

Central City Parking Policy Update (CCPPU)

Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)

Meeting #2 Notes

February 23, 2015 –updated as approved April 27, 2015

5:00 pm – 8:00 pm

SAC Members in attendance: Adam Kriss, Ben Schonberger, Jason Franklin (stand in for Ian Stude), Mike Albrecht, Dan Petrusich, Tamara Kennedy-Hill, Malisa McCreedy, Rex Burkholder, Rob Bearden, Michael Harrison, Dennis Allen, Nicole Knudsen, Peter Stark, Tony Jordan, Greg Goodman, Bob Buchanan, Tom Simpson, Owen Ronchelli, Felicia Williams, Sue Pearce, Leah Treat (PBOT), Pete Collins, Caleb Schlesinger, Patricia Gardner, Heidi Guenin, Corky Collier, Heather McCarey, Adrienne Hill, Rebecca Hamilton.

SAC Members not in attendance: Christopher Handford, Doug Blomgren, Helen Ying, Steve Bozzone, Deborah Imse.

City Staff in attendance: Grant Morehead, Mauricio Leclerc, Colleen Caldwell, Damian Crowder (PDC), Marni Glick, Sallie Edmunds (BPS), Erika Nebel (Com. Novick).

Facilitator: Eryn Deeming Kehe, JLA Public Involvement

Introduction from Leah Treat: She heard many remarks from the first CCPPU SAC meeting, and most of them were positive. The group seems to be off to a good start, and there was much more agreement than expected. Majority of the group seems to agree that changes are needed for parking in the Central City. She was also excited to hear the overall excitement for the role that technology will play in the updated system.

Eryn and Mauricio continued with a summary review of meeting minutes from the first CCPPU SAC meeting. There was a question as to whether or not the notes from the discussion were documented, which they were. The group unanimously voted that the meeting minutes from Meeting #1 were accurate and that there were no changes needed.

Announcements:

- The Central City Parking Policy Update website is up and running, it can be found at <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/66848>
- PBOT is working with other committees to coordinate the parking efforts. This includes developing survey questions for a tenant survey that the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS) will be administering later this spring. There was a previous request from SAC members to view the survey questions and be allowed to make suggestions. As the survey becomes more finalized this will be made available for the group.

- There is a request for the parking facilities managers within the CCPPU SAC group to submit parking utilization data to PBOT from the month of November so that we can have a better understanding of parking usage in non-City owned facilities.
- This group will usually meet the 4th Monday of every month, however next month that date falls on Spring Break. Instead, the next meeting will take place on March 30th, which is the 5th Monday of the month.

Meeting continued with a discussion of the Roles & Responsibilities that were presented at Meeting #1.

Comment – subcommittee decision making may be beneficial for this group. Since the group is so large and varied, there may be issues related to specific interest groups that are not well understood by the larger group as a whole (ie freight). Given the lack of expertise in some areas, having subcommittees may be useful when trying to come to a consensus.

PBOT Response – the CCPPU project must work as a system since everything is related. There are likely to be times where the needs for specific areas/interest groups will need to be addressed, but the committee as a whole will need to make the decisions. When necessary, we will defer to the expertise of members that can best represent these special areas.

Comment – the Roles & Responsibilities document states that SAC group will “make recommendations”, can we clarify what that means.

PBOT Response – Yes, based on the information presented in these meetings, the SAC group will be responsible for helping PBOT make recommendations. The greater consensus that the group can come to will lead to stronger recommendations from the SAC group, which will then be pushed forward for approval by City Council. PBOT will also be responsible for making recommendations, especially ones that are more technical in nature, and rely on the expertise of staff members. In the event that the SAC group cannot come to a consensus, decision making will likely be deferred to PBOT staff.

The group unanimously voted that there were no additional changes needed to the Roles & Responsibilities document.

The meeting continued with a presentation from Marni Glick, Parking Operation Division Manager for PBOT which focused on current policies and practices related to parking management within the Central City.

There was a question and answer session that followed.

Question: Do bike parking corrals take away from vehicle parking?

Staff Answer: Yes, they often take away a space or two, depending on the size of the corral, but they can accommodate many more bikes into that one space than cars.

Question: What are the fees for the Area Parking Permit Program permits?

Staff Answer: All areas at \$60 annually, with the exception of the Central Eastside, which charges \$70.

Question: Has there been any discussion on making the APPP permits costs reflect the actual value of the parking space?

Staff Answer: There has been discussion, but right now they only cost the amount of the administration of the program (which is \$60). They are priced in such a way that costs are low for residents, but prevent commuters from parking. We are looking at other ways of pricing these permits, but since most APPP areas are outside of the Central City, this will likely be under the purview of the Centers & Corridors SAC group.

Follow-up Response: it is very critical to discuss the impact of APPP permits within this CCPPU SAC group, especially the valuation of parking stalls.

Question: Who gets APPP permits?

Staff Answer: All residents within the area, employees within the area, and guests.

Question: Who has the authority to increase the APPP fees?

Staff Answer: City Council

Question: How does a parking corral/rack get installed? What is the process for requesting one?

Staff Answer: There is usually request from the property owner, and possibly other requirements. We will look into the details further with a member of our staff that deals with this issue.

****Staff will follow up****

Question: Is the APPP program designed to accommodate long-term car storage?

Staff Answer: No. The APPP program allows you to exceed the visitor parking time limit, but no vehicle is supposed to be stored on the street for more than 24 hours, and the APPP program does not give permission to do this.

Follow-up Response: Group would like to discuss the enforcement (or lack of) of these 24 hour time limits. There were comments that in Goose Hollow there are vehicles that are parked for months at a time, and that enforcement either ignores them, or places notices on their vehicles, but nothing more.

Staff Response: we will follow up on that complaint.

Question: Can you please clarify the revenue from Car2Go?

Staff Answer: Car2Go pays roughly \$1,400 annually per vehicle in order to park their vehicles in metered areas. They do have GPS systems on their vehicles, and are able to determine with great detail the amount of time that a vehicle is parked in a metered area, and payments to PBOT are based upon that.

Question: Is there any type of GPS system (similar to Car2Go) for truck loading zones? Do trucks pay based on their actual usage of the spaces, or do they pay a flat rate?

Staff Answer: There is no system like that, all truck pay the same fee regardless of their usage.

Question: Is there a priority list for revenue usage from the parking meters?

Staff Answer: Parking meter revenue goes in the Transportation Operating Fund, and there are budgets and proposals every year for the usage of those funds, but there is no priority list that the money is funneled into.

Follow-up Question: Does money generated in a geographic area return to that geographic area?

Staff Answer: There is revenue sharing in the Lloyd and Marquam districts, where 51% of the revenue returns to the area in the form of funding. In other areas that do not have revenue sharing agreements, 51% of the revenue generated does get returned back to funding that that geographic area.

Follow-up Question: What about SmartPark revenue?

Staff Answer: We will have to verify with our SmartPark manager about where the funds go/are distributed.

****Staff will follow up****

Question: What are the odds of a new SmartPark facility?

Staff Answer: There is interest, but the large initial investment is a very big hurdle.

Question: Is the ability to have monthly parking available in SmartPark garages contrary to the goal to SmartPark, which is to offer short-term parking for visitors?

Staff Answer: We believe that SmartPark monthly parking came from a time when parking revenue from SmartPark facilities was very low, and there were attempts to maximize revenue and efficient use of the parking available. Monthly parking spaces are limited to a certain percentage in each garage. We will follow up with our SmartPark manager into a reasoning behind allowing monthly parking in these locations.

****Staff will follow up****

The meeting continued with a presentation from Grant Morehead, a City Planner with PBOT and the Project Manager for the Centers & Corridors Parking Project. His presentation focused on the parking zoning code, and what is allowed/not allowed within the Central City in terms of private, off-street parking.

There was a question and answer session that followed.

Question: Will we discussion expanding the geographic area of the Central City?

Staff Answer: No. This process was done with the Quadrant Plans developed for the CC2035 Plan. The only addition is a small area near Clinton Station

Question: To clarify, residential facilities with parking are allowed to rent their parking spaces to other residents within the Central City, but not to visitors, employees, or commuters?

Staff Answer: That is correct.

Follow-up Response: SAC member mentioned that this is not the case, and that many residential facilities rent their spaces for commercial purposes.

****Staff will follow up****

Question: Are there any type of provisions in the Parking Zoning Code related to the number of disabled spaces required at developments?

Staff Answer: There are usually ADA requirements, but we are unsure right now what the specifics are.

Response from SAC Member: there are ample ADA provisions in the building code

Follow-up Response: There is going to be a large difference in residential locations with off-street parking and ADA parking availability in places that rely on on-street parking

Question: Are the reporting requirements for commercial Growth and Preservation parking facilities going to change?

Staff Answer: Yes. Although there are current rules for reporting every 6 to 12 months, they are not followed. This is likely something we will be changing, but it will depend on whether the need to for reporting is necessary or not.

Question: Is the bike parking fund limited to a certain geographic area?

Staff Answer: We are unsure. We will follow up on this question with another member of our staff.

****Staff will follow up****

Question: What is the problem with allowing a residential location to rent parking spaces for commercial parking? Wouldn't this be a more efficient use of the space?

Staff Answer: We are unsure about that. We believe that this provision initially began as a way to prevent large commercial parking developments from occurring with residential buildings, and give residents the ability to park. This issue is definitely something we want to tackle, and may be related to joint use parking.

Follow-up Response: Allowing this type of commercial parking at residential locations may actually encourage development. Parking costs are a very significant portion of development costs, and allowing the ability to recoup those cost through commercial parking may allow developments to pencil out.

Question: You mentioned that of all developments in the past year, on average they are only building to 85% of the maximum allowed parking. Are there any trends for developments that are building right up to the maximum limit?

Staff Answer: For residential there seems to be the trend of one parking stall per unit. Other than that, it's hard to tell. Built parking depends a lot on economics and other influencing factors such as multimodal options and transit. Markets tend to respond in these areas by creating developments with less parking supplied due to changes in parking demand.

Question: Often the cost of structured parking is so high, but on-street parking is so low, what is the impact of high off-street parking costs on on-street parking demand and availability in surrounding districts?

Staff Answer: We are hoping to look into this issue with the tenant survey that BPS is administering. On-street utilization from our data collection efforts should help with his analysis as well

Follow-up Response: This connection between off-street cost and on-street utilization will be really important in Goose Hollow and the Pearl.

The meeting continued with a review of the discussion from Meeting #1 on what the SAC members liked about current policies and what they would like to see. A document was handed out that listed the comments from the previous meeting.

There was the opportunity to add/modify comments.

Comment: The comment that says “all households have a car” is incorrect, roughly 12% of Portlanders’ do not have a car, and this rate varies in different areas. We need to make sure that we are taking that into account when we are developing location specific plans

Comment: Would like to see a discussion into the connection between on and off street parking. Looking at the Pearl district as an example might be good, and looking at Goose Hollow as an example of the issues that are being faced is also a good place to look.

Comment: Would like to make sure car ownership/usage for certain groups, such as low income, is analyzed properly, and that decision on whether or not to go forward with any type of fee-based structure are not prohibited just because of the existence of these groups.

Comment: Would like to discuss the use of bike parking, and how it impacts multimodal use. Want to also make sure that bike parking for all types/sizes of bikes is reviewed.

Comment: Would like to see a discussion on the relationship between traffic movement and on-street parking, especially how this relationship has changed over time, and what changed have been seen with the availability of on-street parking.

Comment: Would like to look at car ownership rates in different core areas within the Central City. This information also needs to be taken into account when discussing housing affordability.

Comment: Would like a discussion of pedestrian and bike districts, and how parking impacts these areas.

Comment: Would like more discussion about pedestrian ROW and how it is impacted by parking.

Comment: Would like to discuss whether all vehicles should be treated equal. Should there be different parking provisions for hybrid cars as opposed to fossil fuel cars? Same with size/weight of vehicles.

Comment: Would like to explore issues related to circling/cruising for parking spaces, and impacts on pedestrians in terms of air quality/help and traffic accidents.

Comment: Would like to explore the greater use of incentives for any type of policy we develop, focus more on the carrot rather than the stick.

The meeting continued with Mauricio discussing the current efforts for the Central City 2035 (CC2035) Plan and how these guiding policies seem to follow the general desires of the SAC group when it comes to what they would like to see from the updated parking process.

There was a comment period that followed.

Comment: We need to take into account technology and how it has affected office space utilization. When the original office space parking ratios were developed, employee density within office locations was not nearly as high as it is now. With the development in technology, the ability to employ more people in the same space has increased, and the parking ratios for these areas needs to be reflective of that.

Follow-up Comment: We definitely need to consider the anticipated future developments within the Central City and how current parking ratios may affect the ability of development to occur.

Follow-up Comment: As Portland continues to develop and become denser, the needs for goods and services will increase. We need to take that into account, and take into account freight mobility in a higher-density will be impacted by parking.

Comment: This should be a data driven process. It is difficult to predict the future, but we need to do our best to plan for an anticipated future in order to develop the best policies. We need data/trends/forecasts/models to accomplish this.

Comment: We should look into how we bring transit into the conversation, and how the availability of transit impacts parking demand and car ownership.

Comment: Parking trends are in large part market driven, and rely on the impacts of many different things (such as transit availability). In order to plan appropriately, we need to develop a system that is flexible, and will be able to adapt when market changes occur.

Question: Are we looking at case studies from other cities?

Staff Answer: Yes we are.

Comment: We need to make sure we look into how Transportation Demand Management (TDM) will play into the parking issues, especially educational aspects of reducing vehicle ownership.

Comment: When it comes to pricing, we need to take into account the cost of other modes. When it costs \$5 for a round trip MAX ticket into town, but only \$1.60 for parking, there may be issues. We should discuss this feedback loop and how modal pricing impacts modal choice.

There was the opportunity for public comment. There were no comments.

The next meeting will be March 30th, and will discuss trends that the City has seen.

The meeting concluded at 8:00 pm.

Follow-up from questions asked during the meeting that staff was unable to answer at the time

Question: How does a parking corral/rack get installed? What is the process for requesting one?

Staff Response: Needs to be requested from the business, and staff does site visit to verify it's feasible. It's the same process as if you want to adjust parking time limit in front of your business. Requests go to Scott Cohen at PBOT.

Question: Is the bike parking fund limited to a certain geographic area?

Staff Response: The bike fund is used to place the required number of bike spaces directly in front of the property and then when not feasible on the block face and then used citywide.