

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

Meeting date: Tuesday, March 15, 2011

SAC Members in Attendance: Mike Bolliger (Bolliger & Sons Insurance), Matt Butts (Group Mackenzie), Paul Carlson (OMSI), Susan Pearce (Hosford-Abernathy neighborhood [HAND]), Cathy Galbraith (Bosco Milligan), Ellis McCoy (PBOT), Matt Milletto (Water Avenue Coffee), Steve Russell (Kerns neighborhood), Peter Stark (Stark Design/Portland Streetcar-CEIC), Bob Wentworth (Wentworth Chevrolet-Subaru), Dan Yates (Portland Spirit-CEIC).

SAC Members Absent: Jonathan Malsin (Beam Development), Emerald Bogue (Multnomah County), John Cole (BPS), Peter Collins (Goodwill), John Garner (PCC), Bert Geiger (BG Marketing-CEIC), Deek Heykamp (Next Adventure), Trang Lam (PDC), Lance Lindahl (Brooklyn neighborhood), Susan Lindsay (Buckman neighborhood), Juliana Lukasik (@Large Films-CEIC), Lance Marrs (Bside 6).

Staff/Consultants Attending: Bill Hoffman (PBOT), Jason Franklin (Parametrix), Rick Williams (Rick Williams Consulting), Peter Finley Fry (Columbia Pacific Planning), Rick Michaelson (Inner City Properties, Inc.).

Other Attendees: Marshall Proehl (PRC Development), Tom Kerman (Portland Bottling), Jim Kennison (Franz Bakery).

Handouts:

- Agenda
- Problem Statement Matrix
- Public Workshop Summary

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 and discussed the results of the previous meeting. Bill reminded the committee that this is an opportunity for the stakeholders in the district to determine how to best address parking. Bill then described the schedule for the remainder of the project, indicating that there are six more SAC meetings and two more public workshops. This prompted questions from a couple of committee members about why the project was going to take so long and whether or not the project could be accelerated. A couple of committee members also asked if solutions could be proposed and the SAC could then react to those solutions. Bill indicated that if there is agreement this afternoon on the problem statements then the project team could move directly to solutions to those problems and come back with solutions next month.

Bill then described the agenda for the meeting saying that the “Nailing the Problem” exercise would occur first and that the overview of the public workshop would happen

at the end of the meeting. Bill indicated that the committee was divided into three small groups to have a discussion about the parking problem statements. He handed out the Problem Statement Matrix and asked each committee member to read through the problems and score the problem statement as either a high, medium or low priority and whether the problem is an issue in the next two years, in two to five years or five to ten years. After all committee members had an opportunity to score the problems each group facilitator led a discussion about the problem statements.

2. Nailing the Problems

Bill, Rick W. and Jason Franklin each led a small group discussion. Each small group spent about an hour discussing the problem statements and the ranking of the problem statements. They were asked why they ranked problems like they did, where they saw areas of agreement or disagreement and whether any problem statements needed clarification. At the end of an hour each group was asked to report back on their outcomes. Each group reported fairly similar results and agreement on priority of problem statements. Many of the comments highlighted how geographically specific some of the problems are, or how committee members perceive the problems to be geographically specific. It was also clear that Burnside and Belmont should be considered the same as MLK and Grand when it comes to parking policies.

Based on the group discussion and a review of the group, scoring five problem statements rose to the top as high priority, near term issues that need solutions. Those problems are:

- Parking in the district is inefficiently managed
- Existing parking policies do not support the needs of customers and visitors using the MLK and Grand corridor
- Out of district parkers are using up the parking spaces
- OMSI/Southern Triangle redevelopment has unique near-term parking needs that are not met by existing practices
- Future parking management policies in CEID will likely impact adjacent neighborhoods

The attached document shows how each group collectively scored the problem statements.

3. Community Workshop Overview

Jason Franklin provided an overview of the public workshop held on February 22. He indicated that 45 people attended the workshop where they were first provided an overview of the project and research to date and then broke into small groups for discussion. Jason F. said that many of the issues discussed at the workshop are similar to the problem statements discussed by the committee this afternoon. He quickly ran through a couple of examples including:

- Different areas of the district create different parking issues
- Expanding the permit system could help manage parking
- Residents are concerned that the parking problem will shift to the neighborhood
- There is much uncertainty about meters in the district

A full summary of the public workshop is available on the project Web site.

4. Wrap-up/Next Steps

Just before 6 p.m., Bill H. thanked the committee members for their time and indicated that at the next SAC meeting the project team will bring proposed solutions to the parking problems discussed this afternoon.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 19, 2011
 4-6 p.m.
 Architectural Heritage Center
 701 SE Grand Ave., 2nd floor classroom
 Portland, OR