

Central City Parking Policy Update (CCPPU)

Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)

Meeting #5 Notes

July 27, 2015 4:30-7:30pm

SAC Members in attendance: Mike Albrecht- **Freight Advisory Committee**, Dennis Allen - **Development**, Mujtaba Ali-**Smart Park**, Reza Farhoodi-**Pearl District Neighborhood Association**, Greg Goodman- **Developer**, Michael Harrison- **OHSU/South Waterfront**, Tony Jordan- **Citizen**, Ryan Hashagen- **Old Town/Chinatown alternate**, Heather McCarey- **PBOT Bicycle Advisory Committee**, Al Niknabard- **City Center Parking**, Sue Pearce- **Hosford-Abernathy Neighborhood Association**, Dan Petrusich- **Portland Business Alliance**, Owen Ronchelli- **Go Lloyd**, Caleb Schlesinger- **Star Park**, Tom Simpson- **Standard Insurance**, Ian Stude- **PSU**, Felicia Williams- **Downtown Neighborhood Association**

SAC Members not in attendance: Rob Bearden- **Portland Art Museum**, Doug Blomgren- **First Presbyterian Church**, Steve Bozzone- **Community Alliance of Tenants**, Bob Buchanan- **Pioneer Place**, Rex Burkholder- **Oregon Environmental Council**, Pete Collins- **South Waterfront TMA**, Deborah Imse-**Multi-Family NW**, Rebecca Hamilton- **PBOT Pedestrian Advisory Committee**, Christopher Handford-**Davis Street Tavern**, Tamara Kennedy-Hill- **Travel Portland**, Adam Kriss- **Portland Commission on Disability**, Nicole Knudsen- **SEIU**, Ben Schonberger- **Housing Land Advocates**, Peter Stark- **Central Eastside Industrial Council**, Tina Wyszynski- **Goose Hollow Neighborhood Association**

City Staff in attendance: PBOT: Chris Armes, Colleen Caldwell, Kathryn Doherty-Chapman, Matt Ferris-Smith, Judith Gray, Peter Hurley, Malisa McCreedy, Grant Morehead, Leah Treat, Sallie Edmunds (BPS), Racheal Hoy (BPS), Damian Crowder (PDC), Erika Nebel (Com. Novick)

Consultants in attendance: Eryn Deeming Kehe of JLA Public Involvement (Facilitator), Brian Canepa of Nelson/Nygaard Transportation Consulting, Rick Williams of Rick Williams Consulting

1. Welcome and Announcements

Staff updates:

Portland Parking Symposium

PBOT held a parking symposium on June 29th, with several informative speakers. Some committee members attended and enjoyed hearing about different parking management strategies.

Downtown Meter Rate Adjustment

Ms. Gray announced the Downtown Meter Rate Adjustment subcommittee was convened and had two meetings to discuss a near term meter rate adjustment. The subcommittee voted to recommend that City Council vote to increase meter rates by \$0.40 to \$2.00 an hour, along with specific operating changes to better meet customer needs. The changes would not be implemented until after the 2015 holiday shopping season.

Having developed these recommendations under current procedures for the downtown meter district, the subcommittee expressed support for a data-driven approach to setting meter rates, such as the Performance Based Parking Management concepts that are being considered by this policy committee.

2. Public Comment

No public comment was given.

3. Work plan update

Ms. Gray presented a draft work plan for the committee with proposed dates and primary agenda topics for meetings from now until December. A second handout listed steps for developing a Performance Based Parking Management program and related the steps to the future agenda topics. Ms. Gray emphasized the charge of the committee is to update policy first and foremost. See the documents attached at the end of the meeting summary.

DIRECTION: Generally everyone agreed (by head nods) that this committee work plan makes sense.

5. Performance Based Parking Management

Mr. Canepa from Nelson/Nygaard Transportation Consulting gave a presentation on Performance Based Parking Management (PBPM) where he reviewed other cities experience using PBPM such as Berkeley, San Francisco, and Seattle. These cities set meter rates to meet occupancy targets, to mitigate congestion and make places more appealing to customers (easier to find a parking space).

He specified that Seattle's program goals direct the transportation director to set rates to have 1-2 available spaces on every block face throughout the day, however every place sets their goals differently, it just depends on the community and their overall system goals. See the website - <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/68208> for the full presentation.

4. Break for dinner

6. Meeting Notes Summary Approval

Ms. Deeming Kehe asked the group for any changes to the last meeting's notes summary and to vote to approve them as is, or with changes.

ACTION: With two abstentions (they were not at the last meeting) the rest of the group agreed to approve the meeting notes as they were.

5. Performance Based Parking Management Discussion, continued

Question: You mention the program is revenue neutral. In a revenue neutral program, with additional technology and staff to accomplish this program, where would the money come from to pay for it? Meters? I don't want to add any more stress on the city budget.

Staff response: Any program would need to pay for itself, no matter the goals, City meter policy states that any program needs to pay for the costs of operating it.

Staff note: In this context, "revenue neutral" means that revenue is not an objective of the policy; revenue may go up or down, but parking management is geared toward performance.

Nelson/Nygaard response: Generally the cities we have worked with, when they get a higher tech solution, it lowers the costs of labor and the overall program. Re: enforcement, you don't need as many people, etc. I have never seen a city implement a higher tech solution where they didn't save money over time.

Question: Does this involve special events, like timber games, etc. How flexible are we with this target?

Nelson/Nygaard response: In SF they have a special events pricing with their PBPM program, but that is a detail issue, however it will be taken into consideration in the program design.

Question: Based on event parking- is event parking just to have it, or is it specifically designed to mitigate negative outcomes for the event goer?

Nelson/Nygaard response: Yes, it is for both. Cities still use the target, but within a price range or cap. It depends on what the individual community objectives are.

Question: Are you going to pursue this and we never seen it, or are you going to pursue this and we can help make it happen? Or will there be another committee?

Staff response: There is only so much time for this committee, so we really need policy direction from you. We will need an advisory committee for the program design, but for now getting the policy direction from you, is what we need. It depends on how many topics the group wants to talk about in this committee process, we may have time to address some program design issues here, but only at a high level.

ACTION: Question to group: Does this group want to recommend that city staff develop performance based parking management policy?

Policy Recommendation

- Recommend staff develop a performance-based parking management program that includes:
 - Establishing performance targets
 - Coordinating on- and off-street parking
 - Adjusting parking prices to meet parameters

VOTE: With 1 abstention, the rest of the SAC voted to pursue a Performance Based Parking Management policy with specific program design detail discussion in a future phase.

Performance based parking management program design discussion

Mr. Canepa and the group discussed specific program design considerations.

Time Limits and turnover options

Mr. Canepa outlined other cities experience on pricing and time limits such as, peak period pricing/time bands vs one rate all day. Extended times of enforcement. The time limits, price structures are all based on data that each city collects and the goals for that community.

Question: Has any one studied the experience of Chicago, they privatized their on-street parking, I wonder what happened with that.

Nelson/Nygaard response: I am unfamiliar with any other city that has sold their on-street parking. I have not seen any studies on it, but from I understand availability has improved in Chicago.

Question: Who holds the authority to change the hours of enforcement?

Staff response: That requires a city council vote.

Comment: At night in Old Town we have high late night parking occupancy. We would like to change the times of enforcement in our area for the late night scene. Have you seen any other cities that have implemented a night time enforcement area?

Nelson/Nygaard response: Yeah, some cities in California do extend the meter times to address the late night crowd, but those cities are smaller than Portland. I don't know of any large cities that meter late night.

Comment: From the three cities that do PBPM now, what changes would they make? What can we do to learn from their experience?

Nelson/Nygaard response: Communications is one thing that is really important to get right at the start. Data collection, you need to know why you are collecting, and then how you will collect this data set to best use it. Data collection can be very expensive, so you need to know your scale. I would not recommend that Portland do the same data collection effort as SF.

Question: What are the perceived adverse effects of this program, from the merchant's perspectives? What if people rarely come downtown and then they won't know how much they will pay for parking? They may not want to want to come downtown again.

Nelson/Nygaard response: Many merchants are concerned that customers will be driven away, but typically the merchants have positive experiences with PBPM. Though some merchants will push back, you have to look at the broader community goals of making more parking available.

Comment: Berkeley has peak hour pricing, do you know of any one is combining these ideas together, so you have zone based prices, but then also a multiplier of time stays, so the 3rd and 4th hour are more than the 1st and 2nd. What about pay by phone, have the meter hold your credit card info, so you don't have to pay again, to make it more convenient? Do you know of any cities that have this technology?

Nelson/Nygaard response: Has any community combined the peak hour price model with progressive pricing? There are not any communities that do this now, because you want the pricing system to be legible and easy to understand for the customer. Regarding automatic payment, pay when you're done, the meter technology varies greatly, but I don't know of a city that has that option now. Most places have time limits, so that would depend on your community goals.

Question: If PBOT were going to develop a PBPM program, what does city council need to decide on to make that happen? Who has the authority? What actions does council need to make now?

Staff response: Step 1, City council would need to amend the meter district policy to do PBPM with performance targets. Step 2, give the authority to staff to adjust pricing with the specific program design. Step 3, the rates would be approved in the bureau fee structure process, done in the budget process annually, the meter rates would remain in that annual budget process for the future.

Comment: One thing we talk about in other parking groups, is allowing some individual operation differences between neighborhoods, i.e. the hours of enforcement, and price structure would be different from neighborhood to neighborhood, I think we need to build in that flexibility.

Staff response: Yes, I agree.

Comment: Let's stay on the trees (policy), the performance target, we need to emphasize to staff that we are invested in the goal of management, so that price, hours, time limits, they are built on that performance target. I am more concerned about the trees (policy) than the shrubs (program details).

Comment: It seems to me that this is allowing flexibility with neighborhoods, the shrub details should be decided by people in the neighborhoods, not City Council. In terms of the pricing and details, the neighborhoods need to be involved.

Ms. Deeming Kehe: All of the program details would need to be decided by a different committee, so this committee would get a start on the details but not complete them.

Ms. Treat reminded the committee members that their charge is to update the parking policy first and foremost and asked them to focus on that, then as time allows we can delve into specific program details.

Ms. Gray asked the group if they wanted staff to bring specific proposals to the committee in October.

The group declined needing to respond to specific proposals, could discuss details later as time allows.

ACTION: The group agreed to move on with the basic policy recommendation to pursue PBPM with specific program details to be discussed in a different phase.

7. Private parking off-street parking development code (Please see the website- <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/68208> for the full powerpoint)

Rick Williams: Last time we felt we got consensus from you all last time to refine a simpler code. A lot from this old code does not apply and was not even used. This is all about regulating development of new parking only.

Parking Maximums

Question: Should parking maximums be adjusted to reflect changes in district dynamics related to transit, bike, pedestrian and residential investments since 1996?

Proposed changes:

- Impose maximum parking ratios on all uses in the Central City.
- Adjust ratios in all Central City districts outside the downtown downward to reflect investments in transit; bikes, walking and residential infrastructure.
- Adjust office ratios in downtown upward to reflect actual demand for parking in downtown.
- Reduce operating restrictions on all parking approved under a maximum ratio and provided in a parking structure.
- Reduce Parking Sectors from 26 to 6.

Comment: I like everything you said, except the parking maximums. I don't think we need parking maximums, technology- has driven a lot of different things. Air quality has improved through tech, so if everyone drives electric cars we would not need parking maximums.

Rick Williams Response (RW response): Not from a capacity perspective.

Comment: In the effort to simplify the code, have we considered parking preference (visitors vs. workers, etc)? We don't build anywhere near the parking maximum now because it costs so much money to build it. We worry about the different needs of parkers, and the prices that they could pay. Different users have different needs and price sensitivities.

RW response: Well as it is now, any patients can't park in the residential towers in South Waterfront because the current regulation does not allow it, so it could open up some capacity,

Comment: I want to respond to Dan's comment. Technology has changed things, but it has allowed people to telecommute. I want the record to show that technology has improved for the better, air quality is one component of this, but there are many others. What about making bike infrastructure better? What about making bike parking better, that helps people ride bikes more, it has to be all comprehensive.

Comment: Six districts may make sense, but I think the Pearl district should have the same parking ratios as in downtown and near PSU. It is very well served by transit, etc.

Comment: Growth in the work force has not been coupled with a growth in demand for parking. The level of transit service into downtown is incredible and will continue to improve, so I am optimistic. I see a gamble of making a switch, deregulating the parking, I am concerned with flooding the market with available parking. Is there a concern about inducing demand by allowing more parking? **Staff response:** We share that goal of reducing SOV travel, but that's an important thing to consider when looking at this change.

ACTION: Question to the group: Is this the right direction staff should go on this issue?

VOTE: The group agreed that this is the right direction staff should take.

Entitlements

- Should all buildings have an entitlement to parking based on the maximum parking ratio in place for the type of use and district in which the building is located?
- Should these entitlements be allowed to be carried over time?

Recommendation

- Allow parking entitlements to *all uses with maximum parking ratios* and built in garages. This would include residential and hotel.
- Entitlements continue with life of the building or for a predetermined time until fully built (on-site or transferred).
- Operating restrictions on built entitlements are relaxed or minimized.
- Eliminate Eligibility List and Preservation Parking Reserve.

Comment: Why not allow entitlements to stay with the building with no time limits?

Comment: A concern I have is, now you can build more office space, but then we have this reservoir of parking supply that some developer could later build, which might induce more SOV trips. I like this idea of flexibility but I worry about holding this down the line with unintended consequences.

RW: Point of clarification, it would decay over time, as the ratios should be changed periodically.

Question: Would someone be keeping track of the available parking supply that could be built when you are trying to decide when to change the ratios on the future. How do you keep a record of the entitlement?

Staff response: Right now there's no coordination at all with preservation and entitlement.

Comment: Transferring entitlements between developments has caused strife in the NW, and I know that those neighborhoods will be opposed to this. Those Neighborhoods are deeply opposed to building parking garages and would be against transferring entitlements.

Comment: I like this, it seems like preservation light, you don't have to do an inventory for every stall, but there does need to be a tracking system for every development for what they could build. This seems easier.

ACTION: Question to group: Is this entitlement issue recommendation on the right track?

VOTE: The group voted 1 no, 1 unsure, 2 abstained, and the rest agreed it was the right approach.

The rest of the agenda items will be addressed at the next meeting in September.

8. No 2nd public comment

9. Meeting adjourned at 7:28pm.

ATTACHMENTS

White board issues captured:

- Parking maximums must reflect new technology in vehicles and office space density
- Doesn't necessarily mean there is more demand for office parking
- Concern about different maximums between visitor and commuter parkers (user and demand driven)
- Don't assume supply of housing will remain if housing bonus goes away
- Consider moving boundary from Burnside to Hoyt or Irving, maybe use existing "core boundary"
- Recent job growth has not resulted in equal increase in parking demand
- Concern about deregulation of who can sell parking, will this flood the market?
- Consider flexibilities for existing parking
- Why not allow entitlements with no time limit?
- Concern that folks would build more building and trade their parking to someone else who may build too much parking
- How do you keep record of unused parking?
- Entitlement transfer has caused strife in NW neighborhoods

Attachments

Draft Work Plan

<p>July</p> <p>Central City Transportation Mgt Plan (CCTMP) – Rick Williams Present proposals for some policy changes. Obtain clarification on surface lot changes</p> <p>Performance Based Parking Management – Brian Canepa Experiences from other cities. Policy priorities for PBPM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Potential SAC action on Policy Recommendation for Council consideration
<p>August -No meeting</p>
<p>September 14</p> <p>Central City Transportation Mgt Plan (CCTMP) -- RW Continue with draft CCTMP concepts Framework/Draft recommendations on CCTMP update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ SAC direction on Framework/Draft recommendations <p>Transportation Demand Management – Staff presentation (Potential) Other Policy Recommendations – Staff</p>
<p>October 12</p> <p>Performance Based Parking Management -- BC Cont'd <i>Policy Priorities</i> for PBPM (if needed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ SAC Action on <i>Policy Recommendation</i> for Council consideration <p>Discussion of <i>Program Design</i> options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ SAC feedback on Program Design options
<p>November 16</p> <p>Central City Transportation Mgt Plan (CCTMP) -- RW Presentation of Final Recommended CCTMP updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ SAC action on Final Recommended CCTMP Updates <p>(Potential) Other Policy Recommendations -- Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Possible SAC actions
<p>December 14-If needed</p>

Steps to a Performance Based Parking Management Program

Major Steps	Types of Decisions (Anticipated)	Notes
<p style="text-align: center;">Policy Recommendation</p> <p style="text-align: center;">“The Trees”</p>	<p>Policy statements needed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish the performance target 2. On-street & off-street coordination 3. Council to authorize PBOT price adjustment under parameters 	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Fundamental</u> policy direction</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Program Design</p> <p style="text-align: center;">“The Shrubs”</p>	<p>Items such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pricing parameters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Min/max rates • Frequency of adjustments • Amount of incremental changes • Trigger/monitor thresholds 2. Progressive rates for longer time stays 3. Area boundaries: block by block or neighborhood? 4. Peak hour pricing or one price all day? 	<p>Big questions</p> <p>Would also require Council action.</p> <p>Policy SAC input; separate SAC would be needed</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Implementation Plan</p> <p style="text-align: center;">“The Weeds”</p>	<p>Items such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring methodology 2. Public information needed 3. Reporting requirements 4. Enforcement protocols 	<p>Would also require citizen advisory committee</p>