

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

Meeting date: Tuesday, June 21, 2011

SAC Members in Attendance: Mike Bolliger (Bolliger & Sons Insurance), Matt Butts (Group Mackenzie), John Cole (BPS), Cathy Galbraith (Bosco Milligan), Bert Geiger (BG Marketing-CEIC), Lance Lindahl (Brooklyn neighborhood), Susan Lindsay (Buckman neighborhood), Juliana Lukasik (@Large Films-CEIC), Ellis McCoy (PBOT), Matt Milletto (Water Avenue Coffee), Steve Russell (Kerns neighborhood), Peter Stark (Stark Design/Portland Streetcar-CEIC), Dan Yates (Portland Spirit-CEIC).

SAC Members Absent: Paul Carlson (OMSI), Warren Fish (Multnomah County, Jeff Cogan's office), Bill Goman (Goodwill), Jonathan Malsin (Beam Development), John Garner (PCC), Deek Heykamp (Next Adventure), Trang Lam (PDC), Lance Marrs (Bside 6), Susan Pearce (Hosford-Abernathy neighborhood [HAND]), Bob Wentworth (Wentworth Chevrolet-Subaru).

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), Mark Friedman and Donald Hunter (PBOT parking enforcement), Jim Kennison (Franz Bakery).

Handouts:

- Agenda
- Hard copy of presentation
- Flyer for June 28 Community Forum

These documents are posted on the project Web site:

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

1. Welcome/Review Process and Timeline

Bill H. welcomed the committee and reviewed the parking plan development timeline, noting that this meeting would conclude Phase 3. Until now, the SAC has been working on the pieces of the parking plan, he said, "but now it's time to see how the pieces come together." Bill then reviewed the five "problem statements" that the SAC had identified as near-term issues and initial priorities to be addressed by the parking plan (see presentation document). A committee member asked that formation of a Transportation and Parking Management Association (TPMA) be added as a sixth priority, given the SAC's keen interest in creating a TPMA as soon as possible.

2. Review Draft Recommendations

Bill H. said the purpose of the meeting was to review draft plan recommendations refined by the project team based on SAC discussion and guidance in earlier meetings. "Again, we want to be sure you are comfortable with these recommendations before

we take them to the public (a community forum on the proposed CEID parking plan was held June 28) and City Council,” he said. He explained that plan recommendations fall into three major categories: Parking Operations, Formation of a TPMA, and Mitigation of Residential Impacts.

a. Parking Operations

- *Time Zones and Permit Areas*

Before discussing recommendations for time zones and new permit parking areas within the CEID, Rick W. explained how each works. Time zones encourage customer parking (vs. employee parking), allow a fixed “time stay” or length of time in one spot, and give customers who need to stay longer in the district the option of moving to another time zone space. Permit zones, by comparison, provide priority all-day parking for employees (or residents) while also allowing limited time stays for non-permit holders. Non-permitted vehicles cannot re-park within the same permit area for 12 hours. Rick noted that nearly 2000 stalls within the CEID are currently “2 hours or by permit.”

Bill H. then referred committee members to a map showing the location of proposed reformatted parking areas for Phase 1 of the plan. Phase 2 and 3 maps showed potential transition to parking meters along major corridors. “We are trying to strike the proper balance,” Bill said. “We want employees to have opportunities to park in the district as well as customers, but we need your (the SAC’s) help determining what should happen first and how the plan might evolve.”

- *Reformatted Time Limits*

Rick W. discussed the reformatting recommendations (see presentation document), explaining that a defined red area on the map encompassing the MLK/Grand corridor and some east-west major connector corridors would encourage customer parking in what SAC members had identified as a major retail core. While parking along MLK/Grand would have 2-hour time zones geared to customers only, parking along the major connector corridors would be a mix of “2-hour or by permit” parking to allow some employee parking.

Several committee members stated that one or more areas within the “red” zone are not retail-oriented and so should be excluded from the proposed changes. It was agreed that the Phase 1 map should only recommend customer-oriented parking along the MLK/Grand corridor, with the customer parking zone expanding only as needed in the future. The SAC was also reminded that any parking format that does not meet adjacent property or business owners’ needs can be changed through the exceptions process. Currently, PBOT handles exceptions requests, but that task could later be delegated to the CEID TPMA.

Rick W. then discussed the blue area on the Phase 1 map, which would allow either 2-hour or 3-hour time stays for non-permit holders (such as customers) and all-day parking for permit holders (such as employees). Rick asked the SAC for its opinion: should the allowed time stay be boosted to 3 hours in this area, or left at 2 hours like much of it is currently? Data gathered early in the planning process showed that many parkers in 2-hour zones exceeded that time allotment. Some committee members favored remaining with 2-hour time stays, while others were neutral. However, two members of PBOT's parking enforcement team explained that enforcing 3-hour parking limits is more difficult than 2-hour limits, and therefore more likely to be abused. It was agreed to recommend "2 hours or by permit" parking in the designated blue area.

A committee member noted that she did not know about the parking limitations that apply to non-permit holders parking in permit spaces (the fact that re-parking is not allowed in that same permit area for 12 hours) before the meeting, and asked how the general public is supposed to know this. A PBOT representative admitted the City doesn't publicize this rule, but that was something the future TPMA could address.

While the map showing proposed parking area revisions was displayed, a neighborhood representative reiterated her concern about the parking plan's eastern boundary. Susan L. of the Buckman neighborhood said that by expanding the "2-hour or by permit" parking area to 12th Avenue, "we will cause undue hardship in the neighborhood" (potentially limiting parking by residents or guests in front of their dwellings). She advocated for a buffer zone between 10th and 12th avenues, where existing parking conditions could remain.

Several committee members supported the buffer as appropriate for Phase 1 of the plan, but also wanted the flexibility of expanding to 12th in the future. Limiting the boundary to 10th would be "short-sighted," said one member. Bill H. added that PBOT is proactively addressing ways to mitigate the parking plan's impacts on neighborhoods, working with neighborhoods on a plan component that would make establishing a residential permit zone easier.

It was agreed that the recommendation for Phase 1 will include a "status quo" buffer zone between 10th and 12th avenues. That would mean no new time zones or permit zones in the area between Hawthorne and Burnside.

While the recommendations for reformatted parking included subsequent phases (2 and 3), SAC members indicated they would prefer to leave the timing of plan expansion – including installation of parking meters – to the future TPMA. However, the committee did ask that the project team identify some triggers for implementation of next phases. Triggers could include the "Close the Loop" streetcar or Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Line becoming operational (which will impact parking behavior and future development in the CEID), or

parking constraints (parking space usage exceeding the 85% threshold), or all of the above.

- *Meter Revenue Scenarios*

Responding to a SAC request at the previous meeting, Rick W. looked at three different meter revenue options. This gave the SAC an approximation of how much revenue meters could generate and, consequently, potential operating revenues for a future TPMA. (PBOT would share a portion of the revenues with the TPMA; see the presentation document.)

- *Permit Zone Implementation*

Rick W. discussed several options for implementing the expanded permit zone. While the current parking permit program allows businesses to obtain permits for 75% of their employees, he noted that the SAC had earlier indicated a preference for 100%. The current permit fee of \$45/year could be continued, or the SAC could recommend an increase (such as to add a surcharge for the TPMA when functional). Committee members had mixed views on these topics. When asked, a PBOT representative said that permit fees are expected to remain the same next year. In the end, it was agreed to recommend raising the cap to 100% but to keep fees the same for now.

b. Forming a TPMA

Peter S. reported that the Central Eastside Industrial Council (CEIC) had talked about the role it could play in creating a TPMA. Because the CEIC is a nonprofit, a TPMA can easily be created as a subcommittee of the CEIC. The group will continue exploring that option.

c. Mitigating Residential Impacts and Simplifying Creation of a Residential Permit Zone (RPZ)

Although mentioned earlier in the meeting, neighborhood mitigation efforts were briefly discussed again. Susan L. reported that the three neighborhood representatives on the SAC have met separately to discuss how to make a residential permit program “more doable” (e.g., relaxing petitioning requirements). “We have some recommendations,” she said, “and we will continue to work with PBOT.”

3. Next Steps

Bill H. said the project team will come back at the July meeting with a revised Phase 1 map, additional plan refinements, and a report on feedback from the community forum.

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