

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

Thursday, September 24th 2015 | 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

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

Meeting Goals

1. Review Transportation Demand Management proposals and seek SAC feedback and guidance on concept revisions
2. Review residential permit concept refinements and seek SAC endorsement of proposal

Agenda

Schedule	Topic	Presenter
6:00	Welcome & introductions Approval of past meeting notes Other housekeeping items	Jeanne Lawson, JLA Public Involvement
6:05	Project Updates	Grant Morehead, PBOT
6:15	Transportation Demand Management Proposal and SAC Discussion	Scott Cohen, PBOT
7:00	Review Residential Permit Proposal; SAC Discussion and Action	Grant, all
7:45	Public Comment	
7:55	Next steps	
8:00	Adjourn	

Upcoming meetings

City Council Work Session: Thursday, October 8, 10:30 AM, City Hall

SAC #9: Thursday, October 29th, 6 PM, Multnomah County office building



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 #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 29th, 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 found it offensive that the woman from Richmond’s outburst 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 listen to people’s concerns.

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 related, I have an apartment with no parking across from me, 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's the process of going through this? Who is making these decisions? Typically, 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 wish we had the opportunity to work together as a group to draft our own proposals. 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 ourselves, instead we just comment.

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 2nd costs more than the 1st, 3rd more than the 2nd, 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 or have to drive. 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 2nd 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 surprised 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: Can I do 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?

(people raised their hands in response)

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

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 – Residential Permit Parking Concept Equity Scan

Context

Currently many mixed use centers and corridors adjacent to residential neighborhoods are experiencing growth and development that, while accompanied by many benefits, presents new parking management challenges. Developers are not incentivized to build off-street parking for potential residents because there is plentiful free parking on-street. Free and plentiful parking can lead to more driving and car ownership. This combination leads to parking pressures, especially when there are thriving business districts nearby with their own set of parking needs, frustrating long term and new residents alike. To address this specific issue of frustration with finding parking and new buildings built with little to no parking, the city is proposing an overnight Residential Parking Permit program. This memo examines the proposed program and its equity implications.

Parking and Equity

Equity is an overarching objective in City planning and actions. The Portland Plan states that:

“Equity is when everyone has access to the opportunities necessary to satisfy their essential needs, advance their well-being and achieve their full potential. We have a shared fate as individuals within a community and communities within society. All communities need the ability to shape their own present and future. Equity is both the means to healthy communities and an end that benefits us all.”

While equity is an overarching policy, its definition is broad and many interpretations can be derived from it. In addition, equity considerations must be carefully balanced with other directives from the Portland Plan, Comprehensive Plan and other adopted City plans, paying particular attention to some situations where objectives may be at odds with one another.

With this in mind, in an effort to focus our work, we consider the discussion of parking and equity by stating and answering two questions:

- A. What type of equity considerations should influence parking policy decisions, and, inversely
- B. What parking policies affect equity directly, and what directives should be developed to guide how the City proceeds in its policy development.

A. Equity considerations. When referring to equity and City policies, there are many ways to address equity considerations. One may speak of geographic equity, modal equity, racial/ethnic/gender equity and



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.

others. As it relates to parking, the two populations that are directly impacted by City policies are: **people with disabilities, and low-income populations.**

B. Parking policies affecting equity objectives. Below are two parking policy areas where equity has a strong and direct link: policies and programs affecting people with disabilities and low-income populations. Also included are “directives” to staff as it develops policies.

Disabled Parking. The City has a strong and long-standing policy regarding disabled parking. It was recently revisited and amended by City Council on December 13, 2013. Our policies and programs respond to the particular needs of people with disabilities by providing preferential treatment in the allocation and use of our parking supply. Staff considers that the approach to disabled parking addresses equity considerations and offers important lessons as we develop a larger parking and equity strategy. As a reminder and example of how to integrate equity into parking policies, below is a summary of how PBOT’s disabled parking program works.

PBOT’s Disabled Parking Program provides parking locations, time stays and rates that are different and preferential from the general population. As such, people needing disabled parking can apply to the city and receive official recognition that allows them, for example, to secure a convenient on-street parking spot in neighborhoods without parking meters, and preferential and secure parking at many locations, off street and on street. As an example from parking metered areas, in the downtown, disabled parking allows people with mobility impaired disability to park at “easier to park” locations and stay for longer than allowed and paid for (e.g. pay for 2 hours in a 2 hour time limit zone and stay for 3 hours).

***Directive.** Maintain existing disabled parking policies and integrate them into our citywide parking strategy.*

Parking and effect on low-income populations. The other situation where parking affects the City-adopted equity goals is in regard to low-income populations. All things equal, increases in the cost of parking may affect the ability of some low-income residents, visitors and employees to move around the city and access some key destinations, and/or increase their cost of living. There are three instances where parking policies can directly affect low-income residents. These are: policies affecting the cost of housing, the direct cost of paying for parking, and the indirect cost of moving and accessing destinations.

- a. **Cost of housing.** Perhaps the most important instance where parking policy can affect low-income residents is how the provision of parking can affect housing affordability. It is well known that constructing parking can cost from a few thousand dollars for a surface stall to tens of thousands of dollars per stall for structured parking. This cost is then reflected in the cost of the housing unit. In a city whose housing stock continues to get more expensive, requiring on-site parking in excess of what demand or needs are is counterproductive to the goals of a city affordable to all residents.

***Directive:** As we develop parking policies, special attention will be given to avoid recommending policies that on the whole lead to increases in the cost of housing, particularly for affordable and rental units, and lean on policies that may have the effect of decreasing the cost of housing.*

- b. **Paying to park.** This section only pertains to management of public right of way, or the curb zone. Public parking should be managed to the highest and best public use of the public resource, as opposed to maximizing revenue/profit.

A second consideration is that in some cases, it is desirable to use pricing as a management tool for parking in order to better allocate its use. Common examples include the Area Parking Permit Program, where “free” parking to residents is now \$60/year, and in parking metered areas such as downtown, Central Eastside, Lloyd, Northwest and others. Using a more market-based approach to parking has many benefits, both in influencing demand to better respond to limited parking supply, but also in setting performance targets for which pricing can be used to meet those targets.

It should be noted that failing to effectively manage the system is not an equity strategy. When we fail to manage the system, it doesn’t work for anyone and those with fewest options may be some of the most impacted.

***Directive.** As we develop and implement parking tools that increase the direct cost of parking, staff will rely on policy evaluation tools that consider the effects of policies on the cost of paying for parking or the allocation of permits. We will examine whether the policy has a disproportionate burden on low-income populations and, if so, will develop ways to lessen or mitigate the impact as part of the policy or its implementation strategy.*

- c. **Increasing the overall cost of transportation.** One of the most important outcomes of the Portland Plan and reflected in the Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan is to provide an efficient, balanced and cost effective transportation system. Two things are well-known about driving and the cost of transportation: at the level of the individual it is the most expensive mode of travel when one considers the costs of paying for a vehicle, maintenance, gas, and parking. Transportation is the 2nd highest household expense after housing, and in Portland it costs about \$10,000 annually to own and operate a car. Portland’s Comprehensive Plan directs us to develop a system where individuals do not need to own a car to get around each day.

Goal 9.D “The transportation system provides all Portlanders options to move about the city and meet daily needs by using a variety of efficient, convenient, and affordable modes of transportation. Transportation investments are responsive to the distinct needs of each community.”

Yet at the same time if accommodations to driving and parking are provided in abundance, such as in a suburban environment (most often by providing free parking and subsidizing its cost by hiding it in the price of products or rent or in the use of land for parking), the net effect is for driving to overtake the other modes of travel, making walking, taking transit and bicycling less attractive by making their travel longer (more sprawl), slower (more traffic), less connected (more large sites with poor street connectivity and no proper multimodal amenities). The result is the opposite of the urban development objectives stated in the Comprehensive Plan and at odds with our mode split and carbon emissions targets. As a principle, maintaining parking that is cheap, abundant, and convenient will be in conflict with our other goals.

Directive. As we develop equitable parking policies, we should ensure that we do not make parking and driving more convenient than walking, bicycling, and transit.

Residential Permit Program Proposal

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 implementation details of the permit program will be developed by the neighborhood and the City to ensure that the permit program works for each unique neighborhood. 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.

Below is an equity impact scan which briefly considers possible impacts to different populations in Portland neighborhoods near centers and corridors. The scan below only mitigates for disproportionate burdens to people with disabilities and/or low-incomes.

Overnight Residential Parking Permit Proposal Equity Scan

Populations impacted	Possible Positive Impacts (Benefits)	Possible Negative Impacts (Burdens)	Possible Mitigations
Residents of residential zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater assurance of parking near one’s own residence • Less congestion from people circling for a parking space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased cost of car ownership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discount for annual permits for low-income people
Residents of commercial and employment zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less congestion from people circling for a parking space • Fewer conflict opportunities and distracted/frustrated drivers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of overnight/long term on-street parking • Difficulty in finding parking arrangements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow shared off-street parking agreements • TDM Programs such as multi-modal incentives (e.g. discounted transit passes), etc. • Match parkers with available off-street supply
Shoppers/Visitors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More reliable & convenient parking options • Less congestion from people circling for a parking space • Fewer conflict opportunities and distracted/frustrated drivers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confusion for overnight visitors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guest permits
Merchants, restaurant owners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better customer access • Improved perception of area regarding travel convenience • Possibly more customers and turnover of customers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diminished customer perception of area related to travel convenience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information campaign on new parking regulations

Employees/ workers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easier to find on-street parking if they drive • More reliable travel times • Possibly more customers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty for evening workers (bartenders, servers, cleaners, etc.) to park nearby their jobs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discount for annual permits for low-income people. • Adjust hours of enforcement • TDM Programs such as multi-modal incentives (e.g. discounted transit passes), etc.
City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More efficient use of parking supply • Improved travel times • Improved air quality • Safer streets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impacts on low-income households 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discount for annual permits for low-income people

Discussion

The residential permit proposal is designed to be flexible, and to allow neighborhoods to tailor specific details to their needs. This will be accomplished in each neighborhood with a committee that develops a *Supplemental Plan* unique to their permit area. Concerns about parking access for existing residents of adjacent commercial areas, in particular low income residents, can be addressed through each Supplemental Plan. There are many ways to customize a parking permit program, and below are two areas where the Supplemental Plan can be customized for a particular neighborhood. It is not intended to be an exhaustive list, but rather to show a potential way to address equity concerns while retaining the intended purpose of the residential permit concept.

Establishing priority access to permits

The residential permit concept establishes the principal that priority access to parking in a residential zone is for residents of the zone. The Supplemental Plan can establish how access to permits for people who do *not* live within the permit area is prioritized. For example, a certain percentage of the total supply could be set aside for residents of any nearby low-income or senior housing, or for non-residential uses such as retail and employment. Similarly, a neighborhood could “grandfather” existing residents of nearby commercial areas, giving them access to a portion of the available permits. In that situation, new residents of commercial areas would not be eligible for permits, but they would know that in advance and could make housing and transportation choices accordingly.

Determining which blockfaces are signed for use by permit holders

In parking permit areas, short term parking is generally accommodated by signing blocks for “X hours *except by permit.*” However, enforcement details and the number of blockfaces that are restricted to permit holders can be tailored to the needs of a particular area. Below are a few examples of how this could be implemented:

- Leaving bockfaces unrestricted: a neighborhood could decide to leave one side of every block unrestricted, and thus the parking on that side of the street could be used by anyone, including permit holders, short term visitors, and residents of surrounding commercial areas.

- Hours of enforcement: While we have focused on the overnight enforcement aspect, a neighborhood could decide that they want to begin enforcement earlier. If the nearby commercial area is a popular dinner destination, for example, enforcement could begin at 5 PM.
- Restriction details: Restricted blockfaces could be limited to one, two, three, or four hours *except by permit*. In addition, some blockfaces could be signed for *exclusive use by permit holders* during times of peak demand. That way, residents returning from work will have some assurance that they will be able to park on their block, without having to compete with the happy hour and dinner crowd.

Conclusions

Not efficiently managing the parking supply affects all Portlanders. Besides causing frustration trying to find a parking space near people's homes or business districts, there are safety concerns with distracted drivers circling for parking, air quality and public health concerns with increased congestion. Failing to manage parking well does not help us our goals of having a healthy, prosperous, and equitable city.

While this permit proposal slightly increases the financial cost of owning a car and may disproportionately burden low-income households, it attempts to balance the social cost of driving and car ownership while meeting personal needs of Portlanders. By encouraging developers to provide adequate off-street parking and encouraging all residents to use their existing off-street parking spaces such as garages and driveways more efficiently, this permit program helps to alleviate the parking pressures in neighborhoods surrounding mixed use centers and corridors. This proposal may also incentivize people to live low-car or car-free lifestyles by making owning a car slightly more inconvenient, which can help them save more money, help the city reach collective mode split and air quality goals, and help their neighbors find a parking space when they need one.

Sample Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan for new developments of 21 or more units in Mixed Use Zones

Program Type	TDM Element	Program
Project Information & Performance Monitoring Reporting	Project Description	Describe project development, including square footage, number of residential units, commercial/retail space.
	Baseline Reporting Requirements	<p>Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Auto: Proposed number per use (visitor, resident, employee), proposed price(s), who pays, special designations (e.g. carpool) ▪ Bike: Proposed number of spaces, location, access plan, and rack type(s) ▪ District(s) auto parking numbers and prices ▪ Demand: max hour, max day, daily average, priced <p>Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trip generation: volumes, times of day, trip purpose (commute, non-commute), mode, destinations, ▪ Assumptions and methodology <p>Auto ownership based on comparable buildings</p>
	Performance Targets	<p>Performance targets (20 year, with 3, 5, and 10 year interim targets)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mode share consistent with area mode share targets based on Portland Plan and Transportation System Plan ▪ Auto ownership
	Performance Monitoring & Adaptive Management Plan	<p>Commitment to survey building tenants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Year 1 report ▪ Year 2 report* ▪ Year 4 report ▪ Year 7 report ▪ Year 10 report ▪ Year 15 report ▪ Year 20 report <p><i>*If performance targets are not met continue with annual reporting.</i></p> <p>Conduct surveys during same week each year.</p> <p>Commitment to adaptive management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The applicant will work with City to identify additional TDM strategies likely to achieve performance thresholds, if mode share targets are not achieved.

Sample Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan for new developments of 21 or more units in Mixed Use Zones

Program Type	TDM Element	Program
Strategies to reduce drive alone trips	Parking	If auto parking is provided, parking must be unbundled from the cost of primary space and paid by the resident or employee (no employer subsidies).
	Financial Incentives	Multimodal travel incentive (e.g. transit pass subsidy) offered to each tenant and employee for the first year after move-in or new hire.
	Transportation Information	New tenant information on transportation options provided at kiosk in central area or on an individual basis. Information includes but is not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Transit schedules and system maps ○ Bicycle infrastructure information and maps ○ Building bicycle facilities ○ Pedestrian infrastructure and maps ○ Carpool resources ○ Car sharing services
	Marketing	Marketing to tenants that do not own cars.
	Transportation Coordinator	Appointed transportation coordinator for building to administer services, conduct surveys, and report findings, either through property management company, transportation management association, City, or other approved equal.
Ongoing Participation, Enforcement, & Service Delivery	Participation	TDM Plan will be incorporated into CC&R's and deed. Commitment of ongoing funding and resources to the TDM program for 20 years.
	Enforcement	Acknowledgement of enforcement provisions.
	Service Delivery	TDM services, including reporting, measurement, program delivery, and coordination with City can be performed by owner, designated representative, contractor, or City staff or approved equal.
	Administrative Rule	The details above will be codified in an administrative rule, promulgated by Transportation Director.