

Centers and Corridors Parking Study
Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Meeting #3

January 29, 2015
6:00 – 8:00 P.M.
Multnomah County Offices
501 SE Hawthorne, Room 315

Agenda

6:00 – 6:05	Welcome and Introductions	All
6:05 – 6:10	Review meeting #2 Notes	All
6:10 – 6:20	Project Update	Grant Morehead, PBOT
6:20 – 6:50	Best Practices and Policy Questions	Grant Morehead, PBOT
6:50 – 7:00	Review Draft Project Goals	Grant Morehead, PBOT
7:00 – 7:55	Small Group Discussion: Goals and Outcomes	All
7:55 – 8:00	Public Comment	
8:00	Adjourn	

Next Meeting: Thursday, Feb. 26, 6-8 PM
Tentative agenda: Bike parking, Transportation Demand Management concepts, parking occupancy and turnover survey results (preliminary)

Centers and Corridors Parking Study

Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Meeting #2 - Notes

October 30, 2014
6:00 – 8:00 P.M.

SAC members in attendance: Alex Cooley, Gary Davenport, Kathryn Doherty-Chapman, Carol Gossett, Sean Green, William Gregg, Gail Hoffnagle, Oreatha Johnson, Tony Jordan, Rebecca Kennedy, Gerik Kransky, Ted Labbe, Rod Merrick, Rick Michaelson, Kay Newell, Kurt Norback, Sue Pearce, John Rist, Steve Russell, Kristin Slavin, Ian Stude, Mike Westling, Don Wood,

SAC members not in attendance: Pablo Bravo, Tamara Deridder, Allen Field, Jim Kautz, Mary Kyle McCurdy, Chris Smith

City Staff in attendance: Colleen Caldwell, Judith Gray, Mauricio Leclerc, Grant Morehead, Mayna Vancaillie (Bureau of Transportation), Eric Engstrom (Bureau of Planning and Sustainability)

Public in attendance: Doug Klotz, Marsha Henshrow

The meeting began with brief introductions from committee members and a review of the meeting minutes from the first SAC meeting. There were no recommended revisions to the meeting minutes.

Grant gave a presentation about [current zoning practices](#).

Question: Was there a rationale behind why the city eliminated parking minimums in the 1990s?

Response (Staff and members): there were multiple reasons, one being because parking lots were starting to encroach upon the residential districts. There are also local and regional plans (like the Transportation Planning Rule) that have goals to reduce the per capita parking stall count within the city. Portland was one of the first cities to eliminate parking minimum requirements.

Question: What was the Council's reasoning for not allowing off-site residential parking?

Staff Response: There was concern about the needs of residents and how close they should be able to park to their apartments. There was also concerns that by allowing off-site parking, it would lead to a greater number of surface lots.

Grant continued with a presentation about current on-street parking policies. There was a lot of discussion about the Area Parking Permit Program, why it was instituted, and how it works.

Question: Can neighborhood APP Programs increase the amount they charge for their parking permits? I would be willing to pay \$200 a year to park directly in front of my house.

Staff Response: Generally no, the code does not allow that. But looking into changing the code could be something we explore in this group.

Further Question: the current permit fee covers overhead cost, is there a way to have it cover maintenance cost as well? I would like to know what the average cost is to maintain a parking spot on the street, and possibly incorporate that cost into the permit.

Staff Response: This is something we can explore. We will look into the cost figures for parking stall maintenance.

Further Question: I would like to know the estimated cost of a parking stall, including things like maintenance and the environmental cost from things like stormwater runoff.

Question: Are there any types of programs that are kind of the inverse to the APP Programs, where people can have a permit to park overnight (i.e. residents and overnight visitors would have a different permit than commuters)?

Staff Response: Portland does not have a program like this. It's up to the neighborhood if and how many visitor permit passes they allow, but they generally only last 24 hours.

Member Response: I'm not sure how functional that would be, because then people would have to move their car in the morning.

The meeting continued with a discussion about potential areas of interest the committee would like to see the project explore, what things are working well, what things are not, and possible solutions to look into.

Discussion: Area Permit Parking Program

Going back to the APP Program and overnight parking, maybe it would be more beneficial to have an overnight permit program instead of a day time program. This would help deal with the lost revenue from overnight parking by allowing residents to park there, and having others pay during the day. This might just encourage people to drive into work more, if the daytime parking was free. It would also force people to move their cars in the morning.

Some members thought there was an issue with residents who have been in areas for a very long time, and are suddenly faced with competitive parking, and having to pay for a permit in their area, which was never been the norm. Some thought that grandfathering in the older residents may be a way around that, and also to help phase in parking permits for new residents and new apartments without shocking the system.

Maybe we can discourage commuter parking by not allowing it in APP areas, but instead allowing residents to sell/lease their parking spaces to commuters during the day.

Member response: In some areas, like the CES there is no additional parking to lease/sell

Member response: This is not allowed by the code.

Staff response: Although not allowed by the code, it may be possible to grant neighborhoods more flexibility if they want to pursue this option.

Member response: There are some examples of this in California.

Discussion: The parking effort should really engage business owners, not only to gain information from them about their perceived customer issues, but also to educate them on what the data shows. There is also a need to make sure parking matches the market demand. There was one opinion that by offering

free parking, we've essentially destroyed the market, and that will need to be fixed before we can move forward.

Discussion: Some felt that focusing on parking needs was not the only management tactic that the group should take. There was a desire to have a gamut of management needs, from those of businesses, to pedestrians, to urban planners, etc. and to balance the management of the system, not just the parking element. This might need to be something that the SAC creates, because although there are goals/objectives from the different local and regional plans, some of them are too broad.

Discussion: Data and Technology

Many members agreed that data driven policies are what are needed, especially for this project. A few noted though that we do not have the right kind of data, and we are not collecting it in an efficient manner. Before going into policies and changes, we may want to first look at ways to better collect data from regular city actions (i.e. tapping into information from parking meters).

There was also a discussion about technology, especially pertaining to apps. Many of the younger members were interested in exploring the different technology options that have been seen in other cities. One example was an app that allows residential parkers to report illegally parked cars in their areas for better enforcement.

After the discussion, there was an open public comment period. There was one public comment. The commenter noted that parking management will not be terribly effective unless infrastructure is provided that allows people to forego car ownership completely. This includes transit service, sidewalk, and bicycle facilities.

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 PM.

Centers and Corridors Parking Study – Goals and Actions

1. Support the continued development and economic vibrancy of mixed use centers and corridors, while reducing and managing parking spillover into adjacent residential neighborhoods.
2. Empower neighborhoods to address parking issues with a flexible set of parking and demand management tools that is responsive to local conditions as areas change and evolve.
3. Balance the need for parking by residents and businesses with other uses of the public right-of-way.
4. Reduce the demand for automobile parking to meet the city's transportation mode split and carbon emissions targets.
5. Engage a variety of stakeholders, including neighborhood associations, business associations, transportation advocates, developers, and others in the development of project recommendations.
6. Develop policy and code language implementing the recommendations of this project, consistent with the City's policy directives as stated in the Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan, to be adopted by City Council.

The following key actions will guide the process:

1. Develop an accurate understanding of current parking supply and demand in different areas and for different purposes (short term, residential, commute, etc.). Estimate how demand will change in the future based on land use projections developed for the Comprehensive Plan update.
2. Think strategically about the best use for the area adjacent to the curb. Recognize that in some cases the best use of the curb zone may not be motor vehicle parking, but other street features such as travel lanes, larger sidewalks, stormwater management, bicycle parking, etc.
3. Evaluate a broad range of parking management tools. Propose the mix of strategies that best achieves multiple goals, including economic, health, climate, equity and livability goals.
4. Choose strategies based on empirical evidence that minimize demand for parking and use existing parking as efficiently as possible before incurring the substantial cost of building new parking.
5. Increase the visibility of "hidden" or externalized parking costs.
6. Integrate transportation demand management with parking strategies so they are mutually supportive.
7. Consider simplicity, equity, fairness, clarity and transparency when developing parking regulations and management practices.

City of Portland Parking Fundamentals

How to use this document. *This document is intended to establish a common understanding of parking issues. It includes facts about parking management, the economics of parking, and the influence of parking on urban form and travel behavior. This document should be interpreted as a beginning, not necessarily an end product. Parking policy and operational changes to how parking is managed and operated in the City of Portland will be developed as part of the different planning projects that form the Citywide Parking Strategy, and will be incorporated into relevant documents, such as the City Code, Central City 2035 Plan, Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan.*

- 1. Parking is an important part of a multimodal transportation system.** In the City of Portland, as in the rest of the region and the country, more adults use a motor vehicle to get around than any other form of transportation. About 70 percent of Portland residents drove to work in 2012, and 86 percent of Portland households own a car. That is 611,134 people owning 374,121 motor vehicles in 268,056 housing units. This equates to 1.4 vehicles per household or three vehicles for every two housing units. All these cars, along with commercial vehicles and vehicles from other parts of the region, need to park somewhere.
- 2. Vehicle storage is needed, at home and at destinations.** At its most basic, parking is the storage of motor vehicles while they are not being used. Studies show that in the United States, cars are parked 95% of the time. Every time a Portland resident drives to a destination, a parking space must be found at the end of the trip. And every time a Portlander who owns a car chooses to walk, cycle, or take transit, their unused vehicle needs to be stored somewhere.
- 3. The future is going to be different, but cars will still be a prominent transportation mode.** In 20 years, Portland will have 250,000 more people, 135,000 more jobs, and at least 1 million additional trips every day. New vehicle technology, vehicle sharing, and changing consumer preferences are going to alter the way people travel, but cars – and storing them – will continue to be a major part of the transportation equation. Portland needs a clear strategy to accommodate more vehicles while maintaining, and hopefully enhancing, the livability and affordability of the city.
- 4. The distribution of goods will continue to be of great importance.** Even as more people bike, walk and ride transit, the loading and unloading of goods will continue to be a key element of our transportation system. An efficient way to provide loading spaces can support the local economy, minimize conflicts with competing uses of space, minimize traffic impacts and even facilitate the use of other modes; after all, if one can walk to the store to get milk, it's usually because a truck delivered it there.
- 5. Parking is a system.** The supply of parking is comprised of on-street parking, public off-street parking and private parking. Each type affects the other and therefore it should be considered

as a system. In turn, the aggregate parking supply has a direct effect on the use and availability of other transportation modes, and vice versa.

6. **Parking is expensive, even when it appears to be free.** Even free parking has a financial cost that is absorbed into the economy and passed on to consumers. Construction costs can range from a few thousand dollars per space on a surface lot to tens of thousands of dollars per space for structured parking. That results in higher housing costs and commercial rents in a city that is already concerned about affordability. Existing parking spaces also have a cost, as they occupy land that cannot be used for other purposes.
7. **The amount and design of parking impacts urban form and development of the city.** When parking is generously provided, it encourages driving, which in turn creates additional demand for more parking. Left unchecked, land use patterns adjust over time to dedicate more and more space to store more and more vehicles. As more people drive, fewer resources are dedicated to serve pedestrians, transit users and cyclists, leading to more traffic and an unbalanced transportation system. The result is an auto-dominated urban environment.
8. **There is a tension between aspirations for an attractive livable city, and the desire for plentiful, low-cost parking.** Since the 1970s, Portlanders have chosen to build a compact, livable city with high quality open spaces, diverse leisure activities and clean air. The City is now internationally recognized as a great place to live, work and visit. At the same time, many Portlanders expect free parking to be provided at all times within close range of their destinations. As the City grows, it will not be possible to accommodate both of these objectives. Neighborhoods will need new tools to manage parking and maintain livability.
9. **The availability and cost of parking influences individual travel choices.** When an area has too little parking, people who drive there create congestion and emissions while they circle to find parking, and may park illegally or leave the area without fulfilling the purpose of their trip. On the other hand, an area with too much or underpriced parking encourages people to drive when they don't need to, also adding to congestion.
10. **Parking policies support the City's Comprehensive Plan and other City policies.** Parking policies should support compact, mixed use development to reach our Citywide mode split goal of 70 percent commute trips by walking, transit and bicycling by 2035. They should enhance livability, lower carbon emissions and support the economic development and equity goals for the City.
11. **The City has a role in managing parking.** Given the importance of parking and the limited space on our streets, the City has an important role to actively manage and regulate the demand and supply of parking.