

Steve
Novick
Commissioner

Leah Treat
Director

CEIC TPAC Subcommittee

Wednesday, November 12, 2014

4:00-5:30 p.m.

RiverEast Center
1515 SE Water Ave. 3rd Floor
Portland, OR 97214

Meeting Notes

Members in attendance (5:11)

Michael Bolliger, Bob Wentworth, Brian Scott, Peter Stark, Steve Russell.

Staff, consultants, and guests in attendance

Chris Armes, Bill Hoffman, Mayna Vancaillie, and Francesca Patricolo of PBOT. Rick Williams of Rick Williams Consulting.

Welcome + public comment

Bill Hoffman called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone. There was no public comment.

Follow-up from last meeting's on-street parking zone descriptions and map

Bill told the committee that fundamentally the district has two zones: industrial (IG-1, IG-2, and IHg) and central employment (EXd). Mayna Vancaillie reviewed staff's understanding of what the committee agreed to at the last meeting with regards to on-street user priorities in the two zones. She said the handout of parking zone descriptions and user priority for on-street parking illustrate the kinds of uses people would see on the ground in each zone,

1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 • Portland, OR 97204 • 503-823-5185
FAX 503-823-7576 • TTY 503-823-6868 • www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

what that turns into in terms of parking demand, and who has priority of access to the on-street parking in each zone.

Mayna said in the industrial zone, the majority of parking demand is from area employees who drive to work but there are also some commercial vehicles and business visitors who might be customers. She said at the last committee meeting, members indicated the priority in this area should first be for employees, then for vehicle loading, and lastly for visitors.

Mayna said in the central employment zone, the committee indicated the priority is customers, then employees, then loading. She said they gave residents the lowest priority. She said the map she showed the committee at the last meeting had lines drawn around the customer priority area and members ranked on-street user priority in that area as well, however the committee's responses were the same for the customer priority area as the central employment zone. She said in light of that, staff is referring to just the two zones for now. She said the 2012 plan talks about the potential to treat areas differently if they hit certain targets, such as 50% at grade retail, so staff will need to wait until the utilization data comes in to see if, in fact, customer priority is a third zone type to consider.

Committee members discussed potential zoning changes as the result of the City's 2035 Comprehensive Plan update. Staff confirmed that regardless of the changes to come, the final adopted policy decisions for on-street formatting would apply the same. Rick Williams, consultant, added that if an area is underutilized, policy could allow more employee parking in an EXd zone because it would have performance based criteria for management.

On-street parking management best practices

Bill introduced best practices. He said we have two zones with different priorities for who gets to use them. He said Rick Williams will say what the best practices are and then pause to hear what the committee says and hopefully at the December meeting the committee will look at what best practices would look like on a draft map. He said at the December meeting the committee will look at the inventory and survey as well. Bill concluded that working out the best practices specific to the district is an iterative process and this meeting is the beginning of the iterative process.

Rick Williams distributed a page of best practices for parking management strategies. He said it is about when parking management would go to more aggressive measures –what the thresholds are. The committee briefly discussed exceptions and the exceptions process. Rick said even the exception process will be demand based.

Regarding the industrial zone: Rick said the industry standard dictates that if an area is over 85% capacity, people are going to have difficulty getting into the zone and there will need to be alternatives. He explained the three-tiered threshold model of >85%, 60%-84%, and <60%. He said if the area has <60% occupied on-street parking, best practice would be to sell more permits because of the very low occupancy. He said first the policy would make sure everyone has the permits they need, then make interim sales to non-employees. Rick used an example where permits could be sold on a month-to-month basis to residents.

Committee members said there are areas within the district that are over utilized and also areas that are underutilized. The committee briefly discussed the potential to separate the district into multiple parts or segments for managing them differently based on performance. Rick said best practices are to sell to your priority users first then sell to other users on an interim basis or lower permit prices. He said if prices are lowered, there would need to be separate segments for management. A committee member commented that the district appears to already have inherent separate segments because there are physical barriers. Committee members agreed that the <60% occupied on-street parking condition may not exist in the district and may not be that critical.

Rick explained the best practices for treating conditions of 60%-84% occupied on-street parking, referring to it as the "status quo option" where the goal is to manage float. Rick explained that the City sells more permits than stalls in the district, creating a certain amount of flex, or "float", in the system. He said that at any time, 15% of the district's parkers are not parked because they are away or work part time, for example. He said the stall format may include both meters and signs though more than likely it would just include signs. Rick said the number and placement of meters would need to be strategic because the district could lose revenue if employees park at meters with permits.

Committee members discussed concurrent uses of meters and signage. Some members voiced that having permit exceptions (where permits exempt vehicles from paying at meters) presents a conflict. Other members commented that by metering, visitor spaces are forced to turn over a bit faster, which may be important as the on-street parking approaches 84% occupancy. Another member agreed that according to the best practices, parking management would not require meters unless there were significant need.

Rick explained the >85% on-street parking occupancy best standards, saying it is when a meter might make more sense and more money due to visitor demand. He said it is not cost effective to meter all the stalls when spaces are occupied by 85% employees. He said when there is high demand for the spaces, best practices would be to cap the number of permits sold, meter, and highly encourage commuters to use other modes of transportation. He said parking management could attrition the permits and increase the permit fee as-needed based on performance standards.

Committee members discussed how many of the industries in district evolved to need retail showrooms and office space. Some discussed using parking as a deterrent for over-developing non-industrial uses in the district. Staff explained that the businesses in the customer priority area zoning overlay are legitimate uses. Bill said the TPAC as an advisory group can recommend that staff not view businesses in the customer priority area as commercial uses, and to instead view them as in industrial zone, however there might be push back because it may not be defensible since the overlay suggests those uses are appropriate there.

Bill said that it is at the >85% threshold where the district will need to be aggressive in managing parking. Committee members commented that some areas are probably at 100%. Rick responded that at that point, off-street and TDM strategies will become critical.

The committee discussed how the city would decide who should receive permits for employees when there is high demand for on-street parking. Rick said the employers figure it out based on equitable FTE-based standards.

Committee members discussed current inequities in the exceptions process. One comment was that any business can right now ask for and receive an exception and then their users also get to take up limited permit parking shared by all the other businesses.

Action: PBOT staff will add a discussion about exceptions process parameters to a future meeting.

Q: In high occupancy situations, what about making the meter times shorter? Wouldn't that be an option?

A: Yes. It can help turn the spots over more quickly.

Rick discussed best practices for managing on-street parking in the mixed use employment zone. He said when the occupancy of on-street parking is <60%, the area could be used as a blow-off valve. He said at the 60-84% level, the district could start scaling down the number of permits issued by pulling them and/or issuing fewer. He said at the >85% level the best practice is to not allow permits. A committee member brought up that they will need to make a distinction for how to manage employee parking in metered areas where no permits are allowed.

Q: How would on-street parking be managed if a business has property in both industrial and mixed-use land use types?

A: It comes down to what area is specifically being used to calculate the on-street occupancy at 85%.

Q: Are permit-holders recorded in the inventory then cross-referenced to the businesses that issued them?

A: No. We do not have that ability and/or it would be highly complex to do so.

Q: If meters are implemented, will they be implemented on a block-by-block basis or will they be implemented to a particular area?

A: We will not know what would make sense until we see the data next month.

Q: Could determining who gets permits and how many permits they get be as complex as having a variable FTE standard where one area might get more permits than another?

A: Yes. When separated by different districts, that is a possibility.

Committee members discussed affordability of permits and options for working people to get to work when there is high demand for on-street parking.

On-street parking inventory findings

Rick said his firm now has inventory data for every stall and block face in the area the committee directed. He said his staff saw a lot of people parking in permit zones without proper permits. Bill said staff is trying to understand what happened since the inventory brought to light a problem they did not know it existed, in that apparently there may have been some areas that were never signed.

Q: Is it possible the signs were removed?

A: It would be unlikely because it is a capital offense to remove parking signs.

Action: PBOT staff will get back to the committee about the potential missing signage issue when staff knows more.

Communications update

Francesca Patricolo, Parking Operations, said she reached out to Peter Stark, TPAC Executive Director, to see how she could support him with communication tasks for the subcommittee. She said they talked about how to get information from the subcommittee to TPAC and from TPAC to the CEIC and back as well as out to the broader community of potentially interested parties. She said she created a web page for the subcommittee on the City's website and in meeting with Peter they decided to make that web page a static page and to add a section to the TPAC page where there will be more information including agendas and meeting notes.

CEIC TPAC Subcommittee meeting notes 11.12.14

Francesca said public comment will be included on all the agendas moving forward. She said some of their ideas for outreach include using the CEIC's social media accounts and CEIC website to post monthly updates. Francesca said she will start writing updates for the TPAC page and outreach uses on a monthly basis. She said they will use their neighborhood resources such as newsletters. She said that the first thing she is going to do is write a statement about what the committee is and what they are doing, and then spread it around to help people learn about the on-street formatting work taking place. Francesca said they will rely on the committee members to also help get information out.

Peter said it is important that information about the subcommittee's work is made available and that the CEIC works to expand their email list. He said Francesca and him will work with Terry Taylor, CEIC Executive Director, to get his input on outreach as well. He said the committee does not want to find themselves making decisions that become adversarial with businesses in the district.

Q: What about using the database for the permits?

A: The City does not have email addresses for permit holders.

The committee discussed the need and importance of outreach and engagement.

Next steps

Bill said the committee is building on the adopted plan and the data the committee will review at the next meeting will help inform which tools to use to begin to control the balance of on-street occupancy in the district.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.