employees acquire non-SOV commuting habits, it is much more difficult to affect customer modes of transportation. This is why we see so many neighborhood retail districts with metered parking, to assure that there will be frequent turnover in the use of the parking spaces.

Eastlake residents Jules James and Dick Arnold conducted several surveys of retail/neighborhood service businesses in Eastlake to determine their position on the RPZ. The surveys, conducted in April, May and August, identified 55 retail/storefront businesses, 50 of which were contacted by Jules or Dick. While some of the businesses chose not to respond to the survey, 27 businesses said they were in favor of the 2-hour RPZ and 6 were opposed.

Double standard. Establishing restricted parking on residential streets is a lengthy process that involves a parking and license plate study by SED, strict qualifying procedures, hours of petitioning, and numerous public meetings and hearings. Many RPZ processes take up to three years.

Establishing restricted parking on commercial streets, however, is only a phone call away. A commercial property or business owner need only place a phone call to SED requesting the parking restrictions, such as a load zone or 2-hour parking, and within days SED technicians have evaluated the request and, more often than not, installed the signs. No elaborate studies, petitions, public hearings or consultation with the adjacent residential neighborhood.

The most recent example of how quickly and quietly parking restrictions requested by commercial users can be installed can be seen on Boston, just east of Eastlake, where 1-hour restrictions were posted. The signs effectively precluded residents living on that street from daytime parking on a portion of the street.

Oct.31: Last Chance to Qualify for the RPZ
Contact Dick Arnold at 323-2711

SED requires that 60% of the households in the RPZ area must sign the RPZ petition in order for Eastlake to qualify for the RPZ. Based on this criteria, the overall Eastlake area qualified for the RPZ. The Eastlake RPZ boundary is somewhat irregular but not all the streets within this area will be subject to RPZ restrictions. Street blocks that are zoned and developed for commercial uses are not eligible for RPZ restrictions. Other residential blocks that are eligible may not have submitted signatures from 60% of the households on the block. In such cases, the blocks can continue to have unrestricted parking even while parking on other blocks is restricted. Or they can petition to join the RPZ at any future time. Only those blocks that submitted enough signatures supporting the RPZ will have restricted parking. All non-qualifying blocks are shown on the RPZ Map and are listed below.

The ECC wants to make certain that no block is overlooked during the initial implementation of the RPZ. While some blocks may simply not want to participate in the RPZ, others may not have qualified because they were not actively canvassed. To make certain the initial RPZ is as inclusive as possible, additional RPZ petitions for eligible but non-qualifying blocks can be submitted to the ECC through October 31. If a resident intends to submit additional signatures, he/she must contact Dick Arnold (323-2711) of the Residents' RPZ Committee to obtain the appropriate petition materials. **DO NOT CIRCULATE PETITIONS WITHOUT FIRST CALLING DICK.** Dick will also be able to help identify which households have already signed the petitions.

Blocks Not Qualifying (Signatures Needed)

- Boylston: Boston - Lynn (6)
 Roanoke - Edgar (9)
 Edgar - Hamlin (4)
 Hamlin - Franklin (21)
- Franklin: Blaine - Howe (?)
 Howe - Newton (6)
 Shelby to end (20)
- Fairview: Boston - Lynn (41)
 Lynn - Louisa (68)
 Roanoke - Edgar (12)
 Edgar - Hamlin (17)
- Newton: Boylston - Franklin (5)
 Eastlake - Yale (24)
- Lynn: Boylston - Franklin (5)
 Eastlake - Yale (12)
 Minor - Fairview (6)
- Roanoke: Eastlake - Yale (6)
 Yale - Fairview (13)
- Edgar: Boylston - Franklin (1)
 Franklin - Eastlake (5)
 Eastlake - Yale (?)

