

# 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.