

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

Meeting date: Tuesday, Feb. 15, 2011

SAC Members in Attendance: Emerald Bogue (Multnomah County), Matt Butts (Group Mackenzie), Paul Carlson (OMSI), John Cole (BPS), Bill Crawford (Hosford-Abernathy neighborhood [HAND]), Cathy Galbraith (Bosco Milligan), Lance Lindahl (Brooklyn neighborhood), Susan Lindsay (Buckman neighborhood), Lance Marris (Bside 6), Ellis McCoy (PBOT), 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), Peter Collins (Goodwill), John Garner (PCC), Bert Geiger (BG Marketing-CEIC), Deek Heykamp (Next Adventure), Trang Lam (PDC), Juliana Lukasik (@Large Films-CEIC), Jonathan Malsin (Beam Development), Matt Milletto (Water Avenue Coffee), Steve Russell (Kerns neighborhood).

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

Other Attendees: Alice Meyers (BES).

Handouts:

- Agenda
- *Getting to great on-street parking management* (copy of presentation), Feb. 15, 2011

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. For today's meeting, he said, the project team took the SAC's earlier observations about parking problems and opportunities and reframed them as a series of concise problem statements for the committee to review. This will help the committee begin to explore strategies and tools for solutions, he said, beginning today and continuing through the next several meetings. To assist members, the consulting team also prepared a list of suggested "best practices" and tools for devising a successful parking management plan.

Before embarking on the agenda, John Cole of BPS reported back to the committee about recent permitting efforts at the Taylor Electric Building site. Committee members had requested an update, wondering if City Codes were impeding development. Following a fire in 2006, John C. said, the property owner started looking into restoration of the building in 2008, but chose not to complete the permit process. Soon after, a permit was requested and issued for a much larger 120,000-square-foot building

on the site. There were some conditions specified in the permit, but no major requirements, he said. In the end, the project fell through (possibly due to the economic downturn and/or loss of an anchor tenant). There has not been any subsequent activity.

2. Presentation

Sumner S. read through the set of 16 problem statements describing parking issues throughout the CEID. (See presentation document, first two pages .) SAC members generally agreed with the statements, with only a few comments.

Committee Comments/Questions

- A committee member asked for clarification of Problem Statement N (*Continued operation of off-street parking as accessory use limits the District from benefiting from available supply.*). Rick W. responded that the parking survey found only 665 off-street parking stalls (of 8,821 total) are currently available to the public, with remaining spaces limited by code to patrons of on-site businesses. Yet those “accessory” off-street spaces are inefficiently used (40% are vacant at peak).
- Another member suggested that with City Code requiring off-street parking to be “accessory only” for certain land uses (industrial), a zoning change might be required to get around the parking restriction. Rick W. said rather than change zoning, operating restrictions could be revised.
- Regarding Problem Statement O (*Changes to parking management and increasing demand will exacerbate spillover impacts on surrounding neighborhoods.*), a neighborhood association member asked for stronger language, foreseeing huge problems if commuters are suddenly denied access to all-day, on-street parking on 9th through 12th streets. Another member suggested the term “catastrophic” to describe potential spillover impacts.

Group discussion then moved to strategies and tools for implementing them. The presentation handout identified 13 strategies, each followed by suggested tools (policies or programs) based on industry best practices. (See the presentation document for specific tools recommended under each strategy.) The SAC was able to discuss the first 10 strategies before running out of time. Committee members’ comments/questions about each strategy’s suggested tools are summarized below.

Strategy 1: Reformat the public on-street parking supply.

- “Is there any way the CEIC can be involved in this process (such as reformatting time stays – e.g., less 15/30 minute spaces, more 2 hour spaces – and setting new parking permit prices)?” Rick W. responded “absolutely, and you’ll see a recommendation for that.”
- “What do you mean by ‘expand permit zone’ (the first tool listed)?” Rick W. responded there are several options the SAC could consider. Currently, most of the area between 8th and 12th streets is unregulated, he said, and one option

- would be to expand the permit area all the way to 12th. Another would be to create new pockets of permit zones only in certain areas. (A committee member suggested changing the wording from “expand” to “redesign” the permit zone. Another noted firmly that her neighborhood association would not favor expanding the permit zone to 12th.)
- A member asked how two suggested tools related, specifically creating more long-term (2-hour) spaces and exploring parking meter “pilot programs” in select areas. Rick W. said these and other suggested tools may be used in succession or in any combination, as warranted. Some tools (more permit zones, longer term spaces) could be used first and metering could be a later, more aggressive approach as needed to manage on-street parking supply. The benefit of meters, he said, is creating a revenue stream that can eventually pay for parking improvements and possibly encourage construction of a parking structure.
 - “Why would you need meters to justify a parking garage?” Rick W. responded that charging for on-street parking creates more demand for off-street parking, which can then eventually begin charging for parking, and this eventually makes building a parking garage financially viable. Without public subsidies, he said, the cost per stall for a new garage is \$230 per month.
 - A member said he was uncomfortable with the idea of increasing permit costs or adding meters without creating a District TPMA (transportation and parking management association) to coordinate these options. Rick W. said a TPMA is one of the tools recommended later in the presentation. One already exists in the Lloyd District and five other TPMAs exist in the region, he said. The member added that another advantage of a TPMA is determining how a portion of meter revenues are spent on District improvements, in its role as a Meter Revenue Allocation Committee (MRAC).
 - A member expressed concern about maintaining truck loading zones throughout the District. Rick W. said the consulting team is recommending all loading zones remain in the District until the City can complete a more thorough evaluation of their usage.
 - A member worried about increasing the cost of parking permits, feeling that would be detrimental. Local employers already have problems obtaining enough local parking spaces for their employees, he said, and this would make the few permit spaces available more expensive and provide more incentive for businesses to move out of the District and into the suburbs. Another member suggested the committee shouldn’t assume the existing permit program would have to remain the same, that the recommendation to City Council could recommend a redesign that would, for example, allow employers to access more permits for their employees. A third member asked if the District TPMA could develop recommendations for permit pricing and policy; City staff said yes.

SAC members were asked their level of comfort with the tools suggested under the first strategy. Using colored cards, they generally showed support for the concepts discussed, with some reservations about moving forward without more details (particularly on the subjects of metering and potential permit change impacts on neighborhoods).

Strategy 2: Develop new policies for management and building parking.

By a show of cards, SAC members demonstrated strong support for establishing a TPMA, but caution about more specific implementation tools suggested under this strategy.

- A member suggested treading cautiously with the suggestion that accessory parking designations be removed from City Code, believing that “it is there for a reason” and repercussions of removal should be studied first.
- A member was uncomfortable with the suggestion to require minimum parking for new developments, saying the issue of underused existing off-street parking should first be addressed. Another member agreed, noting that the requirement would add costs to development at a time when there are other new costs on the horizon. (A transportation system development charge overlay zone is being considered for the CEID.) A third member said the TPMA should address the need and timing for minimum parking requirements.

Bill H. clarified that some of the tool recommendations (e.g., changing permit requirements) would go to BPS, and some (parking space reformatting, metering, establishing a TPMA) would be PBOT responsibilities.

Strategy 3: Modify the environment to support the economics of parking.

- Several members reiterated their preference that a TPMA explore and coordinate the tools suggested for implementing this strategy, saying they felt that would be a more organized process.
- OMSI’s Paul Carlson expressed concern about limiting new surface parking lots. When OMSI has big exhibits, he said, “we run out of parking and have to lease lots down the street.” When OMSI moves forward on its development plans, it will be displacing some surface parking lots; “how will we replace that space initially?” While OMSI will look at structured parking eventually, it would probably not be within the next three years, he said. “So we’re concerned with the implications of this in the near term.”

Bill H. noted that several members’ concerns have related to timing of the suggested tools. He clarified that some, like structured parking, would likely be pursued much later than others. Rick W. was presenting all possible options (short- through long-term) for consideration, but the team is not recommending implementation of all options at once.

Strategy 4: Develop new or modify existing codes related to the off-street parking supply.

- When Rick W. explained the suggestion to “recalibrate parking maximums in the code,” (Unlike Portland, he said, most cities have a “closer relationship between their preferred mode split and how much parking they allow,” to limit vehicle use and encourage transit use.) a member commented that the code needs to reflect that the District attracts bigger vehicles (school buses to OMSI, large trucks to industrial areas) that can take up more than one parking space.
- A member said reviewing City Code and addressing parking maximums should be another task for the TPMA. “I don’t think this group is in any position to support this recommendation without additional study.”

Strategy 5: Manage current and future parking supply to meet adopted mode-split/TDM goals.

- “What does mode split mean?” Rick W. said mode split describes “how you arrive in the District.” Currently, about 80% of CEID workers arrive by car – an 80% motorized mode split. Transit and bike riders make up the rest.
- A member noted that some of the cars parking in the District carry commuters that then bike or walk downtown or to the Lloyd District, “so we have higher car numbers, but we help the other districts have lower numbers (40-50% motorized split).” He also noted that, given the District’s character differences – more industrial, less retail – that the mode split to aspire to may need to be different. Another member said managing parking for mode split might make more sense later. “Let’s put this in the future toolbox.”

Strategy 6: Move the District to paid parking.

- A member said that the suggestion to “correlate permit costs to transit pass costs” is an excellent idea, citing how spiking transit pass prices once moved him back to car commuting to PSU. Rick W. added that PSU now has a policy that its parking prices must exceed transit pass costs. Another member said such a correlation “makes a lot of sense.”
- A member cautioned that the CEID is an industrial/employment district with “horrible transit access” from many areas so “maybe implementation of this strategy should be 10 years out.” It also was noted that bus service to the District will be worse once light rail is in operation. “We don’t want to make it more difficult for people to work here.” Rick W. countered that current permit parking rates are 8 cents per day, which is very low. Another member concurred, saying he felt the District’s permits are priced too low and “archaic.”

Strategy 7: Encourage a greater number of employees to transition to off-street spaces or to alternative modes.

- No comments. (Tools under this strategy were discussed under earlier strategies.)

Strategy 8: Manage/control on-street parking based on the 85% rule.

- A neighborhood association member asked about the suggestion to implement residential permit zones under this strategy, wondering if that would be a paid permit program. Rick W. said that could be one option. In the Lloyd District, he said, the City offered to establish a paid residential permit zone and waive the fee for the first three years, but no neighborhoods opted for it. The member noted that in some neighborhoods, particularly with transient residents, it would likely be difficult to get “buy in” to such a plan. Bill H. concurred, but said it was worth considering the option as one means to curb the “catastrophic spillover” impact to neighborhoods discussed earlier. Another neighborhood association member added his neighbors are interested in a residential permit program. A suggestion was made to consider a pilot residential permit program in a limited area.
- A member expressed caution about the overall strategy, noting the CEID is “not the Lloyd District” and questioning if applying the 85% rule would be appropriate. Rick W. clarified that strategies to more aggressively manage on-street parking would not take place until it was approaching the 85% occupancy rate at peak, so would be phased in over time.

Strategy 9: Establish private/public approaches to fund new parking supply.

- When structured parking was mentioned as one potential public/private solution, a member suggested the City should think smaller, such as using lifts, which can expand supply on smaller lots.
- A member suggested a public/private venture may eventually provide the District with more parking, but most likely in the longer term. Several members agreed.
- There was some discussion about possibly using ODOT’s lot near OMSI as a Park-and-Ride lot.

Strategy 10: Transition parking on off-street surface lots to structured parking.

- A member asked if, at a future meeting, the team could provide an example of a parking structure in the City that was constructed without public subsidy and the financial details of how that worked.
- A member expressed concern that “we initially talked about working toward a parking structure somewhere in the District, but seem to have backed off.” She said she feels strongly the District would benefit from such a structure at some point. When asked if she would support the recommendation to explore a publicly owned off-street parking lot in the CEID, she said yes, as a starting point.
- A member asked that time be set aside at a future meeting for a focused discussion on structured parking. While some members think that option won’t be needed until well into the future, others don’t, he noted. Another member

added that a parking structure may well be a viable, near-term option near OMSI. "It's a big district, and some areas have different needs."

3. Wrap-up/Next Steps

Just before 6 p.m., Bill H. suggested the SAC meeting conclude. To facilitate discussion at the next meeting, he said, the project team will bundle strategies and tools into short-, mid- and long-term categories, and designate what tasks might be appropriate for a TPMA vs. "punted to BPS or other city bureaus." Bill H. also encouraged SAC members to attend the open house on Feb. 22.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 15, 2011
4-6 p.m.
Architectural Heritage Center
701 SE Grand Ave., 2nd floor classroom
Portland, OR

Public Workshop: Tuesday, Feb. 22, 2011
5:30-7 p.m.
@Large Films
807 NE Couch St.
Portland, OR