

Centers and Corridors Parking Project  
Stakeholder Advisory Committee  
Meeting #7 – Notes

August 5, 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, Rebecca Kennedy, Gary Davenport, Carson Gorecki, William Gregg, Sue Pearce, Kirk Paulsen, Mike Westling, Sean Green, Steve Russell, Tamara Deridder, Chris Smith, Ted Labbe, Rick Michaelson

**SAC members not in attendance:** Alex Cooley, Josh Capps, Carol Gossett, Mary McCurdy, Pablo Bravo, Oreatha Johnson, Gerek Kransky, Rod Merrick, Don Wood

**Staff in attendance:** Mauricio Leclerc, Grant Morehead, Kathryn Doherty-Chapman, Judith Gray, Matt-Ferris Smith, Jay Rogers, Francesca Patricolo (Bureau of Transportation), Eric Engstrom, Marty Stockton (Bureau of Planning & Sustainability), Lidwien Rahman (ODOT), Phill Worth (Consultant team)

---

Meeting was brought to order at 6:05pm

1. **Welcome and introductions**
2. **Meeting notes**

Meeting notes from meeting #6 were passed out, reviewed and approved.

Action: Meeting notes were approved as is.

3. **Public comment # 1**

**Comment:** Glad to see a proposal out there, looking forward to seeing how it goes.

4. **Project schedule**

Grant reviewed the SAC schedule and work plan for the rest of the process. He explained that the consultants work must be completed by the end of the October, but if there was more work the committee wanted to pursue we could do that. The project timeline includes an “if necessary” meeting in October on the 29<sup>th</sup>, the group can decide in September if another meeting is required.

**Question:** I have an idea of creating off-street parking spaces in neighborhood node spaces, done in a public-private partnership, with PDC, PBOT, etc. Will that be a part of this? I think we need to get that property now as prices will go up. I see that as a part of a strategy, that should be in the comprehensive plan, and there is a strong contingent here that wants to explore that idea of partnering to build shared off-street parking.

**Staff response:** Yes we can include that as a tool in the tool kit.

## Parking symposium update

---

Francesca gave an update on the Parking symposium in June, and she shared feedback the City heard from the public including as concerns and ideas. Some things the City heard from the symposium goers, seemed to resonate from what the City heard from this committee: concerns like safety, equity, growing gracefully while preserving livability, and ideas included strategies to maximize efficiency of the spaces we have, permit districts, and more.

**Comment:** Amazing event, I enjoyed it. People should watch the videos, my favorite presenters were the two from Seattle.

**Staff response:** All of the presentations are online on the parking page- on the event materials page, and you can go back and review them all.

**Comment:** I appreciated the keynote speaker, I appreciated that he said in established neighborhoods you should minimally change things, to “protect the incumbents.” I am not sure we are doing that on this committee, we aren’t addressing the parking problems that are being foisted onto our neighborhoods. Sellwood just did a survey of neighbors and they said they thought developers should build parking at a ratio of 0.5-1.0 space per unit.

**Comment:** I was concerned that the person from Richmond was contained, she was very angry, the developers that were there were very conscientious, but I felt that her anger was swept under the rug. I didn’t think her frustrations should have been contained. I think people need to be heard.

## Evaluation of parking management tools

---

Kittelson and Associates began a presentation on evaluation criteria to determine which tools will be selected to address parking issues in different neighborhoods. Mr. Worth walked the committee through the criteria and explained that committee’s ideas and strategies they suggested were in this list.

**Question:** Spill over is this limited to commercial spillover?

**Response:** The city is not overly concerned with shoppers and visitors parking in neighborhoods, but we are primarily concerned with employees parking in neighborhoods all day, and long term parking by residents. We want to mitigate the negative impacts from excessive commercial and residential spillover parking.

**Comment:** I think they are inter-related, I have an apartment with no parking across from my building, and customers have to park in the neighborhood because customer parking is taken up by residential parking.

**Comment:** I want to make sure that what she says is heard.

**Comment:** Regarding objectives, yes we want to provide customer parking, but the economic development issue is so broad we need to be specific about that what that means.

**Comment:** We are concerned about employees, but I believe that incumbent residents who have lived there for decades would not be okay with customers parking in their neighborhoods. They don’t like seeing the flavor of the neighborhood change.

**Comment:** I think you're right, it's the difference between a center and corridor, but corridors are narrow ribbons with single family neighborhoods adjacent to commercial activity, so I think we agree that criteria B should address the issue of spill over parking from whomever, employee, customer, or apartment dweller.

**Question:** Will this be applied neighborhood by neighborhood?

**Response:** Yes, whenever the City is going to talk with neighborhoods about this, they will take into consideration the local context.

**Comment:** You could have \$1,000 permits to encourage people to sell their cars, or you can give incentives to developers to build more parking.

**Comment:** I would like to add to that, we should encourage people to be car-free if they want.

**Comment:** I don't want to force people to get rid of their cars, I don't want to focus on penalties.

**Comment:** Basic rule of psychology, people respond better to carrots than sticks.

**Comment:** I agree I don't want to be punitive, but I want to remove all of the public subsidies that allow of car ownership that exist today.

(Several people said ditto to that)

**Comment:** Implementation, there's a big picture and I want to make there's a comprehensive plan.

**Comment:** I want to echo that point, in order to make it possible to be car-free, there needs to be excellent transit for that to happen.

**Comment:** I want to add on all other modes besides transit. Criteria C talks about mode split and carbon emissions goals, and that means we have to consider bike and pedestrian movement as well.

**Comment:** I want to address the issue of incumbency that keeps coming up. I understand the idea that people bought a house and neighborhood change is hard, but I want to balance other things like affordability and equity. When you are talking about the incumbents you are talking about a very privileged group of people. Yes we need to address the negative impacts of spillover parking, I agree, but we really need to think about equity.

**Comment:** I agree, when we are talking about customers parking in neighborhoods spillover, but employees who need to drive to work in these corridors is also an equity issue. I don't think it's fair to prioritize shoppers, I second the equity concern. Too much air time in these meetings is taken up by conversation about protecting the incumbents, and not enough on equity.

**Comment:** I don't see how to balance the incumbents and equity.

**Comment:** I think that should be an objective here.

**Comment:** Equity is not on that list, and it should be.

**Comment:** I don't see anything that deals with balancing, that idea of growing gracefully while protecting livability.

**Comment:** Priority depends on who you are. All people are important, residents in homes or apartments. We need to look at all the stakeholders with equal weight. Everybody is going to have to give up something or pay for something for this to all work.

**Comment:** I want to push back on the priority and equity issue. I have no problem having a worker park 4 blocks away and walk to work, that doesn't affect affordability, but I do have a problem with making a family walk several blocks to their home.

**Question:** What the process of going through this? Who is making these decisions? Typically what happens, is you go to a neighborhood association and they are usually only homeowners, so how will renters be reached, who will represent them? Also I am not an expert on what's the most effective, it seems to be unfair to have the neighborhoods decide all this, is not right since they are not the experts. We should have the neighbors weigh in, and then have the experts take that advice and come back with solutions.

**Question:** The tools are grouped into certain chunks, do some tools have more weight?

**Response:** We have categorized the strategies but they aren't weighted.

**Comment:** I want to go back to the equity issue, it's not on this list. I think we want to go towards a future where a car is a luxury good and that someday soon we will have great transit service and you won't have to own a car to get around. I see that in some ways we are moving too fast and there is a backlash from incumbents. I am not against the idea of bringing along those incumbents with some protections, but we need to address equity and I want the committee to be sensitive to that.

**Comment:** I agree, there are many equity issues. For instance, the new mixed use corridors with expensive apartments may be abutting a long term residential neighborhood with much lower incomes, we can't assume where the equity issues are. I agree we need to keep looking at this issue. I don't want to induce more driving by making people move their car. I see possible concerns about shared parking arrangements and increasing vehicle miles traveled.

**Comment:** I want to respond to a comment, parking problems are a luxury. They primarily only occur in growing, highly amenitized neighborhoods that are better off. You don't see parking issues in low income neighborhoods.

---

#### **Steps to apply the toolbox-**

1. Identify parking context, 2. Identify parking conditions/issues 3. Determine parking management strategy 4. Select appropriate tool

**Staff comment:** The City's parking operations and planning staff will be working with the neighborhoods businesses, residents, etc. on selecting the tools for their neighborhood.

**Comment:** I think you are missing the first step, goals. We need to come as a city come together what our goals are.

**Comment:** One thing I didn't hear is livability. I've been working on parking in my neighborhood for 20 years, I wrote up my ideas for parking management and I've based it on livability. I think we need to look all of these things together, we want to create inviting, livable communities.

**Comment:** I want to step back, to curb zone prioritization, we are only talking about parking, but the curb zone could be a bike lane, or a bio swale, or a curb extension. I don't want to lose that idea of evaluating the best use of the right of way.

**Consultant response:** I go back to the idea of access, that's the goal, if we created access it is benefitting that district, if's a bike corral for 12 people or a parking space or a bus stop, it doesn't matter as long as the maximizing access.

**Comment:** I don't want to lose that concept in the end of our work. I think we need something that captures that some curb zones should be changed to other uses.

**Comment:** I want to echo that the curb zone is not just space to store cars, but could be viewed to move people, in a bus, on a bike, or whatever.

**ODOT Comment:** The scope of the project is about parking, so yes we can mention the concept of the use of the ROW can be used for other things, but we aren't going to answer that question in this process.

**Comment:** I have been frustrated that we have not been able to draft anything, we only get to comment. I think if we have had time to draft our own tools, this would be a different committee, this has been very frustrating for me and I feel that many people are frustrated with not being able to actually write anything.

**Staff response:** Almost all of the tools in the evaluation matrix were developed by SAC members at the May meeting. That was the primary agenda item of that meeting.

**Comment:** Procedural question, when we go around, we keep hearing from the same people over and over. I feel like it's important that we allow for time for everyone to speak. I don't know if we need to limit comments to once an issue or what, but I'd like to see more opportunity for others to comment.

**Staff response:** After the next presentation, we will go around the table and hear from everyone.

## **5. Overnight Residential Parking Permit Proposal**

Grant gave a presentation on the overnight residential parking permit proposal, asked people to hold comments/questions until he went through his presentation with the concept and the problem they are trying to solve- residential parking tension amongst existing residents and newer residents of buildings with little or no parking.

Grant explained that we need committee support for a package of policy proposals that the City will bring to Council to vote on. Tonight the City is focused on high level policy direction ("the trees") so hold comments on "the weeds" for later please.

The proposal is to create a program for an opt-in program for neighborhoods to develop a permit district based on zoning (residential zoning only), where residents can buy permits to park overnight. Enforcement would be overnight at a minimum, with additional enforcement details to be determined by the needs of the neighborhood. The prices of permits for a household would be progressively higher, (the 2<sup>nd</sup> costs more than the 1<sup>st</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> more than the 2<sup>nd</sup>, etc.).

**Question:** if you are basing this on residential, could someone park in the commercial zoned street?

**Staff Response:** Maybe, it will depend on the area and what the hours of enforcement are. It will depend on that individual neighborhood and the other parking regulations.

**Comment:** I like it, but I am struggling with use of zoning. If a resident lives in a mixed building can't get a permit. Is there a way for someone to buy a permit from an open market place? I am not sure this is fair.

**Comment:** I also see using zoning as a potential issue. Most of the housing left out will be higher density. I am worried about treating residents equally.

**Comment:** I have a concern with non-conforming uses in zones, I don't know how many there are. I am also wondering about the prices. I see it as a problem that for decades we have been publicly subsidizing driving and parking, so we need to move towards pricing parking. I think \$60 is too low to get those goals. Where would the revenue be used? Would it be used generally or used more locally?

**Staff response:** \$60 is not what we are proposing, it's just what we charge now. There are examples of programs we have now, like car pool permit discounts, that are priced to incentivize certain behavior.

**Comment:** Overnight enforcement, at 8:30 pm is when I have an issue, 2 am I don't have an issue.

**Response:** We want to have the program be flexible enough to have the hours start whenever it would work for the neighborhood.

**Comment:** Overnight enforcement does not address the problem we are having now.

**Response:** A rationale for this program, is to discourage the people who live in the car free developments and take transit to work and just leave their car parked for weeks at a time. Overnight enforcement would address that issue.

**Comment:** I don't see people parking their cars for weeks on end.

**Comment:** I think this proposal would solve a lot of problems, I have hesitation, but I think it's very thoughtful and interesting.

**Comment:** I want to echo the overnight enforcement issue, maybe TDM is a way to address that. I have an issue with the zoning. Also pricing, I think \$60 per year is way too high. I worry that will make Portland unaffordable. A lot of people have shared driveways, so you need to be flexible about determining access to off-street parking. I also see non-conforming parking spaces – will those count? I want this study to address encouraging off-street shared parking. The 40 blockface minimum, the neighborhood should be able to change that if they want.

**Staff response:** One thing I mentioned in the memo, if we go forward with this, and we may set a limit of permits sold. We also talked about having a monthly payment options too, so you could pay \$5 a month instead of \$60 for the year if you don't need a permit for the entire year. Also, the 40 blockface minimum is how the current permit system works. We are open to modifying the criteria to establish a permit area.

**Comment:** I support this notion of permitting by zone, it doesn't address how the neighborhoods with high density apartments, how will that be managed? What about other zones? Shoup talks about circling, but it will always fill next to the multi-use building. Who gets first dibs on the permits? I'd like to

propose a set limit. I worry that the single family homes could be outvoted by the residents in apartments that don't want permits.

**Comment:** I like this, I support by zoning, I also support including multi-family zoning. My goal is to set up a system for people in the residential zones to best use the common asset that is parking and pricing is a good mechanism for that. When it comes to equity, the cost of owning a car is really expensive, people shouldn't have to own a car have to drive place. Also the city doesn't subsidize water or garbage collection, so the city doesn't need to subsidize parking. Maybe offer a temporary permit for people moving here with cars, then they can buy a 2 month permit so they can store their car until they find a better solution. We need to allow for rentals of private driveway, or a transfer of parking permits priced appropriately, with a pressure valve to allow for incumbents. I think neighborhoods should have some control over some percent of that money to pay for safety improvements, so that some money that is generated remains in the neighborhood. The cost stings less, because you'll get a cross walk or a crossing beacon. Some areas of the city that have requested zoning changes to mixed use, I worry that a property owner will say to BPS, don't change my zoning because I won't get parking permits. Renting and moving, people move a lot, we may need to provide continuity of permit availability for those locations with people moving around.

**Comment:** You are talking about the same amount of money in all areas of the city, some areas that's really high. I worry that this starts off as a voluntary program and then turns into mandatory.

**Comment:** Generally I like the approach. I live a car-light lifestyle, I don't own a car, but I rent a car sometimes. What about temporary or visitor overnight parking?

**Comment:** Is there some mechanism for people to park in front of their own driveways? That is currently not allowed. What about guest parking? Maybe a scratch off permit or something. I like the zoning parking, current city code offers developers a gift of not putting in parking, what if a developer puts in parking and those residents use that parking. The 2<sup>nd</sup> permit purchase on the black market, could be a problem, but is it really a problem? If people are willing to pay double the price, maybe that's ok.

**Comment:** I agree with zoning, but I wonder about day time parking issues. A lot of neighborhoods have daytime issues. Also the block size, I'd like to see incentives, a fee or something for tools for us to be able to deal with our own problems. The price of permits, there's smaller cars and bigger cars, maybe price small cars less than those big cars.

**Comment:** Generally I like this. If a neighborhood did this, developers would build parking, current mixed use residents should be able to buy permits now, but then moving forward we change that. The cost of the permit should reflect the real cost of the parking space including maintenance.

**Comment:** I am leaning towards support. However, I want to make sure that everyone knows the difference between zoning and housing types. This proposal is the proposal to deal with protecting incumbents. I am also surprised that people don't think this will solve the overnight parking problem; this will.

**Comment:** I generally agree, the cap on the total number of permits, I think it will be bad if some households took 5 permits and some households didn't get any. I think there needs to be a cap, from an equity point of view, I think that's appropriate. I think you should assign the permits to apartment

owners NOT the renters, because people move a lot and I don't want those permits to get tied up. The apartment managers could manage the permits better for their tenants.

**Comment:** I addressed most of my questions and concerns in my write up that I sent to Grant. In the Mixed use zones, we have a lot of people there with no parking in their buildings, but they have cars so we need to address that issue. We have music venues, so there's a late night issue. Fees- I suggested in my paper, a base fee to cover admin fees, then allow for extra \$ to go towards maintaining our streets or going to improvements, if every neighborhood had a little pot of money to decide where improvements went. I think it would make the permit idea more palatable, maybe make it more palatable to council as well.

## **6. Public Comment**

---

**Comment:** I am worried about incentivizing developers to build parking, if there are spaces for tenants, then they will drive more. I think the people who live in those buildings drive less precisely because they are worried about where to park if they do drive. I worry about ending up with more expensive housing with parking. Permits are only allowed for HH with cars, but if you don't have a car, you should be able to buy a permit to sell to someone.

**Comment:** One thought I heard over again, is this doesn't address visitors parking. One idea, is to have dynamic priced meters on those blocks but allow the permit holders to park there. Use Shoup's variable pricing system idea. I am worried about people driving drunk because they have to move their car.

**Comment:** I live in Buckman, and I am not rich. My wife and I own one car, but we bike most of the time, our car sits for days a time, I think not driving is a good thing. The Washington school development with that music venue that seats 800 people has a small parking lot but that isn't enough. I understand the idea of reducing cars, we don't drive very much. I don't understand why these developments don't have to mitigate the negative impacts on their neighbors. I have not heard anything to address this. DC gave existing residents a parking permit and charged everyone else who moved in later.

**Comment:** Michael Anderson- a quick survey of the committee members-

How many people on the committee live in residential zones? How many people are tenants? How many people are person of color?

**Comment:** I am not sure I understand residential versus mixed use zoning. I live in Lair hill, we have businesses sprinkled through there. I am wondering the developers seem to come out better off, the residents bear the brunt of this, neighborhoods don't have needed services like grocery stores, so we don't need a car. If we allow developers to build, can we also say you also then you have to build a service (like a pharmacy or grocery store) that we need so we don't have to drive cars. We are dropping these huge things in areas where we are not ready to have those big things. We are doing this backwards, we should have a plan before we put in these buildings with no parking. You give out more permits than spaces, how will you do a lottery with that? If you can only give out 100 permits, but 300 people need them, how do you deal with that?

Grant concluded the meeting and said the City will come back in September with a more refined proposal for the committee.

**Meeting was adjourned at 8:15pm**