# Central Eastside Parking Management Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting SUMMARY

Meeting date: Monday, Dec. 6, 2010

SAC Members in Attendance: Emerald Bogue (Multnomah County), Paul Carlson (OMSI), John Cole (BPS), Lance Lindahl (Brooklyn neighborhood), Susan Lindsay (Buckman neighborhood), Juliana Lukasik (@Large Films-CEIC), Ellis McCoy (PBOT) Jonathan Malsin (Beam Development) Matt Milletto (Water Avenue Coffee), Bill Crawford (Hosford-Abernathy neighborhood [HAND]), Steve Russell (Kerns neighborhood), Peter Stark (Stark Design/Portland Streetcar-CEIC), Bob Wentworth (Wentworth Chevrolet-Subaru), Dan Yates (Portland Spirit-CEIC).

**SAC Members Absent**: Mike Bolliger (Bolliger & Sons Insurance), Matt Butts (Group Mackenzie), Peter Collins (Goodwill), Cathy Galbraith (Bosco Milligan), John Garner (PCC), Bert Geiger (BG Marketing-CEIC), Deek Heykamp (Next Adventure), Trang Lam (PDC), Lance Marrs (Bside 6).

**Staff/Consultants Attending:** Bill Hoffman and Sarah Heinicke (PBOT), Sumner Sharpe (Parametrix), Rick Williams (Rick Williams Consulting), Rick Michaelson (Inner City Properties, Inc.), Liz Malliris (Words by Malliris).

Other Attendees: Julie Gustafson (Portland Streetcar).

#### Handouts:

- Agenda
- Central Eastside Parking Management Plan Parking Inventory and Survey (print-out of presentation)
- Maps of Study Area, Survey Areas and Parking Inventory areas

These documents are posted on the project Web site: http://www.portlandonline.com/transportation/index.cfm?c=53032.

#### 1. Welcome/Announcements

Bill H. welcomed the committee to the meeting. Up to this point, he said, we have been orienting ourselves to the values and goals of the district, and applicable city policies. Meanwhile, the project consulting team has conducted a full inventory of all on- and off street parking in the district and extensive usage surveys. The presentation at this meeting will provide "a lot of information on the dynamics of parking in the district today – current parking availability and usage patterns," he said. "At our next meeting, we will discuss the district's potential future parking needs" based on zoning and growth trends. Then, beginning in February, we will "bring these two together – today's data and anticipated future needs – to begin discussing parking management strategies."

Sumner S. noted that meeting summaries are posted on the project Web site and committee members may notify project staff with any comments or corrections.

## 2. Parking Data Review

### Inventory

Rick W. presented key findings of a comprehensive parking study conducted in summer 2010. (The full presentation may be found on the project Web site.) Highlights include:

## **On-Street Inventory**

- On-street parking stalls total 6,324 and off-street stalls 8,281, for a total of 14,605.
- Nearly half (46%) of the district's on-street parking supply is designated "no limit." The next highest percentage (29%) of supply is "2 Hour or By Permit" parking (another 4% of stalls are designated "2 Hour" only), followed by 15% designated "1 Hour." The remaining 6-7% of parking stalls are "quick turn" with time limits of 30 minutes or less.
- Judging by maps showing dispersed locations of the different parking "formats" (time limitations), there does not appear to be any strategic allocation.
- o A significant percentage of the district's parking supply is in long-term format.
- With 22% in 1 Hour or less format, the message being given to customers is: if you aren't an employee here, don't plan to stay long.

## **Off-Street Inventory**

- There are 8,281 off-street parking stalls located at 459 different sites across the district, of which 452 are surface parking lots.
- More than 90% of district off-street stalls are "accessory" parking, e.g., their use is restricted to customers/employees of specific businesses. Only 665 off-street stalls are considered "generally available to the public."
- A significant amount of district land is devoted to parking, which means future growth in the district is likely to occur on parking sites, potential worsening parking issues if not property managed.

#### **Committee Comments/Questions**

- Are truck-loading zones included in the data?" Rick W. responded that "we know where they are" and can provide that information later for discussion, but they are not reflected in the parking inventory or surveys.
- "How are time limits determined?" A PBOT staff member responded that Planning designates the format, usually based on requests by business owners on that block face.
- "Is underground parking possible in the district, given proximity to the river?" Peter S. responded that the water table is relatively high, about 25 feet in some areas, which does pose challenges to building underground parking. However,

- one member said his company had successfully created some underground parking spaces for employees and another noted that some underground warehouse space in the district has been converted to parking.
- "What about parking available under the freeway? Is that included in the inventory?" Rick W. said some additional lot surveys are being conducted in the next few weeks in the north and south ends to capture more information on offstreet facilities.
- One committee member reiterated his concerns about the impact of City codes on property owners when they want to improve a surface lot. Requirements for bioswales and landscaping reduce the number of stalls allowed. "These codes are set up for suburban shopping malls. They don't take into consideration an urban district." Rick W. responded that code revisions can be a recommendation by the SAC.

## Occupancy (Survey of How On-street Parking is Used)

Sumner S. noted that 3,660 on-street stalls and 8,281 off-street stalls were surveyed over a 10-hour period (8 a.m. to 6 p.m.) in September, 2010, providing a large, geographically dispersed sample of occupancy rates and usage patterns. Rick W. provided an overview of what was learned from the surveys, noting that his presentation covers aggregated data, but data for individual zones, blocks and block faces exists and can be analyzed further by the committee in the future.

Key findings of the on-street parking survey include:

- Combined peak hour (noon to 1 p.m.) occupancy across the district is 77%, with several pockets of higher occupancy (more than 85%). Highest occupancy rates (89%) occur in 2 Hour/By Permit stalls.
- Average duration of stay is about 3 ½ hours (no limit and permit parking included in average).
- The highest violation rates (parking beyond time limit observed during survey; not actual violations issued by City) occur in 1 Hour stalls. About 40% of 1 Hour users exceed the limit, staying on average a little over 2 hours. Violation rates for remaining stalls are also high, ranging from 23-33%; 5-9% is the industry average.
- The number of unique vehicles parking in the district is relatively low (through data extrapolation, about 11,000 vehicles used some 38,000 available hours of parking). Actual turnover rate (number of cars to use a single stall over a 10-hour period) is also low 2.6.

### Implications of these findings:

- The generally low turnover and low number of unique vehicles indicates many employees are parking on-street (moving their cars only as needed), competing with customers.
- If most parking violations are occurring in 1 Hour stalls and the average stay exceeds 2 hours, are 1 Hour stalls really serving the district? And what does this mean about the relative usefulness of 400 stalls limited to 30 minutes or less?
- O How well are the 2,900 No Limit stalls serving the district? If we assume from the data that at least 50% of these users are employees (based on 5-hour stays or longer), we still don't know if they are in-district or downtown employees ("commuters"). But we do know that the market being served by these stalls is the equivalent of one or more 500-slot parking garages.
- However, parking garages are expensive to build and may or may not make sense when as many as 1,500 on-street parking stalls are underutilized in the district.
- Meanwhile, the off-street parking inventory determined that occupancy rates on district lots can be considerably lower than on-street (55% peak-hour occupancy off-street); meaning abundant unused supply exists but is inaccessible unless restrictions can be removed.
- The permit system appears to work well in the district, with 61% of designated stalls in use with valid permits displayed.

Sumner S. concluded that these findings and implications demonstrate the importance of managing existing supply. "We need to fully utilize what's here before exploring expensive additions."

## **Committee Comments/Questions**

- There were several questions and comments about parking enforcement. A PBOT staff member noted that parking limits are enforced in the district at least three days a week. One employer said enforcement (and fines) has cost his employees, who must park on the street, "a lot of money." Other members commented they had never seen or heard of anyone receiving a parking ticket. There was also discussion about whether stricter enforcement, particularly of 1 Hour limits, would solve some issues. Most disagreed, stating that the 1-Hour designation in general is not realistic and enforcement would not help. "It's difficult to complete a lunch or shop in one hour." But once stalls are appropriately formatted, some saw value in stricter enforcement to help the revised system function.
- There were also many comments about how to address the issue of some 1,000+ commuters (downtown employees "poaching" district parking spaces). If those users are displaced (by parking format changes/restrictions), they will have "a tremendous impact on local neighborhoods, particularly Buckman," said one

neighborhood representative. If this requires a neighborhood parking permit program, that could create other problems due to cost. "You would need to work closely with the neighborhoods on this."

- One member asked what parking permits cost (\$45 per year).
- Several members agreed that better use of "unfriendly" (restricted) off-street lots throughout the district is important. Encouraging "shared use" should be a priority. It was generally agreed that this strategy should be pursued through the CEIC. "We need to get property managers involved."

## 3. Wrap-up/Next Steps

Bill H. said he hoped the committee was able to absorb the considerable amount of information presented at the meeting. At January's meeting, the committee will discuss district land-use projections to get "a longer-term perspective," he said, and to ensure the resulting parking management plan is adaptive and responsive to future needs.

## **Committee Comments/Questions**

A committee member asked if the streetcar and light rail projects will be included in January's discussion, noting that the potential increase in "park-and-riders" could have a dramatic impact, particularly on the south end of the district. Sumner S. responded that "modal split" will be part of the discussion as the SAC discusses the future parking needs of the district.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, Jan. 18, 2010

4-6 p.m.

701 SE Grand Ave., 2<sup>nd</sup> floor classroom

Portland, OR