

PBOT

PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION

1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner **Leah Treat** Director

Centers and Corridors Parking Project Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Wednesday, August 5th 2015 | 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

Multnomah County Building | 501 SE Hawthorne Blvd | Third Floor, Room 315

Meeting Goals

1. Review evaluation of parking management tools
2. Introduce residential permit parking concept; discuss issues to be further refined before September meeting

Agenda

Schedule	Topic	Presenter
6:00	Welcome & introductions Approval of past meeting notes Other housekeeping items	Grant Morehead, PBOT
6:05	Public Comment # 1	
6:10	Project schedule update, Symposium recap	Grant, all
6:25	Review evaluation of parking management tools, SAC discussion	Phill Worth and Matt Bell, Kittelson and Associates
7:10	Review residential permit parking concept, SAC discussion	Grant, all
7:55	Public Comment # 2	
8:00	Next steps/adjourn	

Next SAC meetings

- SAC #8 Thursday, September 24
SAC #9 Thursday, October 29th – If needed



The Portland Bureau of Transportation fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the ADA Title II, and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. For accommodations, complaints and information, call (503) 823-5185, City TTY (503) 823-6868, or use Oregon Relay Service: 711.

Centers and Corridors Parking Project

Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Meeting #6 - Notes

May 28, 2015
6:00 – 8:00 P.M.

SAC members in attendance: Allen Field, Gail Hoffnagle, James Kautz, Kay Newell, Tony Jordan, Kristin Slavin, Kurt Nordback, Alex Cooley, Rebecca Kennedy, Gary Davenport, Josh Capps, Kathryn Doherty-Chapman, William Gregg, Sue Pearce, Kirk Paulsen, Mike Westling, Sean Green, Steve Russell

SAC members not in attendance: Carol Gossett, Tamara Deridder, Chris Smith, Mary McCurdy, Ted Labbe, Rick Michaelson, Pablo Bravo, Oreatha Johnson, Gerik Kransky, Rod Merrick, Don Wood

Staff in attendance: Colleen Caldwell, Mauricio Leclerc, JP McNeil, Grant Morehead, Jay Rogers, Francesca Patricolo (Bureau of Transportation), Erika Nebel (Commissioner Novick's Office), Rick Williams, Matt Bell, Phil Worth (Consultant team)

The meeting began with a quick Project Update from Grant Morehead, who is back from paternity leave. Katherine Doherty-Chapman will be stepping down from the committee as she takes a position with PBOT. Kirk Paulsen will be filling Ian Stude's position from the Bicycle Advisory Committee.

Meeting notes from Meeting #5 were passed out and approved.

Francesca Patricolo filled committee members in on the upcoming Parking Symposium, June 29 at 1 pm, in the Portland Building. Keynote speaker Jeffrey Tumlin will be talking about the economics of parking. More info to follow. Contact Francesca for more info or to RSVP at Francesca.patricolo@portlandoregon.gov.

Committee member Gary Davenport gave a presentation outlining his concerns with parking issues in the city and the committee process and outcomes.

Process concerns he expressed include:

- Not enough opportunity for committee input
- Little real output or deliverables from the effort to date
- Is the limited data collection being conducted actually able to reflect what's happening?

Parking issues include:

- Changes to the "parking ecosystem" with expected demand increases – these changes are happening now and we need to be tracking the changes before and after.
- The City is not adequately managing transit-oriented development (TODs) and microapartment developments.
- A survey showed that 70% of new tenants in TODs will own cars and neighborhoods can't handle the new parking demand.
- Solution is to figure out to do TODs better and to encourage people to own fewer cars.

Phil Worth and Matt Bell of Kittelson Associates led the Parking Management Strategies Toolkit Brainstorming. This was a series of three lists developed by committee members. Each list addresses a different aspect of the parking issues at hand. The consultants will then distill the brainstorm lists down and bring this information back to the committee at a future meeting.

List 1: What are the general set of issues that we're facing in our neighborhoods related to parking?

- Businesses have lost customers due to parking crunch from TOB's with no parking requirements
- Residents using commercial district parking - Need more timed stalls
- Lack of enforcement
- Poor management of the different demands on the right of way
- Residents claiming the right-of-way adjacent to their homes as their own
- Developers get large concessions on parking
- Developers claims that residents of TOB's will not own cars are disingenuous
- Concerns about walking multiple blocks to get home
- Cars stored in front of a house for weeks
- Cumulative commercial activities contribute to high demand
- Empty private lots with vacant stalls are prohibited from shared parking
- Not enough comfortable bike access to businesses on busy streets
- Safety issues – parking reduces sightlines for turning cars and cyclists/pedestrians
- Parking demand increases cruising
- Challenges of insufficient data
- Absence of private parking facilities in neighborhoods
- Apartment buildings with little or no parking are the challenge
- How to incentivize developers to attract car-free households?
- Mini Area Parking Permit Program not attractive enough to residents
- Putting in parking permits could make people more possessive of parking in front of their houses
- Overlook Neighborhood: commuter cars that park and take MAX
- Competition for alternate use of ROW
- Housing affordability – inclusion of parking increases the cost of rent
- Under-utilized parking
- Updating parking needs when business needs change
- Hollywood – low off-street supply for residential parking - Hollywood transit hub not a parking lot
- Off-street parking is relatively full along NE 28th
- Cumulative effects of the influx of new residents and continuing construction
- The process to get to a pertinent program (APP or MAPP) is onerous and complicated
- Lack of political leadership

- Concern about no required parking within 1500 ft. of MAX stations– may work at some stations, but not everywhere – Clinton Street is a good example

List 2: Issues with the parking supply and how is that supply being used? What are all the scenarios?

- Properties without off-street parking
- Properties with unused off-street parking
- Residents that park in the street, rather than in their garage or driveway
- Residents that store vehicles in the street
- People that take up more than one parking space with one vehicle
- Residents with more than one vehicle that don't use their off-street parking
- Visitor parking
- Short term loading and unloading i.e. moving or groceries
- Trash/Recycling roll carts taking up spaces
- Underutilized off-street parking at apartments because they charge – instead residents park on street
- Oversized vehicles taking up multiple stalls
- Using stalls for other reasons i.e. no parking, fire hydrant
- Cars blocking crosswalks

Commercial Activity:

- Owners and employees park in time-restricted stalls on commercial streets
- Owners and employees that park in unrestricted spaces, rather than off-street lots they have access to
- Dead curb cuts that negate parking spaces
- Owners and employees that park in time restricted stalls that don't have access to off-street
- Customer parking spillover into residential areas
- Employees parking in neighborhood
- Loading/unloading – taking up spaces
- Loading/unloading – parking in the center turn lane
- Businesses with insufficient time and space allowed for loading and unloading
- Narrow streets – challenging for deliveries
- Contractors taking up parking

List 3: What are some potential strategies and solutions?

- Bicycle parking (staples, bike corrals, other)
- Better parking enforcement
- Preferential parking for carpools, shared vehicles, other
- Shared use agreement for off-street parking areas
- Valets
- Time restrictions

- Area Permit Program (residential and business)
- Parking pricing
- Parking Improvement District
- Business Improvement District
- Additional off-street parking supply
- Wayfinding and signage
- Education about uses in ROW
- Requiring developers to come up with TDM plans
- Requiring developers to include car sharing
- Good Neighbor Agreements
- Working with developers to subsidize bus passes, car sharing, cargo bikes
- Shared bikes between units
- Legalize parking in front of a curb cut
- Matching time stays with demand
- Charging for on-street parking after 7 pm in districts with high evening demand
- Need to match enforcement tools with parking usage and enforcement needs
- Promote a car-free lifestyle – branding and logo for buildings and developments
- Incentives from the city for car-free life
- Create toolkit for developers to encourage car-free lifestyle
- Reduce vehicle ownership - make it too expensive for people to own cars matched with a robust transit system
- Citywide parking permit and fee - Cheaper prices for smaller vehicles
- Pay-by-plate technology for residential districts
- Assess how many no parking stalls can be converted to parking stalls
- Rent driveway spaces
- MAPP – take out commuter requirement and make cheaper
- Incentivize the construction of off-street parking for lots that don't have any, especially for those with ADU's
- Encourage use of transit and alternative modes
- Get good and continuing data
- Data collection for actual car ownership rates
- Neighborhood associations should play a role in data collection – city needs to support this idea
- Encourage use of alleys where they exist
- Parking pricing
- Encourage SFR residents to go car-free
- Institutional Zones should have a requirement for TDM plans and requirements for neighborhood agreements
- Use technology to pay for and renew parking

- Educate businesses to encourage lower parking and use smart trips
 - Require developers to do TDM plans for new development
 - Enforcement – use smart phones to send photos to report violators
-

The meeting was opened for public comment.

Terry Parker commented in some concerns he has about parking:

Metro is forecasting 60,000 new housing units in the next 10 years. If 75% of units have cars that means 45,000 new cars in Portland. Car storage should not be on the street it must be off-street. Otherwise it is a subsidy to developers. Taxpayers already subsidize transit at \$.60 per passenger mile. If we charge for citywide parking, we must charge for bike and transit parking. Discouraging car use is bad for the economy. The City should get rid of its fleet if it wants everyone else to get rid of their cars.

Linda Nettekoven commented on education and communication:

The city needs to emphasize education. There is a lot of complaining. The City isn't giving the message to the public that anything is being done. City needs to find better ways to get information to the public and ways for them to engage.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Stakeholder Advisory Committee – Remaining Meeting Schedule

Centers & Corridors (2 hour meetings)
July 30 <i>July 30 meeting rescheduled to August 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introductions, project update, Symposium Recap• Preliminary evaluation of parking tools (Consultant)• Introduce residential permit concept and seek SAC direction (City staff)• Public comment - 5 minutes
August No meeting
September 24 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Present draft toolkit (Consultant)• Present detailed permit proposal (City staff)• SAC vote/endorsement on permit proposal and toolkit• Transportation Demand Management – proposed new requirements for new multi-family buildings (City staff)
October 29 (if necessary) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Present refinements to items discussed at 9/24 meeting• SAC endorsement (if not on 9/24)

**Centers and Corridors Parking Project – Residential Permit Parking Concept
August 5, 2015**



One of the major elements of the parking toolkit will be a new residential permit parking program. This new program will not replace the existing commuter-focused Area Permit Parking Program, but will be another tool available to address parking issues. As the SAC discusses the specific elements of the new program, we want to develop parameters that will ensure an effective system, while retaining flexibility for each neighborhood to tailor solutions to their specific needs. To the end, staff is asking the SAC to review the major elements of the program (“the trees”) with the understanding that we are not going to get into “the weeds” at this level. The table below summarizes the difference between program elements and details that would be worked out in a neighborhood-level implementation plan.

Major Steps	Types of Decisions	Notes
<p>Program Elements</p> <p>“The Trees”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the basis for the program? (e.g., zoning) • What is the process to establish? (e.g., neighborhood voting procedure) • What are the criteria to establish? (e.g., occupancy thresholds) • How many permits are issued? 	<p>The overall framework of the program has to be established by City Council through legislative action.</p> <p>Staff is seeking the SAC’s input and endorsement of these elements.</p>
<p>Implementation Plans</p> <p>“The Weeds”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement details (Is overnight enforcement enough, or do we need enforcement earlier?) • Exceptions (do we want “2 hour except by permit” or “4 hour except by permit?”) • Are all blocks in the area signed for permit holders, or are some left unrestricted? 	<p>PBOT staff will work with individual neighborhoods, over time, to develop specific implementation plans that are tailored to address local conditions. These are the types of issues those plans will address.</p>

The Concept: Overnight Residential Permit Parking Area

The Overnight Residential Permit Parking Area would allow residents to create a permit parking area that would restrict on-street parking access for non-permit holders. The concept has the following three main objectives:

- Encourage better management and utilization of existing off-street parking;
- Encourage apartment managers and landlords to market low-parking buildings to car-free tenants;
- Encourage developers to build an amount of parking that is consistent with the demand created by the new development.

Basis

The basis of the concept is zoning. Under this concept, only residentially-zoned properties would be eligible for inclusion in a residential permit area. All properties in residential zones would be eligible, including both single family zones (e.g., R5) and high density multi-family zones (e.g., RH). Properties in Commercial (also referred to as *mixed use*), Industrial, Institutional, and Employment zones would not be eligible. Any blockface within the permit area that fronts a residentially-zoned property could be signed for use by permit holders. The attached map uses our Mississippi study area to illustrate what this concept could look like in practice.

To obtain a permit, an area resident would be required to present proof of occupancy and proof of current vehicle control (either through the vehicle registration or with a notarized letter from the vehicle's registered owner). This way, permits would only be issued for vehicles under the ownership or control of residents of each permit area.

Question for SAC discussion: Is zoning an appropriate basis for creating a residential permit parking area? This concept is housing-type neutral, meaning that all residents of areas zoned for residential use would be eligible for permits, regardless of housing type or homeownership status. Similarly, residents of areas zoned for mixed use would not be eligible, regardless of whether they live in single family or multi-family housing.

Process and criteria to establish

The concept is opt-in: neighborhoods would vote whether or not to create a permit area. The process to establish would be similar to the existing Area Permit Parking Program, and would consist of the following main steps:

- A Neighborhood Association submits a request to PBOT for a residential permit area that consists of a minimum of 40 blockfaces (or 8,000 lineal feet or curb space).
- PBOT works with the Neighborhood Association to create a proposed residential permit area that will work logistically and meet the neighborhood's needs.
- A ballot would then be sent to all addresses within the proposed permit area. To be implemented, a minimum of 50% of the ballots must be returned to PBOT, of which a majority (over 50%) must be "yes" votes, to approve the program.

Question for SAC discussion: Is this the right process to establish a permit area? Under this concept, any Neighborhood Association could request a permit area. There would not be parking occupancy thresholds or signature gathering requirements to make the initial request.

Enforcement

Overnight enforcement is a cornerstone of this concept. Only permit holders would be permitted to park on street in the overnight enforcement hours. At the most basic level, this will ensure that only

permit holders are parked in the permit area outside of normal business hours, and will still provide parking for employees and customers of nearby businesses. However, there may be circumstances where enforcement hours need to be expanded, such as areas with large event venues, and the program would allow for that flexibility in each implementation plan.

Question for SAC discussion: Is overnight enforcement the right approach? This concept is intended to allow for short term and daily parking by customers and employees, while not allowing long term parking by non-permit holders.

Number of permits issued

The total number of permits issued within an area would be capped, based on a standard formula that is related to the total supply of on-street parking. The concept does not include a cap on the number of permits issued to any one address; rather, it proposes a **progressive pricing scheme** (the second permit would cost more than the first, the third would cost more than the second, etc.). Properties with available off-street parking would automatically start at the rate for a second permit. Daily guest permits would be available; these are typically sold in packets of 10.

If demand for permits exceeds supply, a waiting list would be maintained. If supply of permits exceeds demand, a neighborhood could decide to sell surplus permits to people outside the area. That would be a detail to be worked out in each implementation plan.

Question for SAC discussion: Is this the right approach to capping the number of permits? Should we consider a limit on the number of permits issued to a particular address?

The map on the following page shows the zoning around the N Mississippi Ave study area. Under this concept, all the areas labeled as “residential zones” would be eligible for a residential permit parking area, while the areas labeled as “other zones” would not be eligible.

N SKIDMORE ST

Residential Zones

- R2.5 - Single Dwelling Residential 2,500
- R2 - Low Density Multi-Dwelling Residential 2,000
- R1 - Medium Density Multi-Dwelling Residential 1,000
- RH - High Density Multi-Dwelling Residential

Other Zones

- OS - Open Space
- CS - Storefront Commercial
- IG1 - General Industrial 1
- EX - Central Employment

N



N MISSOURI AVE

N MICHIGAN AVE

N MISSISSIPPI AVE

N ALBINA AVE

N BORTHWICK AVE

N KERBY AVE

N HAIGHT AVE

N FREMONT ST

N COOK ST

N IVY ST

N BEECH ST

N FAILING ST

N SHAVER ST

