

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

Meeting date: Tuesday, May 10, 2011

SAC Members in Attendance: Mike Bolliger (Bolliger & Sons Insurance), Paul Carlson (OMSI), John Cole (BPS), Warren Fish (Multnomah County, Jeff Cogan's office), Cathy Galbraith (Bosco Milligan), Bill Goman (Goodwill), Lance Lindahl (Brooklyn neighborhood), Susan Lindsay (Buckman neighborhood), Ellis McCoy (PBOT), Matt Milletto (Water Avenue Coffee), Susan Pearce (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: Matt Butts (Group Mackenzie), Juliana Lukasik (@Large Films-CEIC), Jonathan Malsin (Beam Development), John Garner (PCC), Bert Geiger (BG Marketing-CEIC), Deek Heykamp (Next Adventure), Trang Lam (PDC), Lance Marris (Bside 6).

Staff/Consultants Attending: Bill Hoffman and Sarah Heinicke (PBOT), Jason Franklin (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: Julie Gustafson (Portland Streetcar), Alice Meyers (BES).

Handouts:

- Agenda
- Hard copy of May 10 presentation

These documents are posted on the project Web site:

<http://www.portlandonline.com/transportation/index.cfm?c=53032>.

1. Welcome/Review of Last Meeting

Bill H. welcomed the committee and reviewed the parking plan development timeline, noting that the group is currently midway through Phase 3, developing alternative parking management solutions. In response to some members' questions about whether the process can be completed earlier than August or September, he said it may be possible. By the end of the June 21 meeting, he said, "we should have most of the plan elements pulled together." However, if concerns arise during the June 28 public open house, "we may need some of the remaining scheduled meetings to address those."

Bill then reviewed parking "problem statements" and recommended solutions as revised per SAC comments at the April and May meetings. He noted that, as the committee had directed, the project team removed 2-hour parking limits (via signage, initially, and meters eventually) for the commercial corridors north of Couch St., and along Martin Luther King (MLK) Jr. Blvd. and Grand Ave. north of Couch, to allow permit

parking for employees in the area. He then asked for the SAC's guidance on how best to address parking management adjacent to commercial uses in industrial zones.

This prompted a lengthy discussion about how best to apply parking limits, meters and permit parking areas throughout the district. Members' concerns fell into two main categories:

- Installation of meters. Several members felt revised solutions as stated in the May 10 presentation prematurely suggested the installation of meters when the last presentation had indicated changes would first involve 2-hour signage, with meters considered at a later date. "I think we are jumping the gun on meters," said one member. "Let's wait until after the streetcar goes in to see how parking behavior changes and after we have a parking management organization in place." Another emphasized "we should lead by changing signs, not using meters." One member suggested that, if meters are used at all, they be limited to MLK Jr. Blvd. and Grand Ave.
- Application of parking solutions by zoning. Several members thought this approach was too "broad-brush" and did not reflect that there are sometimes commercial or retail uses in industrial zones. "You almost need to go block by block" to determine parking management throughout the district, said one member.

Rick M. reminded the committee that the plan includes a recommended exception process that would allow property owners/managers to request appropriate parking usage on their block face. Bill H. added that the project team will come back with refinements to address these concerns, including how best to balance employee (permit) parking needs within commercial areas. "This is your plan and you must be comfortable with it," he said.

2. Permit Districts

Bill H. reviewed the process for establishing a new (employee) parking permit district to accommodate the expanded boundaries proposed for the new CEID parking plan. Once the SAC agrees on boundaries, fees, allocation methods and enforcement, these will be recommended as part of the plan to City Council. Regarding allocation, two members said they felt strongly that all CEID employees should be eligible for parking permits.

Susan L., representing the Buckman neighborhood, reiterated concerns about how expanding the employee permit district eastward will impact neighborhoods further east. By displacing commuters that now park free in this area, they will move deeper into the neighborhoods, competing for residents' parking in front of their homes, she said. "Since when do public streets (in the expanded permit area) get reserved only for employees?" she asked. "My understanding was we were going to have a buffer zone."

To address that concern, Bill H. said the project team is recommending defining and establishing neighborhood permit programs for Buckman, Hosford-Abernethy and Kerns neighborhoods. This would allow the neighborhoods to more easily implement residential permit programs later, if and when desired.

Susan L. said she was skeptical that this would solve the problem unless the neighborhood permit programs are implemented at the same time. She urged the project team to talk to residents in these areas. She and another member also reiterated their preference for a transitional buffer or “overlap” zone that would allow residents and employees to both park in some areas. Rick W. suggested this could extend from 10th to 12th streets. Several other members suggested that residential permits allow residents to park anywhere in the CEID.

Bill H. noted that since there was concurrence on implementing residential parking permit programs at the same time as the expanded CEID employee parking permit program, boundaries need to be identified. He asked the neighborhood representatives present if they would be willing to meet separately to discuss details and outreach efforts.

3. Revenue Allocation (MRAC and TMA)

Rick W. talked about how the CEID could capture and control a portion of public parking revenues (e.g., from meters) generated in the district in the future. While the SAC has indicated it is strongly in favor of forming a CEID Transportation and Parking Management Association (TPMA, or TMA), such a group can take a long time to establish. In the interim, Rick said, the CEID could consider forming a Meter Revenue Allocation Committee (MRAC), as was done in the Lloyd District, to prioritize projects and allocate revenues within the district. The MRAC can then transition into or become part of a future TMA. Project staff recommends making MRAC formation part of the parking plan submitted to City Council. (Details of MRAC and TMA structure, funding, and roles are detailed in the presentation document.)

Several members asked questions about the MRAC and TMA:

- Q: How does a business improvement district (BID) work? (A BID was cited as one example to provide base funding for a TMA.) A: Usually by levying a business license fee based on square-footage. Several members expressed concern about using this form of funding because of other special taxing districts pending in the area (i.e., a transportation system development charge overlay district proposed for part of the CEID’s southern area). With 500 businesses owners in the CEID, another member said establishing a BID could be “a daunting task.”
- Q: Can a TMA monitor and enforce parking within the district? A: No. The City has previously turned down such requests. Enforcement is most cost effective if provided Citywide.
- Q: Can the MRAC/TMA include neighborhood representatives? A: Yes, they can be included on the governing board.

Committee members indicated they would like an MRAC to be included as part of the parking plan recommendation. It was suggested that the MRAC be formed under the auspices of the CEIC; a CEIC representative said the group would discuss that idea internally. It was also suggested that one or more SAC or CEIC members consider

meeting with PBOT TMA specialists. Rick W. said he will bring examples of how other TMAs are set up, including budgets and staffing, to the June meeting.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 21, 2011
4-6 p.m.
Architectural Heritage Center
701 SE Grand Ave., 2nd floor classroom
Portland, OR