

## **RICK WILLIAMS CONSULTING**

Parking & Transportation

PO Box 12546

Portland, OR 97212

Phone: (503) 459-7638

E-mail: rick@rickwilliamsconsulting.com

---

### **MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Mauricio Leclerc, PBOT  
Grant Morehead, PBOT

**FROM:** Rick Williams, RWC

**DATE:** November 10, 2015

**RE:** **Central City Transportation Plan Update – Issues and Considerations**  
**VISITOR PARKING & ROLE OF PARKING MANAGER**

---

#### **A. BACKGROUND**

The Central City Parking Policy Update Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) has met several times in the past months to review a set of issues and considerations for strategic revisions to the Central City Transportation Management Plan (CCTMP). The intent of this work is to significantly simplify the zoning code, by recalibrating parking standards to reflect 20 years of change, standardizing the parking operations for historic buildings and transfer of parking entitlements, and streamlining or eliminating requirements that can't be realistically monitored.

To date, active discussions have taken place around the issues of:

- Adjusting/"recalibrating" maximum parking ratios in all parking sectors, and
- Minimizing/eliminating the development of new surface parking lots within the Central City.
- Parking entitlements, and
- Minimizing operating restrictions on approved parking

This memorandum is intended to establish the foundation for initial discussion of two additional issues. These include:

- Visitor Parking, and
- Role of the City's Parking Manager

The recommendations summarized here are intended to provide a foundation for understanding these new issues and for discussion at the November 16, 2015 and subsequent SAC meetings.

## **A. VISITOR PARKING**

### *QUESTION:*

Should the process to build free-standing Visitor Parking Garages be continued and/or refined?

### *BENEFIT:*

- While there has not been a great deal of Visitor Parking built since 1996, this section of the code does preserve a means for Visitor Parking to be built, particularly in the context of SmartPark garages and future expansion of visitor facilities in other Central City districts.

### *ISSUES:*

- Visitor parking is the only “allowed” parking in the code that can be built without being associated with development of new building area.
- Visitor parking is also very strictly conditioned to ensure that the parking built is only provided to shoppers and visitors. To this end, the sale of monthly parking is prohibited in approved Visitor facilities.
- Without some type of Visitor Parking provision it would be unlikely that, for instance, new SmartPark facilities could be justified as they represent facilities “not associated with particular developments.”

### *RECOMMENDATION(S):*

- Continue to allow Visitor parking facilities to be built under a conditional use process (allowing for demand to be measured in a manner appropriate to the specific visitor demand generator - e.g., event, cultural, retail – and/or associated with significant demonstrated losses of on or off-street short-term parking).
- Impose operating restrictions (a) necessary to ensure Visitor demand is the primary use and (b) that are enforceable.
- Manage the parking consistent with Performance Based Parking Management, where occupancy dictates the pricing of parking and the length of stay. The intent is that short term trips be the priority and that parking is operated consistent with established performance targets.
- Continue to allow the sale of monthly passes to residents of the parking sector consistent with established performance based parking management objectives and targets.
- Continue to prohibit “early bird” specials and that the sale of all day passes be tied to a priority system that prioritizes short term trips and is consistent with established performance based parking management objectives and targets.

- Continue provision requiring that approved Visitor Parking operate for a minimum of 10 years before the use can be changed.
- Require that Visitor Parking be owned and/or operated by the City. The intent is not to seek rents from parking activity, but to have access to data to properly monitor occupancy, turnover and time of stay, and make parking operation changes as needed. Parking operation could be executed by a private entity but under City control.
- City would use information to monitor the use of visitor parking consistent with its intended use and to publish information for the public as part of a new Performance Based Parking Management program.
- Existing visitor parking facilities would continue to operate based on the conditions under which they were approved.

## **B. ROLE OF THE CITY PARKING MANAGER**

### *QUESTION:*

Should the role of the City Parking Manager be redesigned to serve as a facilitator of information and data collection versus one of enforcement?

### *BENEFITS:*

- Eliminates restrictions (in current code) that are generally unenforceable.
- Entire code sections on reporting and monitoring (semi-annually) as current conditions of use would be eliminated.
- Transitions City Parking Manager from role of enforcement/regulation to facilitator and information resource.

### *ISSUES:*

- Throughout the code, the role of the City's Parking Manager is routinely called out. The Parking Manager is responsible for maintaining the Preservation Building Eligibility List and the Preservation Parking Reserve.
- The Parking Manager is additionally responsible for collecting semi-annual operations reports for all parking built after 1996 and monitoring compliance in all operational categories by parking type approved.
- These duties have not been carried out, and would be difficult to enforce if they could be carried out.
- It is reasonable to question whether the role of Parking Manager (as defined in Title 33) would be necessary if the code could be simplified, standardized (where possible) and structured around

many of the solutions that the Advisory Committee has supported in this planning effort (e.g., reduced ratios, restrictions on surface parking, entitlements and operating flexibilities).

*RECOMMENDATION(S):*

- Redefine function of City Parking Manager to fit within existing PBOT functions or at the discretion of the PBOT Director:
  - PBOT Development Review Division would handle the development review process, including Central City Parking Review (CCPR) cases, Visitor Parking and recording and tracking the number of stalls built and entitlement uses. PBOT staff will be empowered, on behalf of the PBOT Director, to request (as reasonable and over time) as a condition of approval process parking data on utilization, turnover, rate schedules and mix of users.
  - PBOT Parking Operations Division would collect, analyze and report data as part of a future Performance Based Parking Management program, as well as information on permit districts and parking sharing opportunities in private lots based on available data.