

Category	Factor	Measure	Issue #1: User-friendliness					Issue #2: Under-utilization (off-street)				Issue #3: On-street parking shortages		
			1. Do Nothing	2. Improve signage, education and enforcement	3. Adopt innovative payment technologies	4. Change parking policies (e.g. eliminate 5 hour no reparking)	5. Implement parking pricing	1. Do Nothing	2. Sell or terminate lease on underutilized lots	3. Designate remote lots for long-stay parking to free up prime spaces	4. "Green" lots by landscaping	1. Do Nothing	2. Modify parking time restrictions and enforcement to achieve more turnover	3. Implement parking pricing to reduce use as long-stay parking
Natural	Effect on natural environment	Change in impermeable surface area	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	Reduced if land used for other purposes	No change	Reduced with landscaping	No change	No change	No change
		Estimated change in emissions of air contaminants from motorized vehicles	No reduction	Possible decrease due to reduced circling the block	No change	No change	Possible reduction if mode shift occurs	No reduction	Reduced if land used for other purposes	No change	Reduced if land used for other purposes	No reduction	No reduction	Possible decrease due to reduced circling the block
Social	Effect on pedestrian and cycling environment	Qualitative assessment of safety impacts	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	Fewer parking lots could result in reduced driveway conflicts	No change	Fewer parking spaces and defined pedestrian paths could result in reduced conflicts	No change	Higher turnover of on-street parking could result in more conflicts with cyclists	Higher turnover of on-street parking could result in more conflicts with cyclists
		Qualitative assessment of security impacts	No change	Additional enforcement could improve security	No change	No change	Increased security may be required for staff for cash handling	No change	Possible improvement with fewer underused lots	More security may be required at remote lots	No change	No change	No change	Increased security may be required for staff for cash handling
		Qualitative assessment of walkability impacts	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	May encourage more compact development	Downtowns more walkable for shoppers and visitors	Contributes to pedestrian amenity	No change	Core downtown streets more accessible to shopper and visitors	Core downtown streets more accessible to shopper and visitors
		Qualitative assessment of cycling impacts	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	Landscaping could include bicycle parking/lockers	No change	Higher turnover of on-street parking could result in more conflicts with cyclists
	Effect on residential properties	Potential for traffic infiltration	Keeps parking in lots and core streets	May be reduced with clear signage	May be reduced if technology is easy to use	May result in increased parking in core downtown street	May result in parking spreading to adjacent streets to avoid paying	No change	Could result in parking overspill if parking capacity significantly reduced	Spreads long term parking to edge of core areas	No change	No change	May result in parking spreading to adjacent streets to avoid tickets	May result in parking spreading to adjacent streets to avoid paying
		Ability to meet residential parking needs	Limited ability to accommodate residential permits	May free up some parking spaces for residential use	No change	No change	May free up some parking spaces for residential use	No change	Lower permit availability if parking capacity significantly reduced	May free up some parking spaces for residential use	Lower permit availability if parking capacity significantly reduced	No change	May free up some parking spaces for residential use	May free up some parking spaces for residential use
	Effect on archaeological resources and heritage or cultural features	Number of properties affected	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
	Impact on urban planning design objectives	Consistency with urban design objectives	No change	No change	No change	No change	Needs on-street equipment	No change	May encourage more compact development	Downtowns more walkable for shoppers and visitors	Contributes to pedestrian amenity	No change	No change	Consistent with promotion of walking, cycling and transit
		Compatibility with rapid transit objectives/transit-oriented development	No change	No change	No change	No change	Makes use of transit more attractive	No change	May encourage more transit oriented development	Increased transit service could supplement parking	Contributes to pedestrian amenity	No change	Reduced long-term on-street parking supports transit	Priced parking makes use of transit more attractive

Category	Factor	Measure	Issue #1: User-friendliness					Issue #2: Under-utilization (off-street)				Issue #3: On-street parking shortages		
			1. Do Nothing	2. Improve signage, education and enforcement	3. Adopt innovative payment technologies	4. Change parking policies (e.g. eliminate 5 hour no reparking)	5. Implement parking pricing	1. Do Nothing	2. Sell or terminate lease on underutilized lots	3. Designate remote lots for long-stay parking to free up prime spaces	4. "Green" lots by landscaping	1. Do Nothing	2. Modify parking time restrictions and enforcement to achieve more turnover	3. Implement parking pricing to reduce use as long-stay parking
Economic	Effect on businesses	On-street parking demand to supply ratio	No change	Potential for more short term parking availability	No change	Potential for more on-street demand	Potential to reduce if off-street pricing is lower	No change	Potential for more on-street demand	No change	No change	Continued pressure on high-demand areas	May free up some parking for visitor use	Frees up on-street parking for visitor use
		Off-street parking demand to supply ratio	No change	Potential to increase if on-street demands relocated	No change	No change	Potential to increase if on-street pricing is higher	No change	Reduces off-street parking supply	Shifts demands between lots	Reduces off-street parking supply	No change	Potential to increase off-street utilization	Potential to increase off-street utilization if off-street rates are lower than on-street rates
		Cost of public parking	Businesses sometimes cover cost of parking tickets	No change	No change	No change	Some cost of parking transferred to user	No change	No change	Provides range of monthly parking costs for employees	No change	No change	No change	Some cost of parking transferred directly to users
		User friendliness of parking system for Core Area visitors	Contributes to poor perception of downtown	Reduces confusion through signage	Reduces confusion and increases user-friendliness	Reduces confusion and increases user-friendliness	Results in system common in other cities	No change	No change	Improved availability of parking for visitors	Improved appearance of parking lots	Difficult to find parking directly outside key destinations	Increased turnover of parking supply	Increased turnover and decreased use of on-street parking for long-stay parking
	Effect on development	Compatibility of parking requirements with developer expectations	Expectation of free parking	Increased enforcement could create negative perception	Increased flexibility of payment methods for parking users	Change brings Cambridge into line with most other cities	Does not meet current expectation in Cambridge, but in line with other cities	Difficulty finding permits in high-demand lots	No change	Potential to improve permit availability in some lots	No change	Difficulty finding on-street parking in high-demand areas	No change	Does not meet current expectation in Cambridge, but in line with other cities
		Cost	Expectation of free parking	No change	No costs for developers	No costs for developers	Increased costs for users may impact development	Perception of limited parking supply may impact development	No cost to developers	No cost to developers	No cost to developers	Perception of limited parking supply may impact development	No cost to developers	Increased costs for users may impact development
	Capital and operating cost	Capital cost	No change	Costs for signage and education	Reduced capital costs compared with pay and display	Minimal costs for signage	High capital costs for parking equipment	No change	No change	Minimal costs for signage	Capital costs for landscaping	Continued pressure on high-demand areas	Minimal costs for signage	High capital costs for parking equipment
		Operating cost	No change	On-going enforcement costs	On-going operating costs	No change	On-going operational costs	No change	Reduced operating costs for leases and property tax	No change	Costs for landscape maintenance	No change	Increased enforcement costs	On-going operational costs
		Net annual lifecycle cost to City of Cambridge	No change to current deficit	Increased deficit	Potential to reduce operating expenses compared with standard parking systems	Reduced staff time dealing with complaints	Increased expenses offset by revenue generation	No change to current deficit	Reduced costs	Opportunity for increased revenue generation to offset operating costs	Minimal increase	No change to current deficit	Increased expenses	Increased expenses offset by revenue generation
		Ability for innovative financing options (i.e. public-private partnerships)	No change	Low opportunity	Good potential for cost-sharing	Low opportunity	Some potential for cost-sharing	No change	No change	Low opportunity	No change	No change	Low opportunity	Some potential for cost-sharing
Technical	Ability to meet transportation accessibility needs	Public parking demand/supply and utilization	No change	Minimal change	No change	May result in more demand for on-street parking	Potential to reduce demand in some locations	No change	Reduced parking supply	Improved availability of parking for visitors	Minimal reduction in supply	No change	Potential to increase parking availability for visitors	Potential to reduce demand in some locations
		Efficiency of parking (target of 85% utilization)	No change	Improved turnover and efficiency	No change	More sections over 85%	Improved turnover and efficiency	No change	No change	More efficient use of parking lots	No change	No change	Increased efficiency	Improved turnover and efficiency
		Degree to which option increases or decreases travel options for commuters	May favour automobile travel	No change	Increases options for parking payment	No change	Increased costs of automobile travel	May favour automobile travel	No change	Potential to improve permit availability in some lots	No change	May favour automobile travel	No change	Increased costs of automobile travel
	Ease of implementation	Length of time to achieve desired results	N/A	Short term	Medium term	Short term	Medium term	N/A	Short term	Short term	Medium term	N/A	Short term	Medium term
		Risk and liability	Continued public complaints	Minimal risk	Risk of technology not being accepted or becoming obsolete	Minimal risk	Minimal risk	Continued public complaints	Reduced liability through fewer lots	Security may be required at remote lots	No change	Continued public complaints	Minimal risk	Minimal risk
		Relationship to other projects	N/A	Not related to other projects	Not related to other projects	Not related to other projects	Supports Regional TDM goals	N/A	Not related to other projects	Supports Regional TDM goals	Not related to other projects	N/A	Not related to other projects	Supports Regional TDM goals
		Jurisdictional responsibility	No change	City can implement	City can implement	City can implement	City can implement	N/A	City can implement	City can implement	City can implement	N/A	City can implement	City can implement
	Impact on operations	Impact on road maintenance operations	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
		Impact on emergency response times	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change

Category	Factor	Measure	Issue #4: Capacity for Intensification					Issue #5: Financial sustainability			
			1. Do Nothing	2. Rely on non-automobile modes to mitigate increased parking needs	3. Optimize existing parking supply using peripheral long-stay parking lots	4. Parking supply expansion through strategically located parking structures	5. Rely entirely on private sector for parking provision	1. Do Nothing	2. Decide to continue to subsidize parking costs in core areas	3. Reduce municipal parking supply to lower maintenance and leasing costs	4. Adopt full cost recovery approach to set hourly and monthly parking rates
Natural	Effect on natural environment	Change in impermeable surface area	No change	No change	No change	Possible increase	Possible increase	No change	No change	Reduced if land used for other purposes	No change
		Estimated change in emissions of air contaminants from motorized vehicles	No reduction	Possible reduction if mode shift occurs	No reduction	No reduction	Possible increase	No reduction	No reduction	Possible increase due to increased circling the block	Possible reduction if mode shift occurs
Social	Effect on pedestrian and cycling environment	Qualitative assessment of safety impacts	No change	Increased volumes of pedestrians and cyclists may improve visibility to motorists	Increased walking distance for some parking lot users	Could result in increased pedestrian/vehicle conflicts, depending on location	Could result in dispersed parking supply with additional pedestrian/vehicle conflicts	No change	No change	Fewer parking lots could result in reduced driveway conflicts	Possible improvement if mode shift occurs
		Qualitative assessment of security impacts	No change	Possible improvement with increased pedestrian volumes may require additional support for transit, and improved pedestrian and cycling facilities	More security may be required at remote lots	Increased security may be required for parking structures	Limited public control of core area parking	No change	No change	More compact parking system could result in improved security	Revenues could be used to improve security
		Qualitative assessment of walkability impacts	No change	Increased walking distance for some parking lot users	Supports compact development and increased walkability	Could result in dispersed parking supply that may detract from walkability	No change	No change	More compact parking system could result in improved walkability	May spread out parking demands if motorists seek to avoid payment	
		Qualitative assessment of cycling impacts	No change	May require improved cycling facilities such as bike lanes and bicycle storage/parking to encourage cycling	No change	Potential to include bicycle storage facilities	Potential to include bicycle storage facilities through zoning by-law	No change	No change	Fewer parking lots could result in reduced driveway conflicts	No change
	Effect on residential properties	Potential for traffic infiltration	No change	May increase if non-auto modes not supported	Spreads long term parking to edge of core areas	Supports compact downtown development	Limited public control of core area parking	No change	Infiltration may increase	Could result in parking overspill if parking capacity significantly reduced	May spread out parking demands if motorists seek to avoid payment
		Ability to meet residential parking needs	No change	No new capacity for residential permits	May free up some parking spaces for residential use	Could add more capacity for residential parking	Potential to require residential parking through zoning by-law	No change	No new capacity for residential permits	Lower permit availability if parking capacity significantly reduced	May free up some parking spaces for residential use
	Effect on archaeological resources and heritage or cultural features	Number of properties affected	No change	No change	No change	Potential compatibility issues could be addressed by design	City has limited control	No change	No change	No change	No change
	Impact on urban planning design objectives	Consistency with urban design objectives	No change	Consistent with City's intensification objectives	Promotes downtown as place to visit	Supports compact downtown development	City has limited control	No change	Not consistent with objectives for supporting non-auto modes	Supports more compact parking system	Revenues could be used to improve urban design
		Compatibility with rapid transit objectives/transit-oriented development	No change	Consistent with City's RT/TOD objectives	Access by transit increases in attractiveness	Supports compact downtown development	Requires control through zoning by-law	No change	Not consistent with objectives for supporting transit	Supports transit objectives	Supports transit objectives

Category	Factor	Measure	Issue #4: Capacity for Intensification					Issue #5: Financial sustainability			
			1. Do Nothing	2. Rely on non-automobile modes to mitigate increased parking needs	3. Optimize existing parking supply using peripheral long-stay parking lots	4. Parking supply expansion through strategically located parking structures	5. Rely entirely on private sector for parking provision	1. Do Nothing	2. Decide to continue to subsidize parking costs in core areas	3. Reduce municipal parking supply to lower maintenance and leasing costs	4. Adopt full cost recovery approach to set hourly and monthly parking rates
Economic	Effect on businesses	On-street parking demand to supply ratio	No change	Increasing demands with intensification	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	May increase on-street parking demand	Potential to reduce parking demand
		Off-street parking demand to supply ratio	Limited capacity for future growth in demand	May contribute to reducing increase in demands due to intensification	Shifts demands between lots	Increased off-street supply	Dependent on private sector initiatives	No change	No change	Reduces supply of off-street parking	Potential to reduce parking demand
		Cost of public parking	No change	No change	Provides range of monthly parking costs for employees	Higher cost of parking for structured parking	Set by private sector for new facilities	Continued taxpayer subsidy of parking system	No change	Reduces cost of parking system	Some cost of parking transferred directly to public
		User friendliness of parking system for Core Area visitors	Difficult to find parking directly outside key destinations	No change	Improved availability of parking for visitors	Central facility aids wayfinding and accessibility to core	May not evolve as comprehensive system	Limited ability to fund improvements	No change	No change	System common to most Ontario cities
	Effect on development	Compatibility of parking requirements with developer expectations	Difficulty finding on-street parking in high-demand areas	Outside of rapid transit, not expected to provide significant capacity for intensification	No change	No change	Counter to current expectations	Difficulty finding on-street parking in high-demand areas	No change	No change	Does not meet current expectation in Cambridge, but in line with other cities
		Cost	Perception of limited parking supply may impact development	Minimal costs to developer	No cost to developers	No cost to developers	Increased costs of development	Perception of limited parking supply may impact development	No cost to developers	No cost to developers	Increased costs for users may impact development
	Capital and operating cost	Capital cost	No change	No change	Minimal costs for signage	High capital costs	No cost to City	No change	No change	No change	High capital costs for parking equipment
		Operating cost	No change	No change	No change	Ongoing operating costs	No change	No change	No change	Reduced operating costs	On-going operational costs
		Net annual lifecycle cost to City of Cambridge	No change to current deficit	No change	No change	Needs significant increase in permit and hourly rates to break even	No change	Continued taxpayer subsidy of parking system	No change to current deficit	Reduces cost of parking system	Increased expenses offset by revenue generation
		Ability for innovative financing options (i.e. public-private partnerships)	No change	Some opportunity	Low opportunity	Good potential	Good potential	No change	No change	Low opportunity	Some potential for cost-sharing
Technical	Ability to meet transportation accessibility needs	Public parking demand/supply and utilization	No change	Demands likely to increase over time	Shifts demands between lots	Increased parking supply	Potential for increased parking supply	No change	No change	Reduced parking supply	Potential to reduce demand in some locations
		Efficiency of parking (target of 85% utilization)	No change	More sections over 85%	Improved turnover at prime lots	Efficient use of parking resources	No change	No change	No change	More sections over 85%	More efficient use of on and off-street parking
		Degree to which option increases or decreases travel options for commuters	May favour automobile travel	More options for travel	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	Increased costs of automobile travel
	Ease of implementation	Length of time to achieve desired results	N/A	Long time to achieve results	Short term	Long time to achieve results	Long term	N/A	N/A	Short term	Medium term
		Risk and liability	Risk of not meeting growth targets	Risk of demand reduction not meeting requirements	Minimal risk	High risk	Minimal risk to City	No change	No change	Reduced liability through fewer lots	Minimal risk
		Relationship to other projects	N/A	Supports Regional TDM goals	Not related to other projects	Supports Regional Rapid Transit initiative	Not related to other projects	N/A	No change	Not related to other projects	Supports Regional TDM goals
		Jurisdictional responsibility	N/A	Regional jurisdiction for Rapid Transit	City can implement	May require third party for financing structure	Third party implementation	N/A	No change	City can implement	City can implement
	Impact on operations	Impact on road maintenance operations	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
		Impact on emergency response times	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change