

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

Meeting date: Tuesday, August 16, 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), Juliana Lukasik (@Large Films-CEIC), 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: Susan Lindsay (Buckman neighborhood), Warren Fish (Multnomah County, Jeff Cogan's office), John Garner (PCC), Bill Goman (Goodwill), Deek Heykamp (Next Adventure), Trang Lam (PDC), Jonathan Malsin (Beam Development), Ellis McCoy (PBOT), Lance Marrs (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: Ramon Corona (PBOT Parking Control).

Handouts:

- Agenda
- Draft parking plan

There was also a summary PowerPoint presentation given at the meeting. These documents are posted on the project Web site:

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

1. Review Process and Timeline

Bill H. began by noting this is the second to last SAC meeting for this project. "We'd like to discuss and resolve remaining key issues today," he said, "so we can review a final draft of the parking management plan next month." Issues still being discussed include timing and location of meter installation, as well as identifying "triggers" for that action, and details around the formation, responsibilities, and funding of a Transportation & Parking Management Association (TPMA) to represent the CEID.

2. Draft Parking Plan Presentation

Before launching into discussion, Bill presented several slides reviewing the plans goals, proposed solutions and implementation timeline. The project's intent was to develop a plan that would simplify the parking system, establish a new permit and meter district, expand the permit program, create a customer priority parking area, create a fair exceptions process (for business owners needing different parking uses – such as

shorter time-stays – on or adjacent to their block), streamline the residential permit process, protect adjacent neighborhoods from incursions by displaced parkers, and encourage establishment of a TPMA.

To that end, the SAC and project team have produced a draft plan that reduces the confusing mix of on-street parking types to two base zones (two- or three-hour stays) throughout most of the district, with expanded all-day permit parking allowed in those zones except along the identified customer priority corridor (MLK and Grand boulevards and a half block of adjacent east-west streets), he said. In addition, the plan identifies criteria for an exceptions process, establishes a neighborhood buffer zone, and lays the foundation for developing a less cumbersome residential permit process and establishing a TPMA.

The draft plan shows implementation of some parking changes beginning as early as first quarter 2012, with others phased in over the next three years. Signage changes to implement the new time-stays and establishment of the exceptions process would happen the earliest, with issuance of new employee parking permits potentially beginning in the third quarter.

3. Draft Parking Plan Discussion

SAC members then discussed unresolved issues. They are grouped by topic below.

Off-street Parking

- John C. of BPS asked fellow SAC members whether better use of off-street parking throughout the district should be considered as one way to replace on-street parking lost to the streetcar and to postpone the need to install meters. While all new off-street parking must be shared with the public, existing lots are designated “accessory” use, meaning only property/business owners, employees and customers have access. Data gathered for the project showed these lots are inefficiently used. Rick W. noted that the project team discussed and recommended removing accessory designations (via a city code change) from existing properties so they can be shared, although this is not specified in the draft plan. SAC members favored the idea. John C. was asked to provide a paragraph to the project team for inclusion in the plan.

Parking Meters

- A committee member pointed out that the parking usage data used to develop the plan was collected on weekdays, “so why are we talking about enforcing new parking zones or meters on Saturdays?” Other members agreed that this may not be necessary in the primarily industrial, southern area of the CEID, but noted that Saturday enforcement was important on the north end due to Rose Garden events that attract hundreds of visitors. At the end of the meeting SAC members agreed that enforcement would remain Monday through Saturday.

- Peter S., representing the Central Eastside Industrial Council (CEIC), said the CEIC board believes metering “at this particular time” is unnecessary, but agrees that they will likely be needed in the future. The decision to install meters should rest with the TPMA, he said, which ideally could use revenue from a proposed parking permit surcharge to fund a parking usage/needs study when appropriate. “The board wants to be sure we engage CEID business owners in the meter installation decision,” he said.
- Another CEIC member noted that the board strongly supports the north-south retail corridor (the customer parking priority area along MLK and Grand boulevards that would likely be the first district location for meters), but has concerns about the SAC’s “lack of consensus” about extending this area for a half block on east and west streets. It may be left to the TPMA to look “block by block” at whether metering or permit parking spaces are most appropriate along those side streets, he said. A third CEIC member noted that the board did not discuss the district’s Southern Triangle, south of Clay Street, but doubted that it would object to the plan’s proposal to eventually meter some 30 spaces “in what is becoming an entertainment district.” The plan calls for on-street metering in this area (with three-hour time stays) when the streetcar begins operating in September 2012.
- Paul C. from OMSI, located in the Southern Triangle, reiterated the museum’s support of metering on-street parking in the area, as OMSI plans to meter its own lots to discourage off-site users (including Esplanade bikers, rowing enthusiasts, and “park-and-riders”). However, he also advocated that the plan address potential metering along Water Avenue in this area, perhaps as far north at Taylor Street. “If there’s an opportunity for better parking management, Water Avenue is it,” he said.
- A SAC member located on Water Avenue farther north concurred with the idea of metering along the avenue, but advocated meters be considered along the avenue’s entire stretch or at least in selective subareas beyond the Southern Triangle. “Water Avenue is a mess right now,” he said. “It’s a free-for-all.” Several CEIC members expressed support for Water Avenue metering as well. Paul C. said he will host a meeting of Water Avenue business owners to explore interest in metering prior to the final SAC meeting in September, with the intent of adding language to the parking plan that cites this avenue as a candidate for future metering.
- Bill H. asked the CEIC representatives on the committee for clarification on what “trigger” they have identified for conducting a future parking usage study that would, in turn, determine the need for or timing of meter installation. Specifically, he asked if the 85% peak occupancy standard was the intended trigger. Peter S. responded that it could be one trigger among several. Rick W. noted that some cities use the 85% rule along with other triggers, such as efficiency of parking space usage, the need to revenue generation, or the need for better parking enforcement (which meters facilitate).

TPMA

- Peter S. reported that the CEIC fully supports formation of a TPMA, initially as a CEIC committee, with the expectation it would begin as a volunteer organization and then grow into one with a paid, professional director. While the CEIC could provide some start-up support, it would expect that the TPMA would soon have a source of revenue (permit surcharges) and authority to use those funds, he said, to reimburse the CEIC and support future TPMA activities.
- Bill H. said that normally, shared meter revenues provide the first source of funding for a TPMA. Given that the plan now calls for meter installation at a point to be determined in the future, thereby deferring that revenue stream, he was unsure if PBOT authorities would approve a permit surcharge. He also clarified that the plan will recommend formation of a TPMA and perhaps some “revenue processes,” but will not require formation. City staff can assist a non-profit organization setting up the TPMA, but the City has no money to directly fund the effort.
- This concerned several SAC/CEIC members who wanted the plan to include a stronger City endorsement of the TPMA and \$10 permit surcharge. Expected to raise between \$16,000 and \$40,000 annually, surcharge revenues would be vital to the TPMA’s ability to conduct future parking studies, said one member, which would, in turn, determine meter installation. It could be that the TPMA will need to conduct several studies before meters are installed, he said, because the district will be undergoing a series of “shocks” to its transportation system over the next few years: parking changes when the plan is enforced, completion of the eastside streetcar and then completion of the Close-the-Loop streetcar route. “How will these affect parking patterns?” he asked. “We won’t know until we’ve done a study...and those cost money. Maybe this isn’t the norm (using permit surcharges to jump-start a TPMA), but we’ve always done things differently in the CEID.” Another member said that formation and funding of a TPMA are a must-have for the CEIC to support the parking plan.
- Rick W. noted that an interim option exists: a community entity similar to a Meter Revenue Allocation Committee (MRAC, perhaps renamed Transportation Revenue Allocation Committee, or TRAC) could be formed first – with lesser authority than a TPMA – and serve as a placeholder until the TPMA is formed.
- Bill H. suggested that CEIC representatives contact Dan Bowers in PBOT Transportation Management in the next month to discuss the permit surcharge/TPMA funding issue, following up with PBOT Director Tom Miller, as needed.

4. Next Steps

Bill H. identified issues that will be discussed at the final SAC meeting in September: TPMA formation and funding, and potential meter installation along Water Avenue.

He said project staff would look into the economic feasibility of installing meters along Water Avenue and provide those to Paul C. prior to the proposed meeting of Water Avenue business owners.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, Sept. 20, 2011
4-6 p.m.
Architectural Heritage Center
701 SE Grand Ave., 2nd floor classroom
Portland, OR