

## Central City Parking Policy Update (CCPPU)

### Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)

#### Meeting #4 Notes

---

June 9, 2015

4:30-7:30pm

**SAC Members in Attendance:** Bob Buchanan, David Galat, Ben Schonberger, Dan Petrusich, Owen Ronchelli, Deborah Imse, Al Niknabard, Felicia Williams, Greg Goodman, Helen Ying, Ian Stude, Mujtaba Ali, Michael Harrison, Mike Albrecht, Pete Collins, Peter Stark, Rob Bearden, Rex Burkholder, Sue Pearce, Nicole Knudsen, Reza Farhoodi, Rebecca Hamilton, Steve Bozzone, Tina Wyszinski, and Tony Jordan.

**SAC members not in attendance:** Heather McCarey, Caleb Schlesinger, Christopher Handford, Dennis Allen, Tom Simpson, Tamara Kennedy-Hill, Rob Bearden, Doug Blomgren, Ian Stude, Adam Kriss

**City Staff in attendance:** Colleen Caldwell, Judith Gray, Francesca Patricolo, Jody Yates, Marni Glick, Grant Morehead, Kathryn Doherty-Chapman, Leah Treat, Sallie Edmunds (BPS), Erika Nebel (Com. Novick).

**Consultants in attendance:** Eryn Deeming Kehe, JLA Public Involvement (Facilitator), Rick Williams, Rick Williams Consulting.

---

#### 1. Welcome and announcements

Eryn Deeming Kehe welcomed the committee at 4:35pm and went over the agenda and format for the evening. She then asked committee and staff members to go around and introduce themselves.

**Parking Symposium-** Committee members were invited to attend the parking symposium on June 29<sup>th</sup> and to pass along the invitation to other interested parties.

**Centers and corridors study update-** Specific ideas and proposals are being drafted. Next meeting is in July.

#### **Downtown meter rate adjustment subcommittee-**

The last meeting this committee decided that we would create a subcommittee for that meter rate adjustment. The meeting will be sometime in June or July.

**General comment -** Rex Burkholder sent some comments about the use of the right of way that he asked to be shared with the committee, there are copies at the front.

#### 2. Approval of past meeting notes

---

Ms. Deeming Kehe asked for edits to the meeting notes from April 27<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Amendments to April 27<sup>th</sup> meeting notes**

The committee agreed without dissent, by a show of hands to approve the past meeting minutes with the following changes:

1. **Original comment-** All the pricing should be something we should look at. Smart Park and on-street parking work together.

**Amended comment-** I want to take a holistic approach and consider off-street and on-street parking prices together as a system.

2. **Original Comment:** The Smart Park parking garages are not in all of the Central City areas.

**Amended comment:** Because Smart Park garages are only in two neighborhoods in the whole Central City, the discussion of managing them should be not be taken up by this committee.

---

### 3. First public comment:

There were no public comments.

### 4. Project updates

The next Centers and Corridors parking study SAC meeting will be at the end of July, staff recently received the full parking study reports from consultants, which will be discussed at the next meeting.

### 5. Performance Based Parking Management – Policy Principles

---

Ms. Gray asked if there were any comments on the draft Performance Based Parking Management policy principles document that was sent out. Staff will be using this to help inform future work; it is not intended for formal action. Additional comments are welcome; email is fine.

### 6. Break for dinner 5:00pm

---

**Announcement:** Mauricio is out of the office due to an injury, we are not sure when he will return.

### 7. Private Parking Policy Presentation

---

Rick Williams presented on the private parking regulations and policies of the existing CCTMP.

*Comment from staff: This primary outcome of the presentation and discussion is to present current regulations and issues, and get committee direction on the issues they feel warrant further consideration. These are not formal “actions” on policy, but rather they direct staff on which policies the committee will be considering at future meetings.*

**Issue 1:** Maintain the policy framework that structures parking regulations to support goals for Air Quality, Economic Development, Mode Split Goals and Historic Preservation.

**Question:** Regarding historic preservation and parking entitlements, what about on–street and Smart Park garages, what’s their role as they relate to these entitlements?

**RW Response:** Smart park garages can’t currently accept monthly parking permits, it’s for visitors. That may be one way to address the historic preservation entitlement issues. There was a concern that marketing old buildings without parking would be difficult, as they would be seen as less attractive than new buildings. Those old buildings got an allotment of parking spaces to be built off-site in the future.

**Question:** What about the code on this, how does that affect old buildings?

**RW Response:** In the past, we wanted those parking spaces to be on lots, but as we grew, we tore down old buildings, because they didn't have parking, this entitlement was to prevent that.

**Question:** How is that accomplished? How do we accommodate parking for buildings without parking?

**RW Response:** As surface lots go away, the parking manager takes a note of the spaces going away, puts them into a parking reserve for future use. Every building that does not have parking now, has an entitlement to build parking up to the maximum parking ration in the district. It's a net zero, so it's not building "new parking spaces".

**Comment:** These policies should be examined to ensure that the Portland Plan elements are reflected.

**Comment:** We are also packing more people inside the city, more units in the UGB. We need to look at this from a regional perspective.

**RW:** Let's come back to the central question, are these key four elements appropriate?

**Question:** Were the mode split goals just about busses, or where there are other modes and benefits for them? What do they get besides exercise? But what about scooters or motorcycles? Scooters aren't free to park, but they take up very little space.

**RW response:** Yes, there were mode split goals for bicycling, walking, and carpools in addition to transit.

**Question:** Do we know how these goals perform? We are being asked to decide without knowing how they performed. We need more information.

**RW response:** Yes, we know the air quality goal is being met, and we are not quite meeting the economic development goals the way that we imagined. Mode split goals, they have all improved. Historic preservation entitlements are being used, so that is working.

**Comment:** We are not getting our share of economic development, there's been so many residential units added to downtown. Parking policy should promote more jobs downtown, SmartPark garages to promote retail, let's not change that. Most of the growth recently Downtown has been in housing, and we need more jobs.

**Ms. Deeming Kehe asked** the committee if they supported to reaffirm the four key foundation elements of the CCTMP?

**Action:** The majority of the committee agreed to support the four foundational goals.

**Four foundational goals:**

1. ***Air Quality.*** Plan developed as a key strategy for the City's compliance with the Federal Clean Air Act air quality standards.

2. **Economic Development.** This goal envisioned capturing a greater share of regional employment and housing growth in a manner that minimized “auto-oriented” development patterns and maximized planned investments alternative modes.
3. **Mode Split Goals.** Mode split goals for each unique Central City District were adopted based on envisioned levels of non-auto mode options in place in each district.
4. **Preservation Buildings.** Future development projects would result in surface lots being replaced by new buildings; reducing the supply of parking for older buildings. Need to ensure that there was a means for these buildings to develop parking and remain competitive.

## ISSUE 2- Adjust or recalibrate maximum parking ratios

---

Rick explained the existing parking ratios. Each district has its own parking ratios, max parking you can build for residential, office, retail, etc. They are all different because at the time this plan was made the transit and bike capacity of the other areas was not the same as downtown. The intent was to recalibrate the ratios over time, every 7 years.

### Questions for the group:

Do we need to readjust ratios by district to account for alternate mode capacity?

Do we recalibrate the standards for commercial, residential, etc.?

Should we change the maximums for all uses including residential?

Should we be more flexible with operations for owners to make agreements to share parking, for visitors, or residential. The code currently does NOT allow this flexible selling/sharing of parking spaces.

Do we collapse parking areas into fewer? They all have different ratios. It might be easier for people to understand code if we had fewer parking districts.

### Committee discussion

---

**Comment:** The South Waterfront has a single ratio for new development of parking structures, if we reduced that amount, we would need to examine the need for patient parking vs. employee parking, as we treat that differently. As far as differences between districts go, I believe the South Waterfront will someday look like the rest of the city, but it's not there yet, so treat it differently.

**Comment:** Office space has changed in the last 20 years, because of changes in technology and generational preference shifts. Density has gone way, need to recalibrate based on the change in density.

**Comment:** Why wouldn't we encourage more flexible operations to provide parking? Developers struggle with making sharing arrangements. We should change the code to make it easier to use our existing parking supply better.

**Question:** I am concerned with sharing the residential and commercial parking, that it may force the residential user out of their parking space and encourage them to drive to work and not use another mode.

**Comment:** The mode split for non-auto doubled in one year because of ONLY one reason, because of the installation of parking meters. If we are looking at changing policy to performance-based pricing, and how that affects people's behavior on mode, then these policies need to be connected.

**Comment:** If we are considering that office space density is growing based on preferences, then residential preferences are changing as well. As well as mode and travel choices, new construction needs to look at bike parking and access as well as auto parking.

**Comment:** The city gives out parking permits to anyone in the district, but there is not a space for each permit. When are we going to address that?

**Grant response:** We are looking at this issue in the TGM Centers and Corridors study.

**Comment:** If we look at these 4 goals, they are broad. The issue is when you look at maximums and cost to build and the economic development piece is what we have not done as well. I think that needs to be looked at.

**Comment:** What performance metrics will use be used? The same transit seats metrics?

**RW response:** No, we will develop new performance measures.

**Question posed to committee-**

Does the SAC endorse adjusting/recalibrating the parking ratios based on the suggestions stated above?

**Action:** There needs be more detailed discussion and a vote on this in the future.

### **Issue 3 - Surface Lots (w/ no new development)**

---

**Rick asked the committee:** Should we extend the prohibition of a surface lot to EVERY district, there are huge variations to districts.

**Comment:** This started as historic preservation, CEID is different with new building types, and it seems inevitable that old buildings would be torn down to build parking. How would this address that?

**Comment:** We are not in any way able to build a parking garage in the Central East side without a public subsidy. We have open ground, with no use for it, so why can't we temporarily use it as parking when we have so many parking issues. Maybe this old rule has outlived its purpose.

**Comment:** Could you build a structure?

**RW response:** No, current code prohibits building new structured parking without a development.

**Comment:** If a surface lot is generating income you are less likely to build a building there later on, you are less likely to do anything else to benefit the district.

**Comment:** I know a building subcontractor who was not allowed to park his truck next to the building that he was working on, and now he is driving more than if he could just park at the job site. I worry that these businesses will move out if they can't park.

**Comment:** We need more flexibility to address the problem that we have. Why can't we share parking with residential and commercial? Let's cap the parking and make it more flexible.

**Comment:** Regarding the CEID- Why would you tear the building down to build a parking lot, if the market suggests that there is a higher and better use for that space than parking? Why wouldn't you build something else?

**Comment:** If you have an empty dirt patch, you can't just pave it and have a parking lot. You have to build groundwater features, and other mitigation techniques. Who would want to actually pay to build a parking lot for 5 years and then give it up, I can see that being a disincentive.

**Comment:** Parking lots are better than empty land, public safety issues abound with those empty lots. So open up the opportunity to be flexible to make parking lots, or to add food carts. That has an economic development benefit.

**ACTION: Ms. Deeming Kehe asked the committee to vote:** Change the status quo on surface lots or keep it?

**11 No, 10 Yes, with 1 unsure.**

**Comment:** I think districts should be considered differently.

**Action:** As the committee is split, this issue needs more discussion and we will come back to it.

#### **Issue 4- Surface lots with NEW development code changes**

---

**Mr. Williams** directed people to the memo with the table with current code ratios for new developments and asked the group if we should CONSIDER prohibiting surface lots with new development.

**Comment:** Re: South Waterfront- the cap on lots, it is not clear if those parking spaces can be moved, or if they remain in perpetuity. Is it a max on sq. ft. or location?

**RW:** Should we consider prohibiting new surface lots with new development.

**Comment:** South Waterfront was allowed to build surface lots because it was brownfield with no transit, but now we have good transit, and it's getting better. Are we there yet? Can we say we don't need surface parking? We think it needs to be revisited, but we need it now.

**Question-** If I wanted to build a building on two parcels, and wanted to build parking on one and a building on the other, would this prohibit me from building surface lot next to that? Would this change prohibit me from building surface lot parking?

**RW Answer:** Yes.

**Comment:** I am concerned about the rising cost of housing in the region.

**RW-** Currently you could build a 40, 0000 sq. ft. surface lot with new development in other districts. We are NOT seeing developers build surface lots anymore (even though they could).

**Comment:** It's generally good policy to prohibit surface lots because you are codifying that as parking for ever. Look at OHSU, they are getting rid of parking with a master plan, in a phased development, building interim parking for a greater good in phases.

**Comment:** Going back to the 4 policy guidelines- thinking of the context of Chinatown. When these were put in place, were surface lots reduced? Can we say this policy has performed the way we wanted it to perform?

**RW response:** Development that goes in now, goes with structures, not lots. In Lloyd district builders are not building surface parking, maybe they don't need it, but maybe other districts do.

<p><b>Action:</b> This topic needs more detailed discussion later, the committee will come back to this issue and vote later.</p>
---

### Issue 5- Operating restrictions: Accessory and Shared parking (allowing all approved parking to share uses).

---

**RW:** Accessory parking is currently prohibited, accessory parking is parking for another use than what it was built for. Parking in the Rose quarter for example, can ONLY serve uses that occur in the rose quarter, then it sits empty all day. The only shared parking allowed now, is for office and commercial use. Any other parking- residential, hotel has restrictions on it.

#### Potential solutions-

- a. Eliminate "accessory" restrictions on all parking approved under a maximum ratio and in a structure.
- b. Eliminate reporting and monitoring requirements on all parking approved under a maximum parking ratio and in a structure.
- c. Consider operating flexibilities for existing "accessory" facilities

**Comment:** What was the original intent of these in the beginning?

**RW response:** We needed to be able to show the feds that we were getting to the mode split goals, so it was an attempt to reach goal number 3, that parking was provided for certain uses, so that people weren't using residential parking for non-approved uses.

**Question:** Why have operating restrictions if everything has a max on it?

**Comment:** Are there examples from other US cities of that?

**Comment:** Parking price, how that's done, without proper pricing we will have spillover into neighborhoods. Metro did a study and found shared parking is an effective strategy. Empty parking spaces are not good for anyone.

**Comment:** We need to NOT build what we want today, but for what we want for the future. I would prefer to see us balance this for the future growth.

**Comment:** I am worried about future growth being hurt by not allowing more parking to be built in the future. We need to periodically review the parking situation and be flexible.

**Comment:** I think you will get more development with shared parking, I like this.

**Action:** We will come back to a vote on this

## ISSUE 6 Transferring Parking Entitlements

---

Currently if you build a residential building in Central city with NO parking, you have NO right to come back and build parking later. Should we allow residential buildings to come back and build new parking? Should we just use the MAX ratio and allow flexible operation?

### POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

- a. Set all Preservation ratios at same level as those for new development.
- b. Eliminate Preservation operating restrictions.
- c. Consider entitlements (preservation) for hotels and residential.
- d. Eliminate Preservation Eligibility List and Parking Reserve.
- e. Create more efficient approach for accounting for entitlements.

**Question-** Are there any buildings that come back and want to build parking?

**RW-** Yes downtown, there are lot of old buildings that want to build parking now and can't.

**Question to committee:** Should we change this to consider entitlements for hotels or residential units later on?

**Action:** The group agreed to change the preservation operating restrictions.

## Issue 7- Visitor parking

---

Rick explained the current conditions of visitor parking. Very few visitor parking garages have been built since 1996. Smart parks were all built before the CCTMP was adopted. Visitor parking is the ONLY allowed parking to be built without a building. You must prove that least 65% of demand comes from within 750 feet away, between 9am and 7pm in order to be able to build visitor parking.

Do we need visitor parking now?

### Potential solutions

- a. Reconsider on-going need for Visitor Parking
- b. Reconsider demand criteria for approving Visitor Parking
- c. Evaluate more realistic options for approving Visitor facilities, particularly City owned SmartPark garages.

**Ms. Deeming Kehe asked the committee:** Should we look at different ways of providing visitor parking?

**Comment:** This goes hand in hand with prohibiting surface parking, it would make it easier to make a market for visitor parking. But if you let anyone build parking then there's no market.

**Comment:** I am for re-evaluating the criteria for this rather than getting rid of it. We should not eliminate the private sector's ability to provide visitor parking. Make the regulation simpler.

**Comment:** Re-evaluate criteria for visitor parking then maybe remove restrictions on accessory parking.

**Action:** We will come back to this issue.

## **Issue 8- Parking Manager and Monitoring**

---

Rick explained the current code. This code says there should be a parking manager that quantifies and tallies every on and off street parking stall and putting them in reserves when parking is removed for future entitlements. If you manage a residential building you must report annually that you are using your parking as it was intended.

He reminded us that we did this in the past because there was little trust that parking regulations would be followed, so this was put into place to enforce them. Prohibiting the shared use of parking is probably not needed anymore. The city is partially at fault for not doing this management and enforcement, and the private sector is guilty of not complying by completing reports.

**Rick asked the committee:**

Do we need to simplify regulations in general?

Should we restructure the parking manager role?

**Action:** The committee agreed we should eliminate or reconsider the need for a parking manager and for annual reporting.

**Ms. Deeming Kehe asked the group:** Is there anything missing?

**Comment:** I know it's separate in the code, but bike parking needs to be looked at. The demand has changed, it's just as critical to have safe parking for bikes as it to have lanes. It's just as critical to look at bike parking as motor vehicles parking

**Public Comment:**

No public comment.

---

The group will come back to the issues that we were not able to vote on at the next meeting including:

- **Issue 2- Adjust or recalibrate maximum parking ratios**
- **Issue 3 - Surface Lots (w/ no new development)**
- **Issue 4- Surface lots with NEW development code changes**

- Issue 5- Operating restrictions: Accessory and Shared parking (allowing all approved parking to share uses).
- Issue 7- Visitor parking

---

Meeting was adjourned at 7:19 pm.

---

Themes/issues captured on easels during discussion

---

#### ISSUE 01

- Seek consistency of foundational elements with Portland Plan Goals
- How has the Central City Transportation Master Plan performed?
- Share of economic development among districts / downtown

#### ISSUE 02

- Examine the need for patient v. visitor parking in South Waterfront (priority users)
- Density-office space (change over time)
- Flexible operations with garages—efficient use (arrangements)
- Outgrown
- Caution of encouraging driving with policies → Economic effects on demand → connect policies
- Consider different lifestyle preferences and trends
- Accommodation of bikes
- Revisit policy to adjust as needed
- Concern: neighborhood crowding/permits
- Limitation on residential permits?
- Issue when looking at maximums
- Balance defined central city area → go back to intent
- **Option E:**
  - Routine periodic review
  - Add max to residential

#### ISSUE 03

- Consider likelihood of development to occur
- Prohibiting it downtown → not other areas
- Need more flexibility—sharing
- Market-driven consideration to redevelop to surface parking
- Higher use with investment

- Loosen up on the East Side
- A way to address issues on Central Eastside
- Keep the prohibition downtown or expand the prohibition to all of Central city?
- Prohibition affects food carts —> have to be on surface parking

#### **ISSUE 04**

- Consider the prohibition in Central City
- Concern re: high cost of housing in region
- Look with phased approach for ultimate full build out
- Will it help or harm outcomes?

#### **ISSUE 05**

- Serving the pinch first —> building to what we have today —> think regional with growth and attraction
- Better utilized resource you already have

#### **ISSUE 06**

- (Revisit)

#### **OTHER**

- Bicycle parking

DRAFT