

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

Meeting date: Tuesday, July 19, 2011

SAC Members in Attendance: Mike Bolliger (Bolliger & Sons Insurance), Matt Butts (Group Mackenzie), Paul Carlson (OMSI), 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), Susan Pearce (Hosford-Abernathy neighborhood [HAND]), Steve Russell (Kerns neighborhood), Peter Stark (Stark Design/Portland Streetcar-CEIC), Bob Wentworth (Wentworth Chevrolet-Subaru).

SAC Members Absent: 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), Dan Yates (Portland Spirit-CEIC).

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), Jim Kennison (Franz Bakery).

Handouts:

- Agenda
- Hard copy of meeting discussion points
- Summary of Public Workshop #2
- *Framework Criteria for Allowing Exceptions to 2- and 3-hour base parking standards in the Central Eastside*

These documents are posted on the project Web site:

<http://www.portlandonline.com/transportation/index.cfm?c=53032>. In addition, a draft TPMA charter was e-mailed to SAC members prior to the meeting; since the document is still preliminary.

1. Report on Public Workshop & CEIC Quarterly Meeting

Bill H. began the meeting by asking if SAC members who were present at the public workshop held June 28 wished to share their observations. The workshop was an opportunity for CEID property owners, business people, and residents to learn about the latest elements of the emerging Central Eastside Parking Management Plan. Several members responded, reporting that workshop attendees appeared to welcome parking improvements, but were worried about how specific policy proposals would impact them. One member pointed out that given the CEID's "schizophrenia" (multiple lands uses with differing parking needs), a proposed solution to help one group was sometimes perceived as harmful to another. Whatever plan is adopted, educating the

public about new parking policies and their intent will be “an important but daunting” task, he said.

Jason F. of the project team then summarized key points gleaned from the public workshop. As noted by the SAC members, he said, attendees recognized that the district needs a new approach to parking, but proposed changes will be “difficult to adjust to” given other changes occurring simultaneously in the district. Specifically, concerns were raised about the installation of parking meters, the proposed change in distribution of employee parking permits and the formation of a local Transportation & Parking Management Association (TPMA). Most participants appeared OK with meters being installed along the MLK/Grand corridor, but questioned their necessity and how they would impact parking patterns. Likewise, most attendees were supportive of a TPMA but differed as to how large a role it should be allowed in making parking decisions. Some participants found certain plan elements confusing which, again, “will make education very important,” Jason said. (For more details, see the workshop summary posted on the project Web site.)

SAC members who are also members of the Central Eastside Industrial Council (CEIC) then reported back on the CEIC’s quarterly meeting held June 29, where the parking plan was discussed. Like the general public, CEIC members expressed “much concern about parking meters,” they said, but were also keenly interested in the proposed parking management process. (The TPMA will likely be formed as a subcommittee of the CEIC.) The CEIC also agrees that an education campaign should be part of the adopted plan.

2. Review Process and Timeline

Bill H. reviewed the project’s timeline, noting that the SAC is “in the last lap of this planning process (in Phase 4),” with two meetings remaining to finalize the parking management plan. He asked committee members whether a public workshop planned Sept. 27 would be “the best way to get word out about the final plan,” or if members would like to suggest an alternative. For example, he suggested mailing informational flyers to all CEID landowners. Some SAC members suggesting instead that PBOT and the project team focus on communicating directly with businesses along the commercial corridor where changes will be most pronounced.

3. Draft Plan Outline

Bill H. discussed the draft plan outline, noting that the project team intends to provide SAC members with a draft report to review before the Aug. 16 meeting. There are nine core issues involved in the plan, he said. The SAC has addressed four of those – changes to the permit parking district, allowed time stays in certain areas, enforcement and a neighborhood buffer zone – during earlier meetings. Today’s meeting would continue discussions on paid parking (meters), the “exceptions” process (how shorter time stays can be requested near certain businesses), status of the neighborhood permit district,

and a draft TPMA charter. In August, the SAC will address an implementation schedule for the parking plan.

4. Refinement of Remaining Plan Elements

- ***Paid Parking***

Rick W. discussed a CEID map showing revised boundaries for a “customer parking priority area,” based on SAC members’ comments at the last meeting. The resulting map looks much like a ladder, he noted, with 2-hour parking zones along MLK and Grand and extending a half-block down each intersecting east/west street.

Several committee members expressed continuing concerns despite the reduction in size of the customer parking area. One was worried about the loss of employee (permit) parking in this area. Bill H. indicated that simultaneous expansion of the permit parking area would have a net effect of increasing employee parking in the CEID, although those spots may be located elsewhere. Several SAC members thought the customer parking area needed to be tweaked further, such as excluding the commercial corridor area south of Taylor St. and perhaps including scattered pockets of retail uses off the corridor (such as along Water Ave.). One member suggested asking each business owner along the corridor if the proposed 2-hour customer parking zone works for them. “We’re trying to build a customer corridor,” the member said, “but there’s disagreement about whether ‘one size fits all.’”

Bill H. then discussed potential “triggers” for moving from 2-hour free parking to paid parking (meters) along the commercial corridor in the future. Because metered parking tends to promote turnover, freeing up parking spaces more often, installation of meters would be appropriate when more customers are attracted to the district and there is more competition for on-street parking. Because completion of the streetcar would likely create this scenario, the project team suggests that could be a logical trigger for metering the corridor, he said.

This prompted a lengthy discussion about the timing of meter installation. One member questioned whether the streetcar was an appropriate trigger. “I think we need to see what the impact of the streetcar actually is,” she said. “We’ll lose some parking spaces, but gain better access to transit. We need to factor this in before talking about meters.”

Some members suggested completion of the Close The Loop streetcar project or meeting the “85% capacity use” threshold (defined during the Nov. 16, 2010, meeting; see posted documents) as alternative triggers. But some members felt it was premature to discuss any triggers for meters. A few felt streetcar completion should trigger just the implementation of the 2-hour customer parking area, with meters triggered by something else in the future. The 2-hour zone “will be a test for meters,” said one. “We should wait to see how that works before establishing a trigger for meters.” Others preferred having the future TPMA determine the timing of meters.

But Bill H. urged the group to define a trigger. “We have worked hard over the past year to collectively devise strategies to address parking issues in the district, both now and in the future,” he said. While diverse uses throughout the CEID make parking problem-solving difficult, “we owe it to ourselves to ensure that implementation of our good ideas is carried out. For that, we need a tangible trigger included in the plan.”

Bill H. asked if the group’s consensus was to explore 85% capacity usage as a trigger. One member disagreed, favoring the installation of meters when the streetcar is completed, but the rest were in general agreement. Pursuing that as a trigger would require conducting a future parking space usage survey along the corridor, at an approximate cost of \$15,000, he noted. “Is it realistic to assume that the TPMA will have that money available to conduct the survey?” he asked. The project team will look at the viability of the Close The Loop and 85% capacity usage triggers and report back at the August meeting.

On the subject of TPMA funding, some members asked PBOT staff about meter and parking permit rates. While Rick W. used meter prices of \$1 per hour for his revenue analysis (discussed during the June 21 meeting), the TPMA could provide input on meter rates, Bill H. said. (The TPMA would share meter revenues with the City.) Ellis M. of PBOT confirmed that annual permit rates will remain \$45 in the district for the next year, but expanding the number of employee spaces in the district could allow PBOT to reduce what it charges per permit. This would make it more palatable for the TPMA to add a surcharge to the cost of the permits.

Rick W. briefly discussed recommendations for parking changes in the Southern Triangle of the district: allowing “metered 3-hour or all day by permit” parking in this area. The OMSI representative on the SAC reiterated that the museum will soon move forward with metering its parking lots to discourage them from becoming “park and ride” lots for commuters when the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail line and Close The Loop streetcar project are completed. There was minimal committee comment on the Southern Triangle recommendations.

- **Exceptions Process**

Rick W. discussed guidelines for a parking exceptions process that would allow businesses to request parking spaces with shorter time stays on their block face. Such businesses may include coffee shops, drycleaners, banks or one-hour photo shops (among others to be defined) that conduct many short transactions with customers daily, or retail businesses located in primarily parking-permit zones that need one or more spaces freed for customers. There was minimal committee comment on the exceptions process, which had been discussed at earlier meetings. (Recommended criteria and methodology for the exceptions process can be found in the *Framework Criteria for Allowing Exceptions* document posted on the project Web site.)

- **Neighborhood Permit District**

Bill H. reported that PBOT and CEID neighborhood representatives continue to work on a streamlined residential permit parking program that is intended to mitigate the parking plan's impact on neighborhoods.

- **TPMA Charter**

Peter S. briefly discussed his emerging draft of a TPMA charter, a copy of which was provided to SAC members before the meeting. The TPMA's top priority is to work closely with PBOT to manage the district's transportation and parking system to foster business and employment growth, he said. A second priority is defining an appropriate trigger for future metering within the district – not only for the commercial corridor, but for any parking subzone – which the draft identifies as 85% capacity usage.

Peter S. noted the charter does not suggest a local taxing district to fund the TPMA. Also, because the TPMA would be formed under the non-profit CEIC, it may need to be a "committee" of the CEIC, which could mean renaming it a Transportation & Parking Management Committee (TPMC).

Bill H. added that formation of the TPMA will be a two-part process. First, the parking management plan must include appropriate language to direct City staff to work with the CEIC to form the TPMA. Second, details as delineated in the draft charter need to be worked out and finalized. The latter will likely occur after the overall parking plan is finalized.

5. Next Steps

Bill H. reiterated that the project team will report back next month on alternative (metering) triggers discussed at the meeting and urged committee members to contact him if they have additional comments or ideas. At the August meeting, the SAC will review a draft report/plan and implementation schedule, with the option of meeting again in September to make additional refinements and discuss how best to communicate the plan.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, August 16, 2011
4-6 p.m.
Architectural Heritage Center
701 SE Grand Ave., 2nd floor classroom
Portland, OR