

**Parking Policy Update Public Comments via Pdxparking email  
Public Comment Bundle # 1  
Comments between June 2015- October 20, 2015**

The public has been given an email address to submit comments, ideas, and to express concerns and ask questions to the City regarding the parking policy updates. This document is a record of those email comments with their contact information including email address removed. A summary of the main themes is below.

**Summary**

While the ideas of parking solutions vary from requiring developers to build off-street parking to pricing on-street parking based on fair market value, the main take away is that Portlanders understand that parking is a key player in managing the whole transportation system, and that getting the parking policies right today is important for how we grow in the future.

**Residential Parking Permit Program**

Most people are in favor of a new residential parking permit program. They see this as a good step in encouraging developers to either market their units to car-free people, or to build some parking if they need it because the adjacent streets won't be a free for all. Some people are concerned that currently many residents use garages and driveways for storage and not for parking their cars. Maybe the permit program is a way to encourage them to use their existing off-street parking facilities more efficiently.

**Concerns**

- Equity
  - There are worries that this permit program could be used to exclude people including renters and workers, etc. based on the zoning. People want a provision to sell some permits to renters in mixed used zones and workers in the area.
  - Progressive pricing scheme-Some are worried that the price would be too high for low income people. Others worry the price may be too low for the program to work as intended.
- District size
  - Some worry about the size of the district being too big or too small to be effective.

**Ideas**

- People like the idea of adding on to the permit or for a portion of the permit revenue to be spent in the neighborhood on improvements such as safer crosswalks, enhanced enforcement, or for transportation demand management programs.

**Transportation Demand Management Programs**

People are generally in favor of implementing programs to help residents of new apartment buildings learn about and try transportation options. They are in favor of requiring developers to help subsidize transit passes and other mobility options for new residents.

People also would like the new developments to advertise to car-free tenants and make agreements with the city to offer on-site car sharing parking spaces. Generally, people really like the ideas of increasing

car-sharing services and pricing parking as at least the same price or more as other options such as transit.

### **Parking Minimums/Maximums for Development**

Many people are concerned that we allow developments to go in without parking. Some want us to reverse that decision and require all developments to include some off-street parking. Others would prefer stricter and tighter parking maximums on new development. While people are divided on how to solve the issue, people generally agree that something must be done to change the current conditions.

### **Performance Based Parking Management**

Several people specifically mentioned wanting the city to adopt performance based parking management using performance targets and variable priced meters (different prices for different districts or times of day based on demand). Many people like the idea of installing meters on busy neighborhood commercial streets to encourage turnover of visitors. They recognize that installing meters may not be politically feasible.

### **Other Ideas or Concerns**

- Price the public good (on-street parking) appropriately to incentivize other modes.
- Truck Loading/unloading for business districts is important to get right, possibly offer reservation permits in neighborhood districts for a fee, and have a centralized loading zone for neighborhood districts.
- Plan for better motorcycle parking.
- Some people will continue to need to drive, so while we want to encourage other modes, don't forget about those who can't bicycle, walk, or take transit.
- Political will- we need it, worry we don't have it to get this right.

### **Comments**

*Note: These public comments are unedited and pasted as they were sent to [pdxparking@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:pdxparking@portlandoregon.gov).*

1. Mon 6/29/2015 9:46 PM

From: Patrick Vinograd

To: PDX Parking

Re: Don't listen to the cranks

I was unable to attend today's parking symposium due to work commitments, but I want to urge the city to aggressively adopt the kind of parking management strategies described by Mr. Tumlin. Attaching a direct market-based cost to parking across a wide swath of Portland would cure many of the city's ills - reducing congestion (and corresponding air pollution), incentivizing bicycle and transit use, and creating a more compact and livable urban form.

I live in inner SE near Division and would welcome a parking benefit district as described in Shoup's *The High Cost of Free Parking*. I think the only error the city has made in places where it is charging for parking

is that the cost is too low. This public real estate is valuable and should be priced accordingly. I think the annual cost for residential permit districts should also be re-evaluated and increased.

Getting a handle on parking could be a transformation for Portland on the same order as the choice to build light rail instead of the Mt. Hood Freeway. Sadly, I don't think the parking choice will come from the bottom up since too many neighborhood associations are dominated by car-dependent residents. Instead I think an elected official needs to flex their political will to lead the city to the transportation choices that we need to make.

Thank you,  
Patrick Vinograd

---

2. 8/8/2015 1:37 PM

From: Colorafi, Mary

To: PDXparking@portlandoregon.gov

RE: Parking strategy comments

Hello. I missed the survey monkey but offer an important item to consider in any parking strategy.

I was informed by City of Portland Parking Violations that it is not illegal for cars to park on graveled walkways adjacent to roads when I called in multiple cars parked on the walkways between homes and these streets. It necessitates walking in the streets or squeezing around cars and fences, twisting around at best. I don't see why the homeowners should get free parking spaces to park their trucks, SUVs, and other vehicles likely because their garages and driveways are filled with the owner's possessions while pedestrians are forced to walk around them in the streets, sometimes with oncoming traffic. It's bad enough that no sidewalks have been installed but now I find that I and my walking neighbors can't even have the space to walk on the gravel. Shameful. It is bad in the summer when these homeowners likely have visitors with the vehicles too but certainly not good when having to walk in the mud produced by the tire tracks wearing down the gravel and dirt.

You guessed it, I've witnessed this on SE Ellis Street between SE 92nd Avenue and SE Foster/83rd, but I'm sure it is occurring in other parts of the city as well. At a minimum these parkers need at least to be ticketed. Please take this seriously. Thank you.

Rose Mary Colorafi

---

3. Wed 7/15/2015 4:32 PM

Kay Newell

Re: The magic wand that could create better community parking

This is long, but it has been 20 years in planning

Kay Newell

Sunlan Lighting, Inc

Kay L Newell

## The Magic Wand Parking Plan

If I could wave a wand and create a parking plan for Mississippi Avenue, this would be the plan. I have tried for years to get ahead of the parking problems that I believed would impact this community. There are fewer issues and complaints if people feel their needs are met. The best plans involve all forms of traffic, all commuters, those who live in the community and visitors.

Let me introduce myself. I own Sunlan Lighting in the center of the Mississippi Business District. Some of my employees bike or ride the bus, and I walk to work with the help of my walker. I own a home with a garage across the street from my business. Any where I go, I must drive. When I wander down Mississippi I use my electric scooter, but there are many places I cannot visit because of barriers. I have mobility issues.

I own rentals, and when I rented to my current tenants, they did not own cars. One developed a business that requires an auto to conduct his business. He parks on the street. One of my renters walked to work, and his wife drove her car to Camas for her job. They parked on the street. My son owns a house with a parking slab that he uses. He walks or bikes to work. I have a company truck that we need to conduct our business parked on our company parking pad.

I am one person but all forms of transportation affect me. I need big trucks to deliver my goods. Very few of my neighbors buy enough of my light bulbs to keep me in business. I depend on the contractors, building engineers, businesses, and customers from everywhere to keep my doors open. The customers need a place to park. Very few arrive by bus because of the long time required to get to Mississippi Avenue. People on time cards need to park close, as a 15 minute walk to buy needed parts can be very costly.

In short, my parking plan is that every mode of transportation be given equal weight. Trucks, cars, bikes, and pedestrians all need to be included in any plan for parking. Home owners, renters, and businesses are all important. For our twenty minute community to be successful, we need to respects the needs of all members of our community equally.

To create and implement my plan some city codes would need to be rewritten

### **THE PLAN**

Trucks: Businesses depend on the delivery of goods. Trucks will either park in the street to deliver, which is never a good option, or in protected loading zones. I would require loading zones to be located only on side streets. With strict enforcement, and the following modifications, truck loading zones would work very well. The current 15 minute requirement for loading and unloading works, but problems can arise, especially when a delivery truck needs to make deliveries to several businesses. They require a much longer time to serve business needs. Some trucks will park in my loading zone for an hour while the driver delivers food to restaurants and stores up and down Mississippi Ave. The man moves as fast as he can, but he has a lot of deliveries.

The first modification would be to give companies the ability to buy a tag to display on the front and back of the truck, giving that truck to right to use a loading zone for longer periods. Misuse of the tags for

personal use would result in a year's suspension of the tags. It would be cheaper for the truckers than the current fines, and allow time to make deliveries.

The next modification would be a 15 minute customer loading parking space next to the loading zone for customers. This zone would also be available for extra long trucks without danger of a violation.

The last modification would allow businesses to reserve loading zones for evening use. Many venues have trucks that bring equipment to use for one evening. Using a loading zone to park the trucks for the evening would free up customer parking and allow venues to reserve the space from 6 PM to 12 AM for an evening to load and unload equipment. Usage could be identified by a placard placed in the visitor's window. A reserve cover for that business would be placed over the loading zone sign the day of the reservation. The card would be for the business use only during evening hours, and cost a reasonable fee.

Enforcement is the key to make it work. Currently, Parking Enforcement checks parking, then comes back to recheck before ticketing. This process could be expedited. If a person sees a vehicle parked illegally, they could take a picture of the car or truck, the building or space it is located, and email the information to Parking Enforcement. The time-stamped pictures can then be used to write the ticket, reducing the time taken to identify illegally parked vehicles to one trip.

The loading zones should be placed in the center of a business district, then on alternating side streets, depending on the needs of the neighborhood. Where there are fewer deliveries, one loading zone would work.

#### **Bikes:**

Bike staples in front of stores are great ways store up to 2 bikes where people shop. Placed correctly, bike corrals can become not only an attractive way to park a bike, but a wonderful way to help pedestrians cross the roadway, and help drivers see traffic. Corrals should be placed on side streets at curb, on the side of the street cars turn into, as close to the side walk crossing as can be built. This placement opens up the view of traffic to everyone. At the end of the corral, put one or two spaces for motorcycles. The space could also be used for bike trailers. Bike parking creates a safe place to park, and the corrals help keep the bikes off the sidewalks.

Bike should be allowed on sidewalks ONLY when the bike is walked in ALL business districts. The only exceptions are children who go slowly, at walking speed.

A bike Corral at each block on a side street would provide access to stores, improve safety, and make a statement about using the bike as an important form of transportation.

#### **Buses:**

Public busses and Max Lines are well placed in most communities. More cross busses, maybe smaller busses would help people travel between centers more efficiently.

#### **Cars in the business districts:**

I prefer timed parking for my business. I personally avoid going to shop where I need to feed a meter. The time it takes to get a ticket and return to my car, takes up a hunk of the paid time. Then I need to shop quickly. In a hour or two hour zone, I do not have time to buy what I need and drop by the cute shop I just saw. My dream parking would allow for shopping. Each block would have customer parking in front of the stores, and wrap commercial parking around the side street at least half a block or more. The side streets would also have bike parking and truck loading. For placement, see truck and bike parking. I would put 15 minute parking and handicap parking on all side streets at all intersections where bike parking was not created. I would have NO sidewalk bump out on two lane streets. I would treat each block as a unit with the sidewalk on each side of the street making up the block. I would group parking in 1, 2 or 3 hours for each block according to the kinds of businesses on each block. Each block of businesses could modify the arrangements. On the main street, some businesses have faster in and out traffic. If more 15 minute zones are needed they could be located at the ends of the blocks, close to the crosswalk. With good parking turnover, customers will not be parking as deep in the neighborhood.

I feel that there should not be any parking stalls in the street used for mini parks if there are other public areas offered by businesses. Business should not be able to use public right-of-way for personal gain. When a restaurant used a 40 X 10 foot space [400Sq feet} and other businesses pay rent at from \$20 to \$25 dollars a square foot, it is not fair to the community in general. The city should not provide unfair advantage to anyone business. It may feel 'cool and hip' but it removes valuable parking from the community, increases parking problems, increases traffic circling, and it pushes the displaced cars into the neighboring streets. The Interstate Urban Renewal Steering Committee told us in 2000 that each parking space was worth \$10,000 to the business community. When the parking space is used to accommodate customer turnover, businesses thrive. When customers cannot find reasonable parking, they do not return. A business district has businesses that serve locals and other businesses. It brings in customers from all over. Parking needs to be provided for both kinds of customers. Bike parking and timed vehicular parking serve the needs.

Many businesses feel that metered parking drives customers to other areas. Feeding the meters add to the cost of product. Timed parking, whether metered or non-metered, needs to be enforced. Enforcement of parking regulations in the business districts is the only way to make any plan work. Allowing reporting parking violations with time-stamped pictures would help with enforcement.

#### **Cars in residential areas:**

People want to park in front of their homes. Some people NEED to park close to their home. They have mobility issues, and walking two blocks is physically impossible. How do mothers with babies and small children keep them safe while unloading groceries? My plan would allow these needs to be met, and still require open permit parking. It would also help with the problem of claiming the space in front of a house as owned by right.

As part of the business timed parking program, I would have parking by permit only up to two or three blocks on either side of a business district. Each block would have 24 hour permit parking for people who live and work in the area. During the business hours of 8 AM to 11 PM, any unpermitted car or truck would be able to park from 2 to 4 hours, allowing business customers to use the spaces left open by local residents that work or shop in other areas. If there are no evening businesses, the hours of open parking would be restricted.

Cars would be required to be moved every 24 hours on weekdays. With only business customers allowed to park during the day along the business streets, fewer business customers would need parking in the neighborhood. With the requirement to move residential vehicles every day during the week, people who mostly store cars on the street would be encouraged to use auto-sharing and other forms of transportation. A "fill in the date" vacation sticker/card would be provided for permit holders as part of their yearly permit. This card would allow for two weeks of vacation or visitor overnight parking. A second vacation permit could be purchased if needed. Use of an undated sticker/card would result in a fine.

To help residents have better access to load and unload their autos, these parking changes need to be made. Parking should be on alternating sides of the street, unless the street is one way. One parking stall per block shall be placed next to the cross walk and marked as a 30 minutes Permit Loading Zone Only. Each block MAY have one handicap parking and one shared car parking stall if requested by the block residents.

To increase parking stalls, any street wide enough will allow nose in parking on one side of the street and standard parallel parking on the other side. For safety in pulling out of the stalls, these streets should become one way streets. Here are few streets this wide.

Common tow lane streets with current parking on both sides would change to one way streets with nose in parking on one side. The angle of the stall would be at 45 to 50 degrees to allow for easier parking than parallel parking, better view of traffic in the rearview mirror, less street space used for the stall, and more cars parked on the block.

To encourage residents to use alley accessible parking, the city will allow parking pads to be built with a permit cost less than \$100.00, or for free if they do not hold a parking permit. Reduced permit fees for covered parking or garages will be available for households without a parking permit.

## **Permits**

The number of available parking stalls in the residential areas would be counted. To count needed parking permits, we need a formula. I suggest that we count the number of houses, and add a percentage of the number of apartments in buildings without on-site parking. Maybe 10% to 30% of the units to count for parking stall use per building. Add one parking stall per business. Subtract any on-site residential or business parking. I hope the two sets of numbers are close. Allow shared parking in business lots. This will require code changes.

Each Permit would be for one year, and would allow 24 hour parking in the residential area. It would come with one guest/vacation permit for 14 days of either storage of a car on the street to allow for vacation time, overnight visitors, or any unforeseeable reason, such as mechanical failure. This 2 week permit would be free with the year permit. Additional permits would cost extra.

Each stand alone residential building or joined family housing may apply for one permit, using addresses to ID the permit. Second permits per address needs to cost more.

Restricted business parking permits should be issued for business use. These restricted permits would allow all day parking, up to 9 hours in the residential areas for business employees. There would be one

permit per business in the first count to obtain a permit. There would be a lottery drawing for extra permits.

I would allow an open period each year to buy or renew area permits. All addresses would be able to buy one permit. Seconded permit request would be by lottery. Up to 125% of available parking would have permit tickets. Because permits are by address, the permit would remain at the address when a home was sold. New homes or businesses would need to apply for any unused permits or wait for the following year's open enrollment month.

Because of limited street parking, the city needs to change the laws for driveway parking, parking on home lots, and shared parking in lots.

There is a cost to provide parking when housing is built, streets are paved or parking is provided. Taxes paid for our streets and we expect to be able to use the street for free as part of the benefit of our taxes. Going to a permit system will allow street parking cost to be shared by the city and those who use the space. Some code changes will be required. The permits need to be priced to cover the cost of the permit, plus 50% of any additional cost to be applied to neighborhood maintenances, such as repairing pot holes, signage, and other street improvements as might be requested by the current Neighborhood Association. Then, 50 % of the cost over the direct administration cost would go exclusively to broader community transportation repairs.

However, during the first year of a permit program, 100% of the difference between collected fees and the administrating costs would be used for permit signage, and any changes required for identifying roadways at the start the permit program.

### **Apartment Buildings**

People who live in standalone houses complain that apartment dwellers take up the street parking. But, people in apartments often need a car to drive to work. Permits can discourage storing cars for people who use a bike most of the time, or take the bus. Car sharing provides a car for both home owners and renters at a savings.

All apartments building which do not provide any parking should be required to provide a car sharing program and a loading zone for their residents. This stall should be large enough to handle a small U-Haul truck. Apartments have more turnovers, and people need to be able to move into their units without carrying furniture for a block. Developers and the city bureus

Like home owners, apartment dwellers need to carry groceries and children into their units. A loading zone would provide for this livability issue. The number of permits for street parking available to each building would be a percentage of the units. Apartments without parking would be expected to market to non auto owners. They also need to be required to provide car sharing or extra bike parking. Every building should include a loading zone to help with moving in and out of the building and loading/unloading purchases.

### **Senior permit discount**

One complaint is the permit cost for older long time low income home owners. Create a senior discount program. To use it, a home owner must live in the house, have a current driver's license, and own a licensed and insured car with no on-site parking, as well as proof of qualifying income.

## Summary

Not everyone will be happy with this program. I designed it to address the need the community has to use our public streets for the public good. We need bus stops and bike corrals. We need auto parking and truck loading zones. We need a safe way to cross our streets, and we need a way in and out of our business districts. This plan makes most people unhappy and provides for everyone a safer community.

Parking is a need in Portland. We are not New York with everyone taking the subway. We are a western city where the most of us feel we need a car and many who bike or take a bus also have a car. Good parking is a requirement of a healthy business area. Downtown has parking garages. Small business streets cannot support one. The increase of apartments along these commercial zones has drastically increased shared street parking on close residential streets. These cars, along with the increased volumes of business and customer traffic, create issues and tensions with new and long time residents as well as businesses and visiting customers. The decrease of livability in our neighborhoods take away the feelings of community.

Each parking stall is important. The street should only be used for community transportation for cars, loading zones, bikes, buses, and short term storage of residential or business transportation modes. The cost of a lost parking stall is born by the community at large. The parking stalls should never be used for the personal gain of any company or group. Most developments are required to provide public amenities and allowing a business or group to use public parking space for personal gain is not fair nor is a good use of our public parking stalls.

The report I copied below gives a reason for not including parking for apartments. Someone needs to pay for our common infrastructure. We need to look at the whole, with the needed uses of our street, to create best use practices. Someone needs to pay for parking of autos on or off the street. If the space is not included in the rent, to whom and how is the cost to store/park a car assigned?

## A Report about New Development and Parking

Every dollar invested in creating an apartment translates to a higher minimum rent required just to break even. If a developer does not expect a new unit will command this target rent, that potential project will not be built. If the amount of parking can be reduced or eliminated, the money saved on construction will lower the required rent to break even and make some projects viable that were not viable before. More viable projects translate to more units getting built resulting in greater competition and thus lower local rents if demand holds constant. From <http://www.reinventingparking.org/2015/06/how-much-does-one-parking-spot-add-to.html>

Parking. From Kay Newell at Sunlan [503-281-0453](tel:503-281-0453)

Each Parking space is worth \$10,000 to the local businesses each year. Businesses who serve neighborhood needs benefit from bike traffic and walk-able sidewalks. Businesses who serve the larger community have customers who often drive to the area. Without parking, these businesses do not

thrive. Bus service and biking parking serve some customers but like malls, streets with destination businesses need turn over auto parking

Some of the elements I want to include are: Using the main street shopping areas for parking including Bike Corrals, these should be close to cross walks to allow for a greater visual area and safety for pedestrians and the bikers. Each auto space used for bike parking allows for several bikes to be parked. Where store sell items that attract bikes with trailers, they should be encouraged provide an area for these bikes.

All street parking in commercial zones use either timed parking or metered parking with areas for 15 minutes to 3 hours to increase turn over and to prevent all day parking in areas. Cars parked all day in a commercial area limit turn over parking and sends more traffic into neighborhoods.

Owners and employees of businesses should park 2 to 3 blocks away to allow customers to park close to shop.

## **Part 2: Traffic Flow to Help the “Magic Wand Parking Plan”**

Parking is the end result of driving someplace you want to be. If you find yourself driving around to find an empty space to park, and then are required to walk forever to get there, and then back to your car, you are halfway to becoming mad at someone.

The main street of a business district should have good two-way traffic flow. It should allow through traffic at a speed that allows drivers to see people, bicycles, notice where they are on the street, and still feel that they are moving smoothly. Frustrated drivers are more apt to cause accidents.

People who can park close to their destination buy more. That is good for business. When people perceive there is parking available, they will circle to find a spot. Store front stalls that are used for purposes other than transportation increase frustration, create more driving around to find parking, and increase parking in residential neighborhoods. For a business, those who find parking spaces buy goods. Without available parking, a business loses money. A business that does not make money is going out of business. Using parking space for vehicular use on streets reduces business customers parking in residential areas.

People who live in a neighborhood want to drive home and park in front of their house. They dislike it when business customers repeatedly drive around the block looking for a spot, then park in “their space”. A common feeling among people who own a house or are renting one is that they also own the sidewalk and street parking in front of their home.

My plan may only increase parking a little, but it will decrease the circling. Many people will dislike the change, even as it makes the flow better for bicycles and cars. The parking plan will also help remove the ownership of a parking space by mixing up the parking arrangements. I will require some changes in city policies and an investment in educating communities of the changes. Much like the changes on Williams bike lanes, the change will make the traffic a safer experience for everyone..

The main street traffic would be two way. The traffic on the parallel streets would be one way. Both bicycles and cars would go one way. With parking on both sides of the side street, or my preferred nose-

in parking, a driver would have twice the chance of parking close to the house they live in and/or close to the block they wish to visit.

Many of our streets are too narrow for standard nose-in parking. If we use a 48 degree angle to park nose-in to the curb we can use narrow streets. The streets would need to have the stalls marked to maximize the number of stalls. The triangle created by the angled parking could be used to provide a loading space or a small bicycle parking area. Streets would have one residential by permit loading zone for each block, and may have a car-sharing reserved stall if requested by the neighbors.

The one way streets would involve the streets with permit parking on one to two streets to either side of the main street.

Bicycles would be encouraged to use the side streets, park in the side street corrals, and then walk to the businesses. The staples in front of stores would be used by those who walk their bicycles. No bicycle riding on the sidewalk would encourage use of the side street corrals. A safer ride for cyclists and safer walk for pedestrians would be the result.

Customers in automobiles would drive down the main street looking for parking. If they did not find any in the area they wished to stop, they could turn on one of the side streets and go to the next parallel street. They would only be allowed to turn one way on the side streets. The main street and all the side streets without lights that cross the main street would be two way streets. At traffic signals the traffic could turn either direction. All other turns from the main street on to the side street would be right turns only.

Bicycles would follow the same rules as vehicles unless crossing the main streets as pedestrians.

People who were using the street as a pass thru would travel smoother because automobiles would only take right turns, speeding up traffic without increasing speed. Watching for people in the cross walks would be easier resulting in safer foot traffic. Cyclists would cross the main streets as pedestrians.

This traffic flow pattern would be safer for pedestrians, as traffic will flow up and down the street and turn only to the right. With bicycle corrals and short term parking at the corner, visibility will be better without taking away parking stalls. For cars entering the main street with right turns only except for intersections with lights, everyone would have better visuals and traffic would move smoother.

Cars would only turn right onto or off of the main street. Cyclists would use the crosswalks, and walk the bicycles across the main street. There would need to be signage as the right of way is only in the crosswalk, not in the center of the street.

To help people understand that they do not own the spot in front of their home, a new stall plan would be implemented. The one way streets would have nose-in parking, unless that created a street too narrow to be safe. By parking at a nose-in angle, all vehicles would park on one side of a one way street. One lane would remain for vehicles and bicycles, and one lane and both parking areas would convert to nose-in parking. As a result, the street would have about the same number of stalls, or a few more. No one would have the parking in front of their house. A permitted loading stall would be the first or last space on the street, depending on the traffic flow. Some streets are wide enough for both nose-in parking and parallel parking.

To be clear, use of parking stalls along business main streets should be limited to bus loading/unloading areas and car sized parking stalls. Bicycle corrals and truck loading space should be on side streets.

To pay for signage and needed striping, 100% of permit fees collected over administration costs during the first year would be used. After the first year, 50% of collected fees would be used for neighborhood transportation maintenance, and 50% would be dedicated to city wide street repair.

City Commissioners could put this plan in place for two reasons. It would improve road safety, and it would raise funds for road repair and transportation needs. While a 'right turn only' zone can be a pain, they are safer. Preserving parking in a business district improves businesses. Our 20 minute neighborhoods are not stand-alone communities. All businesses need customers to thrive, and very few can thrive on walk-in customers only. Even downtown businesses require places for visiting customers and employees to park. Smaller neighborhoods with thriving businesses are better places to live.

I know that public transportation and bicycles are very important transportation modes. However, trucks are needed to deliver goods to our community business centers. Many people require a vehicle to go to work, or for a quality life.

I live and work in a 20 minute community. I cannot walk to the stores, and my scooter cannot climb the steps to many of the stores. I cannot park and walk two blocks to my house. To stay in business, I depend on good customer flow from all transportation modes, delivery of goods to sell, and a healthy community.

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Mon 8/10/2015 8:09 PM

From: [zavid1](#)

RE: Parking solutions

If there was an actual incentive to park a motorcycle and motorcycle parking was cheaper than car parking, a motorcycle can be parked in a much smaller space, even on the sidewalk near bike racks if need be.

The current situation is motorcyclist have to pay the same amount as a 3 ton diesel truck which is ridiculous considering you can park about six motorcycles in the same spot one small compact car takes up.

---

Tue 8/11/2015 5:38 AM

From: kathy buss

Re: suggestions for parking

stop building condos and apartments which do not have parking! the problem is compounded over and over and over every time new housing goes up!

I work downtown for a non profit utilizing volunteers. however, they cannot find parking in order to help with our agency.....

kathy buss

---

Tue 8/11/2015 6:24 AM

Miller, Rick

here are some ideas that will be ignored!

Lets quit building huge apartment complexes without parking. Lets quit giving up street space to food cart and restaurant seating. Quit taking up a quarter of the block with those open runoff sewers that look like hell because the city doesn't take care of them. The city government is totally out of touch. They keep taking away driving lanes and parking and then wonder why there is a problem. Total idiots running the city. Wake up. By the way I am moving next year. I have been driven out by all the poor decisions that are ruining this once wonderful city.

---

Tue 8/11/2015 7:28 AM

Megan Mautemps

Parking

I have lived in Portland my whole life. I park here and visit businesses, parking problems started for example, on Mississippi there are many new apartment complexes without dedicated parking for those apartments. This pushes people out onto the streets to park just to go to there homes. Start requiring builders to add dedicated parking for their big apartment complexes they are putting up on areas that did not have apartments before. More parking is REQUIRED when building residential complexes.

Thanks,

Megan Mautemps.

---

Tue 8/11/2015 8:22 AM

Larry Bilodeau

parking in Portland

You want to solve your parking problems then cease this ridiculous policy of not requiring multi-family developments to provide off-street parking now!.

---

Tue 8/11/2015 8:29 AM

Robert Rubenstein

inadequate street parking

My solution to the parking problem is simple. Change the city code so that it requires new multi-family residential buildings to provide a minimum of one off street parking place for every residential unit. This will help reduce the demand for street parking.

Robert Rubenstein

---

**From:** Alan Kessler  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 06, 2015 4:02 PM  
**To:** Morehead, Grant <[Grant.Morehead@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Grant.Morehead@portlandoregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Centers, Corridors, Parking Toolkit

Dear Grant,

I live at SE 36th and Clinton in the Richmond Neighborhood. I happen to be a member of the board of the Richmond Neighborhood Association; however, this email is on my own behalf not on that of the board.

I attended the 7th SAC meeting yesterday evening, and I wanted to provide my written comments for your consideration.

I am very much in favor of the proposal you have set out. Although any solution raises equity issues, I think that the current proposal strikes a fair balance. A point that I think was missing from the discussion is that the mixed-use commercial properties are intended to be rented to residents without cars. As we have seen, however, free parking is too good to pass up, so many of the people moving into these complexes are car owners. The free neighborhood parking these residents get, are increasing the value of their rentals. In the current market, landlords are undoubtedly capturing that surplus.

By moving to the proposed permit system, we would enforce the intent of the City's earlier decision to eliminate parking requirements in transit corridors, and we would likely see that housing become more affordable as prospective tenants who intended to keep a car would opt away from those properties. Allowing the tenants of low-parking buildings participate in the permit program, as was suggested as an equitable solution by some SAC members, actually works to increase the value (and thus rent) of those units and is counterproductive.

The proposed plan would help increase political will for additional low/no parking developments, that would allow for higher residential density and decreased rents. Having more feet on the pavement will bolster support for transit, and we will enter a virtuous cycle.

Although I understand that the political will may not yet be here, the obvious next step is to allow neighborhoods to meter all parking. The residential parking passes could provide immunity from the meters, then dynamic pricing could ensure that commercial parking is distributed more evenly throughout the neighborhood, increasing the likelihood of quickly finding parking within a block or two of each resident's home.

These dynamic meters should not have time limits, and should be enforced 24/7, so that inebriated restaurant and bar patrons would be able to (for a price) leave their cars overnight and take a taxi home. This is a less harsh alternative to ticketing or towing occasional overnight parkers who make the correct decision not to drive drunk.

The meters would also incentivize better allocation of parking. Store employees might choose to park 5 or 6 blocks away from their work in order to enjoy cheaper (or free) parking. Short-term shoppers may be willing to pay several dollars an hour in order to park in front of their restaurant or store of choice.

As for affordability, the \$60 figure floated around the room last night is ridiculously low. No other aspect of car ownership is that cheap. Insurance, gas, registration, and maintenance are all much greater

expenses. A goal of this program is to increase transit and active mode share. A \$60 bill will miff a few people, but it will do little to change people's behavior. Parking downtown can cost \$200/month; \$200/year is certainly within the realm of reason for neighborhood parking spaces.

Finally, I think it is important that revenue from the overnight enforcement and from the meters I'm proposing is partially channeled into a parking benefit district pool. This will help get the support of the neighborhoods, and provide needed maintenance and services. I know Richmond residents would absolutely love some street trash cans, for example.

Alan Kessler

---

**From:** Brian Cefola

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 05, 2015 6:49 AM

**To:** Morehead, Grant <[Grant.Morehead@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Grant.Morehead@portlandoregon.gov)>

**Subject:** [User Approved] Comment on Residential Permit Parking Concept

Grant, below are comments intended for the Centers and Corridors Parking Project Stakeholders Advisory Committee. Could you forward to them, or advise how I might do so?

Thanks,

Brian

Stakeholder Advisory Committee members, I'm writing to provide comment on the Residential Permit Parking Concept.

I think the concept is vulnerable to the accusation that it puts Portland in the business of enforcing class distinctions. Residential neighborhoods could enact a permit district not as a means of solving a parking problem, but as a means of excluding those unable to afford a home in the neighborhood. Such a use establishes "insiders" and "outsiders", with the latter required to leave at night. That reminds me of sundown laws.

I think the way to avoid that outcome is to avoid districts where permits are held exclusively by district residents, there ought to be some external permit holders in every district. In that case there is no insider/outsider split, there's just parking permits.

In looking at the concept, I urge the committee to consider these methods of avoiding exclusive districts:

- It's crucial that the concept retain the provision that residents with off-street parking pay the "second permit" price for their first permit. Furthermore, that price should be high enough that district residents don't buy them frivolously. As a benchmark, PBOT estimated the cost of minimum parking rules to residents of new multi-family construction at \$50/month or \$600/year.
- Districts should be big. Bigger districts are more likely to include housing with off-street parking, and more likely to have slack capacity.
- Consider adding a requirement that a minimum percentage of spaces be available to external users as part of the district approval process.

Thanks for your consideration,

Brian Cefola

**From:** Stephen Gomez

**Sent:** Friday, July 31, 2015 5:06 PM

**To:** Morehead, Grant <[Grant.Morehead@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Grant.Morehead@portlandoregon.gov)>

**Cc:** Kay

**Subject:** Re: Centers and Corridors Parking Project - Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting #7

Hello Grant

I've circulated your meeting announcement and link to the new residential permit parking program to our Land Use & Transportation Committee and also to the Boise NA board. I've asked for comment so that Kay will have a some sense of these stakeholders at next week's meeting. I wish I could attend but I'm leaving Sunday on a two week road trip.

I'd like to share with you the thoughts I just expressed (in blue) to these two Boise groups along with your email:

Personally I do not support this plan as designed. It is unreasonable to put the burden of allocating the public right of way onto one group of residents--in this case apartment renters, many of whom don't even live here yet (and therefor can't vote on the plan). This plan just perpetuates the belief some have that the curbside in front of and/or near their home is "theirs." The density coming to the neighborhood brings some positive and some challenging changes to the community--having one class of residents absorb those challenges is patently unfair. The proposal allows our elected officials to avoid taking potentially unpopular positions.

Clearly some sort of parking allocation system will need to go in place as the Boise neighborhood (and nearby neighborhoods) nears capacity of the on-street curbside parking. No doubt the large apartment buildings are contributing to the demand for on-street parking with no parking provided developments (there's only a few in Boise) or low parking developments (most new buildings will have one parking spot for every three or two units). But don't forget home dwellers create a similar impact with their primary or second or third car on the street, dilapidated and unused garages and/or new ADU unit where off-street parking once was available.

I could support economic disincentives for apartment dwellers to induce them to use available on-site parking. For example, if a residential parking permit cost X, apartment dwellers in commercial zones could be charged 2X, 3X or even 4X to use the parking inventory available in their buildings.

However you feel about this topic one thing is clear--this is a subject most everyone is going to have a strong opinion about. Figuring this out will require openness to ideas, compromise and most importantly collaboration between residents, business owners and the increasing number of employers coming to our community.

Grant: I'm aware this is going to be a long slog for everyone involved and as mentioned above lots of compromise by all will be necessary. For whatever it's worth, I had coffee with Commissioner Novick a few weeks ago--he brought this idea up and I expressed the same perspective as above. We have a rapidly densifying neighborhood and city--we need leadership to make decisions that will support the dense city we are soon becoming, not solutions that deal with only the here and now.

I'm aware you'll be meeting with the Mississippi business association next month (I'll also be gone then). It will be interesting to hear their perspective on this concept. I'm also interested in how this plan will anticipate the large amount of employment coming to our neighborhood. The One North project at

Fremont and Williams/Vancouver will bring 300+ workers to the area. Jim Winkler has a large site at Fremont and Mississippi which is variously being planned either as dense mixed use (200+ apartments) or office.

Let's keep in touch.

Thanks  
Stephen Gomez  
Boise NA LUTC Chair

---

Tue 8/11/2015 11:03 AM  
Bobby Driggs b  
ideas to help with the parking problem

To whom it may concern,

After reading an article that KOIN 6 published. It has come to my attention the city is looking for additional ideas on how to solve the parking problem.

I want to start by saying, as a native of the city, I strongly feel that the city is coming up with the wrong ideas. Forcing people to buy permits to park outside their own home is a terrible idea! You essentially telling people who have lived here for a long time that you don't care about them - and being a native, I have to take that personally.

In the article Pearce is quoted with saying that living in a growing city is a challenge. I think that is where the city should start. Start not with punishing people who have cars and who have lived here for years, 'punish' the people moving here. Mississippi never used to have so many apartment complexes, etc, but most of them were built in the passed 10 years, even along streets like Vancouver and Williams, a better solution could have been to force developers to build enough parking spaces for AT LEAST 1/3 of the building occupancy. That would keep home owners happy, businesses happy, and occupants of those new building happy. The only person who would be upset would be the developers - which as a native, I am totally OK with.

The city needs to learn that not every one bikes around town, people can't afford 2.5k monthly rent, and are forced to live miles from where they work.

Don't punish the people currently living here, punish the people who WANT to make Portland their home. The city is growing at a pace that is unsustainable, and if a developer backs out, because they are forced by the city to build a parking garage underground, then so be it - it retains the character of the city.

Thank you,  
Robert Driggs

---

Thu 8/13/2015 10:10 AM  
Greg Andrews

[User Approved] Parking in PDX

Good Day;

In the past several years, I have noticed that Portland city government has been removing on-street parking while encouraging higher occupancy dwelling construction. Property development should be required to have on-site parking for at least one car per dwelling unit. Period. No "Grandfather" clauses should be issued because it gives even more privilege to the privileged. Not doing this increases parking congestion everywhere. To help reduce on street parking congestion, houses with garages and carports should be required to park their motor vehicles in those garages and not use them for "storage units". This would make more on-street available to residents, guests and business customers.

It is not realistic to expect that all present and future residents will walk, ride mass transit or bike to work, to visit the doctor, to shop for food, to visit family and friends or to attend public/private events.

The City of Portland knows that it can get more tax dollars from multi-unit dwellings on existing lots than it can from single family homes and that appears to be the real reasons for this exercise in social engineering. Enough! As single family home dwellers, we have given up much to PBOT and BTA with nothing in return.

Very Sincerely,  
Greg Andrews

---

Tue 8/25/2015 3:23 PM

Jim Panos

You can not force people to take city transit.

I am a 75yo male who has lived the majority of the time in Portland, but am very familiar with cities like New York, San, Francisco, Seattle and Washington DC and they all have parking problems, because they do not build a parking space for each apartment., which the puts more cars out on the streets making it harder for people who are in residential areas to have space for visitors.

I find that the city council thinks very small and does not plan for 25 to 50 years down the road. Our infrastructure is so behind the times due to poor planning. Highway 26 should have been planned as 6 lanes in the beginning all the way out to the Tillamook cut off, not 4 lanes.

We have poor city planners who can't think outside the box.

Jim P.

---

**From:** Gary Davenport

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 26, 2015 1:24 PM

**To:** Patricolo, Francesca <[Francesca.Patricolo@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Francesca.Patricolo@portlandoregon.gov)>

**Subject:** In case you didn't receive it

Hi Francesca,

In case you weren't provided with a copy of the document that a few of us wrote, I thought you might find this an interesting read. We tried to put aside the finger pointing to see if there might be a better way for the city to move forward as density increases. Though it's been sent to everyone up the PBOT chain command above Grant, to Susan Anderson and Barry Manning, no one even acknowledged receipt of the document. Good news is that Grant did circulate to the SAC committee.

<gary>

Gary Davenport  
owner, pdxvtours

### **UNIFYING THE COMMUNITY TO ABSORB GROWTH**

Gary Davenport, Tom Morris, Kevin Campbell, Adrian Baker-Campbell

6/19/2015

#### **OVERVIEW**

- Portland is increasing urban density by building transit-oriented apartment buildings with little or no parking
- Approximately 72% of these apartment tenants own at least one car
- Do we expect tenants of these buildings to own fewer cars?
- Do we ask them to do so?
- Do we tell them to do so?
- Do we help them to do so?
- If so, how do we help them as a community?

This document explores ways in which city stakeholders can work together as a community to absorb the growth reducing car ownership and growing low-car and car-free populations.

#### **THE CITY**

- Give us a compelling vision of how car-free living will benefit our community and clearly explain what is expected of developers, renters, neighbors and the cycling/walking community if we are to realize this vision.
- Actively support, educate and promote public awareness that transit oriented-buildings are being built to promote car-free populations. Promote pride in establishing true car-free communities. What if transit-oriented buildings were really car-free?
- Create and enforce parking permit programs that protect neighborhoods from being overrun by cars.
- Create parking permit programs that respect and preserve existing parking ecosystems formed by businesses and adjacent neighborhoods.
- Change existing zoning code to require developers and property management companies to contractually rent to car-sharing and car-free populations.
- Provide incentives to developers who rent to tenants who are car-free.

- Change zoning code to give developers a permit to build a transit-oriented building with no parking provided that all rental agreements include the provision that all tenants must remain car-free (i.e. to not own a car nor enter into a long-term lease agreement for a car) for the duration of their tenancy.
- Work with taxis, car-sharing and other transit businesses to create programs that reduce fares for those who don't own cars. Provide free advertising describing how these specific businesses are helping Portland to grow car-free populations. Consider mandating their participation in these programs as part of the licensing process.
- Approach automobile manufacturers and local car dealerships to explore ways to provide usage of cars for car sharing in transit buildings in exchange for reduced group rates or free advertising that describes how they are helping Portland by providing car-sharing solutions.
- Require developers of car-free buildings to include language in their rental agreements and advertising that clearly explains why the city has permitted apartments to be built without parking and to explain that the people who choose to live in these building should strive to live car-free, as this ideal helps build better communities.
- Provide free or discounted public transit tickets to car-free tenants in transit-oriented buildings.
- Develop a "Live Car-Free" logo and require that transit-oriented buildings prominently display this logo on all buildings, contracts and advertising. Additionally, provide free decals and bumper stickers to stakeholders to actively promote the concept.
- Develop a "Support Car-Free" logo and provide free decals and bumper stickers of the logo to stakeholders who wish to actively endorse and promote the concept.
- Develop city-owned, low-cost park and ride lots as an alternative to parking in the neighborhoods and develop strong enforcement procedures in order to prevent people from warehousing cars in the neighborhood and using neighborhood parking as a cheap way to commute downtown.
- Provide incentives to businesses with unused parking spaces to provide free or low-cost parking to car-owning tenants in transit-oriented buildings.
- Increase on-street parking inventories by allowing homeowners to park on the street (parallel to the curb), blocking their driveways.
- Work with Portland's neighborhood associations and other neighborhood groups to develop low-cost, community-driven survey tools that can be used to collect data on parking supplies both before and after the construction of high-density, transit-oriented buildings. Homeowners, businesses and apartment tenants should all be surveyed over time so that the city and residents have the

information they need to make informed decisions concerning zoning, parking regulations and parking enforcement.

- Develop a simple, effective program, possibly using smart phones, that empowers neighborhood residents to police and report parking infractions in neighborhoods including long-term storage, commuter parking and illegal parking.
- Create a donation plan where developers, neighbors, businesses, NGOs serving the aging and disabled community can contribute to a fund that's available for car-free tenants to use to purchase car-sharing and taxi services. This might be a way to integrate Uber, Lyft and other ride-sharing services into our community.

#### **NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS AND VOLUNTEER GROUPS**

- Participate in the “new sharing economy” by creating a neighborhood-specific, web-based ridesharing service for car-free/car-share apartment tenants who are in need of a car ride to run errands.
- Contribute money to a neighborhood fund that car-free tenants can use to purchase car-sharing and taxi services that provide low-cost transportation.
- Use the low cost, community-driven survey tools that the city develops to collect data on parking supplies both before and after the construction of high-density transit-oriented buildings. These studies will provide feedback to urban planners and City officials of the effectiveness of permitting programs and enforcement.
- Find positive ways for neighborhoods to work with people who move into the new high-density, transit-oriented apartments to make sure they feel they are part of the community. Share “best-practices” among neighborhoods.

#### **DEVELOPERS**

- Prominently display the “Live Car-Free” logo on all transit-oriented building and put the logo on contracts and advertising.
- Include language in all transit-oriented apartment rental agreements that clearly explains why the city has permitted apartments to be built without parking and ask the people who choose to live in these buildings to live as car-free as possible. Living up to this ideal will build better communities.
- Give rental preference and reduced rental rates to car-free tenants.
- Provide free parking spaces to those tenants who choose a low-car car sharing lifestyle. Put minimums in place (perhaps 3-4 apartments sharing one car) to qualify.

- Contribute money to the city wide fund that car-free tenants can use to purchase car sharing and taxi services that provide low-cost transportation.
- Purchase monthly transit passes for tenants without raising the rents.
- Sign good neighbor agreements with the neighborhood association and participate in neighborhood surveys.
- Locate and make available adjacent shared-parking resources as low-cost alternatives to parking in the neighborhoods or expensive onsite parking.

#### **THE BIKING COMMUNITY**

- Actively support, educate and promote public awareness that transit oriented-buildings are being built to promote car-free populations. Promote pride in establishing true car-free communities.
- Distribute and display 'Live Car-Free' logo on all marketing and advertising materials.
- In solidarity, encourage the biking community to place 'Live Car-Free' decals on their bicycles.
- Advocate for lower rents in transit oriented buildings.
- Advocate for developers to rent to car free/car share populations.

#### **THE ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNITY**

- Actively support, educate and promote public awareness that transit oriented-buildings are being built to promote car-free populations. Promote pride in establishing true car-free communities.
  - Distribute and display 'Live Car-Free' logo on all marketing and advertising materials.
  - Advocate for developers to rent to car free/car share populations.
- 

Tue 8/11/2015 8:14 AM

Alex

Allow free motorcycle parking everywhere in Portland at all times! Free zone passes too!

This will get people out of cars and on motor bikes. Traffic will be cut in half and five or more motor bikes can park in one car's space. This will incentivize switching to motor bikes rather than figuring out how to punish cars. Pollution and traffic is reduced and parking is maximized.

Sent from my iPad

---

Tue 8/11/2015 8:21 AM

Kevin Clark

Portland's Parking Problem

Hello,

I am currently a Masters Student at Portland State. I recently wrote a paper about how Portland can fix the way that it approached parking. The approach proposed in the Paper would be a social, economically,

and environmentally optimal regulation of parking in the City. Please take a few minutes to read it, if you have a chance.

Kevin Clark

### Free Parking and Housing Cost in the City of Portland

By: Kevin Clark

“Block Busters: The urban density Charlie Hales championed has arrived on Division Street. Why isn’t he celebrating?” headlined Willamette Week’s September 19, 2012 cover story. The article detailed community opposition to seven developments along Division without parking. Believing these would restrict parking and cause congestion, community members pressured the City of Portland to change decades-old zoning that eliminated required parking for developments with good transit access.<sup>1</sup>

In November 2012, the city published several related reports. One analyzed onsite parking’s effect on housing affordability, finding that parking requirements increase production cost per unit, reduce density of units, and result in higher rents.<sup>2</sup> Another examined eight new developments with and without parking, finding peak parking utilization in surrounding areas was still below 85 percent of capacity, indicating adequate supply. Furthermore, despite a reluctance to give up personal vehicles, the top features found to attract people to developments were neighborhood character and amenities, not parking availability.<sup>3</sup> These reports did little, however, to calm the pressure to add parking requirements for development.

Responding to this pressure, Dr. Donald Shoup, the UCLA economist and parking expert, implored the city to take alternative action such as overnight permitting in neighborhoods.<sup>4</sup> In March 2013, Portland Bureau of Transportation’s Parking Policy Coordinator Sara Schooley dismissed Dr. Shoup’s idea and failed to adequately explore his other concepts for managing curb parking.<sup>5</sup>

Spurred by Mayor Charlie Hales, on April 10, 2013 the City Council added minimum parking requirements for multifamily buildings over 30 units sited within 500 feet of a transit stop. The Council argued that “large multi-dwelling projects without parking pose a risk of overtaxing the supply of local on-street parking.”<sup>6</sup> Although this action was intended to mitigate negative public opinion, many have continued to decry the state of parking in Portland. Indeed, a collection of editorials in the *The Oregonian* brought such opinions as: “Portland should fix parking mess city created” by Frank Saldonis,<sup>7</sup> “Parking wars, Southeast Portland style” by Helen Jung,<sup>8</sup> and “Portland has created parking problems through bad planning” by David Krogh.<sup>9</sup> While these editorials had different levels of sophistication, a common theme was that curb parking in southeast Portland is not as available as it should be because of added density, and that the city should take further action.

More recently, a new concern over increasing housing costs has joined the perception of insufficient parking at the center of community consciousness. Several studies have demonstrated that housing prices in Portland are rapidly rising, and construction and wages are not keeping up.<sup>10</sup> The inaugural *State of Housing in Portland* report found that 2014 production was still below pre-recession

---

<sup>1</sup> Mesh, Aaron, “Block Busters,” *Willamette Week*.

<sup>2</sup> City of Portland, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, *Cost Comparison*.

<sup>3</sup> City of Portland, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, *Parking Impacts for New TOD*.

<sup>4</sup> Editorial, *The Oregonian*, January 5, 2013.

<sup>5</sup> City of Portland, Bureau of Transportation, *PBOT Staff Response*.

<sup>6</sup> City of Portland, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, *New Apartments and Parking Zoning Code Amendments*.

<sup>7</sup> Editorial, April 24, 2014.

<sup>8</sup> Editorial, March 14, 2015.

<sup>9</sup> Editorial, March 24, 2015.

<sup>10</sup> Portland Business Alliance, *Middle Income Jobs*.

levels; lowered production and demand from a growing population classically combine to drive up housing prices. Such rising costs, persistent wage stagnation, and wealth inequality are increasingly affecting working families. Portland also lacks the resources to align its affordable housing goals with programming and production.<sup>11</sup> At the neighborhood level, these challenges are blamed on Portland's increasing density, yet they are actually closely tied to free parking provided across more than 95 percent of the city. Portland attempted to address a parking congestion problem by shifting its cost to the housing market through minimum parking requirements—the classic way cities have treated the negative externalities of automobile ownership. However, it is time to attack the root of the problem: free curb parking.

Free curb parking is a classic “economic commons” problem. To reverse its damaging consequences, Portland should unbundle parking from development and allow the market to set a price for curb parking. This approach would drive increased parking production, greater overall density, lower costs, and less conflict over development.

### Free Parking as a Problem of the Commons

The commons problem is exemplified by the pastoral village land freely available to all for herd grazing. At first this arrangement works well and the community flourishes, then the community grows. With such growth, animals are added to the grazing commons. All villagers grazing animals are acting rationally and in their own self-interest by using wealth generated from the activity to add more income-producing animals. Over time, the land becomes overrun and overgrazed, and can support no animals. Villagers want to use the commons forever, but it is a scarce resource and personal restraint on a communal asset yields no individual economic reward. As a shared common resource, free curb parking is the urban commons of today; it has no economically derived price and is scarce.<sup>12</sup>

Common parking encourages waste as drivers cruise looking for their share of the commons, providing little incentive for them to limit consumption of the resource once parked. Parking overconsumption results, and a degraded urban form. We have chosen to try to meet the demand for “free” parking through minimum parking requirements in real estate development, lower-density zoning, and offset fees. However, when the price of a commodity in a market is zero, demand can never be satisfied. As Donald Shoup states:

*Most markets depend on prices to allocate resources—so much so that it's hard to imagine they could operate in any other way. Nevertheless, cities have tried to manage parking almost entirely without prices. To see the absurdity of this policy, look at it from a new perspective. Cities require off-street parking because the market supposedly fails to provide enough of it. But the market fails to provide many things at a price everyone can afford.<sup>13</sup>*

We continue to build more parking, because there is not “enough” parking. There is not enough parking because we do not charge a price at all for most of it. Instead of making a market to regulate this commodity, we have chosen to shift the cost of total automobile capacity over time (i.e. parking) to other aspects of the economy, primarily real estate. Cities across the U.S. treat parking as unilaterally a supply problem, employing models and systems that inevitably conclude demand for this non-priced, “free” good perpetually exceeds supply.

### Minimum Parking Requirements and Planning for Free Parking

The predominant model is problematic because real estate development planning during the automobile age has historically assumed free parking as inextricably linked to land improvements, by

---

<sup>11</sup> City of Portland, Portland Housing Bureau, *State of Housing in Portland, Phase 1*.

<sup>12</sup> Shoup, Donald, *The High Cost of Free Parking*.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

right. Assuming that all parking will be free to users and costless to developers distorts transportation choices and land use regulation, and creates a cyclical system that demands ever more parking. Cities have planned for the amount of parking required in absence of market pricing, leading to trip generation models that reinforce increased demand predictions and minimum parking requirements that shift parking's myriad costs to real estate development.

Planning parking without prices actually creates an illusion of parking demand. In cities like Portland, drivers will not have to pay for parking in more than 99 percent of trips. Without prices to systematize demand, cities inevitably require new developments to satisfy peak demand for free spaces on a project-by-project basis. This means cities require free parking to be provided at peak capacities, no matter the direct or implied economic costs. Thus an endless cycle of municipal governments mandating provision of a costly yet unpriced commodity ensues, meaning this ideologically induced economic shortage is only ever addressed in mandates on the built environment.<sup>14</sup>

Reliance on unpriced parking has pervaded planning and transportation departments across the U.S., and has led directly to more expensive lower density development that induces more automobile trips. Planning without a price on parking leads to the six-step cycle of endless free parking planning. Step one: traffic engineers with the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) survey peak demand for parking at suburban sites with ample free parking and little-to-no public transit. This data is summarized in the annual *Parking Generation* publication which delineates parking rates for each type of land use. Step two: urban planners use *Parking Generation* to assign minimum parking requirements to various land uses. In most departments, the *peak* parking demand is determined to be the *minimum* acceptable standard. Step three: the required parking spaces are built at such oversupply their market price is driven to zero. People drive more because free parking is available on almost all trips. Step four: ITE transportation engineers survey trips to and from the same suburban sites with ample free parking, publishing these results in the annual *Trip Generation* publication. Step five: transportation planners consult *Trip Generation* to design transportation systems and attendant upgrades necessary for continued development. Such design provides enough capacity for the trips generated by a suburban site with ample free parking. Step six: urban planners plan for density that simultaneously provides ample free parking and does not congest roads. This causes lower density which spreads activities spatially, thus increasing vehicle travel and parking demand—driving up peak parking observations. This system can never satisfy demand for parking over time because the free parking reflexively creates insatiable demand for itself.

The planning orthodoxy's main tool for spreading free parking is the minimum parking requirement in development, a status quo that has not always been at play. Of 73 cities in 1946, only 17 percent had parking requirements, but by 1951 the proportion had swelled to 71 percent. (These measures were not imposed by an uncaring bureaucracy, but rather were often demanded by residents.<sup>15</sup>) Thus by 1951, America had effectively bundled parking to real estate development. Under such regimes, new developments were mandated to provide a certain number of spaces without a required parking surcharge to end users, implicitly assuming the developments would provide economic mitigation. This bundled parking damages cities by inducing automobile ownership and trips, increasing real estate prices, and weakening the economy.<sup>16</sup> Specifically, bundled parking and free curb parking negatively affect urban housing markets.

### Free Parking and Housing

Free parking and impact fees affect housing prices because they transfer the cost of automobile storage into the real estate market. Owning a home, renting an apartment, working in an office, or opening a restaurant do not necessarily require automobile ownership. However, we treat free parking as

---

<sup>14</sup> Shoup, Donald, *The High Cost of Free Parking*.

<sup>15</sup> Shoup, Donald, *The High Cost of Free Parking*.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

a forgone conclusion of real estate development through minimum parking requirements and impact fees. These measures are at their most draconian in housing market regulations—increasing cost, lowering density, and slowing investment. Although this practice makes owning a car more affordable, it makes housing more expensive. Case studies from San Francisco<sup>17</sup>, Los Angeles<sup>18</sup>, and New York<sup>19</sup> all established a direct link between providing parking and increased consumer housing prices. Another study of affordable housing developments found that the provision of a single space per unit raised the price by 12.5 percent, and two spaces per unit caused a 25 percent increase. The same study found current parking minimums result in a 10 percent tax on development nationwide.<sup>20</sup>

Besides increasing costs on a capital basis, these regulations detract from highest and best use of urban land. Illustrating the resulting inefficient density, a study of housing development in Oakland, California found that before the institution of a parking requirement in 1961, the city enjoyed housing development that produced 30 percent more units per acre, investment of \$92,000 per acre, and land value of \$72,000 more per acre. These results stemmed from just one required space per unit—mild by many of today's existing regulations.<sup>21</sup> The study further determined the requirement did not produce more total parking, rather it induced developers to build bigger units commanding higher rents. Free parking therefore functions as an additional building massing restriction akin to floor area ratio limits.

Cities also charge parking and traffic impact fees on new development—a de facto free-parking tax regime. The fees are largely generated by a complex equation factoring in the ITE's *Trip Generation* and *Parking Generation* survey data. However, because the parking and trip figures are inflated by existing free parking, the resulting impact fees are proportionally inflated, causing new developments to subsidize free parking and suffer diminished residual value from reduced density.

### Free Parking and Housing in Portland

Portland prides itself on progressive politics and quality land use planning, billing itself as “The City That Works.” Yet free parking remains the norm, paid for by Transportation System Development Charges (TSDCs) accompanying all development and promulgated by minimum parking requirements. TSDCs are determined based on each development's projected impact on the transportation system, constituting a tax born inside of, and thus perpetuating, the free parking model. Minimum parking requirements apply to all development outside the Central City, creating the same externalities observed in other studies: higher costs, lower density, and less investment.

TSDCs are based on the estimated motorized, transit, and pedestrian trips each project is projected to induce over a ten year period. These fees fund qualified projects of a motorized, transit, and non-motorized nature on a like-kind basis (i.e. motorized fees pay for motorized improvements). As of 2015, the fee for a single-family dwelling unit is \$1,883, \$140,816 for a 104-unit apartment, and \$382,044 for a supermarket.<sup>22</sup> From October 1997 to October 2006, the city collected \$43 million, and would have collected \$61 million had affordable and transit-oriented developments not received waivers.<sup>23</sup> Since the fees use estimated trips generated in the free parking environment, the motorized component is needlessly inflated, implicitly subsidizing free parking and ultimately car ownership.

Despite the praise Portland receives for ostensibly progressive urban planning, the city still bundles parking, and recently increased minimum parking requirements. This reality does not support the General Plan's vision for an urban, multimodal city of twenty-minute neighborhoods. Admittedly, one

---

<sup>17</sup> Jia, Wenyu, and Martin Wachs. "Parking and affordable housing."

<sup>18</sup> Manville, Michael, and Donald C. Shoup. "Parking requirements as a barrier to housing development."

<sup>19</sup> McDonnell, Simon, Josiah Madar, and Vicki Been. "Minimum parking requirements and housing affordability in New York City."

<sup>20</sup> Litman, Todd, "Parking requirement impacts on housing affordability."

<sup>21</sup> Shoup, Donald, *The High Cost of Free Parking*.

<sup>22</sup> City of Portland, Office of Transportation, *Update of Transportation System Development Charges*.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid*.

caveat is the Central City exemption from all minimum parking requirements, and a similar exemption for developments along transit streets prior to the Division Street controversy. The response to the outcry over the unparked Division Street developments is a classic case of a city trying to treat parking as a supply problem. This time though, the jurisdiction knew parking minimums would increase cost, lower density, and not fix the parking “problem”.

The new parking requirements are not harsh in relative terms, and do provide for a sliding scale: developments of 51 units or more must provide .33 parking stalls per unit, 41 to 50 units must supply .25 stalls per unit, and 31 to 40 units shall provide .20 stalls per unit.<sup>24</sup> By the City of Portland’s own admission, this will cost upcoming developments between \$3,000 and \$45,000 per newly required stall. The city’s own analysis demonstrated this policy would result in less dense buildings delivered at a higher cost. Before the change, a 50-unit building on a typical southeast site would charge monthly rents of \$800 to \$1,150 per unit. Now, the same site will only produce 45 units at \$850 to \$1,200/month/unit.<sup>25</sup> Unsurprisingly, when surveying proposed developments in the Belmont-Hawthorne-Division area, the change seems to be shifting problems to developments of 30 units or less. The new parking minimum has increased housing prices and reduced development density. Unbelievably, the parking controversy has not gone away, yet Portland housing prices continue rising amidst newly restricted production. The free parking orthodoxy has only gained strength after the Portland City Council’s response to parking controversies. However, the city still has the opportunity to contain rising housing costs, reduce conflict, and increase density by reforming its approach to parking.

#### Reforming Parking Policy in Portland

Portland is currently planning for free parking, hiding its costs in other civic functions, particularly real estate development. Trying to “solve” parking through supply only causes severe negative externalities; in the housing market this results in higher prices, lower density, and controversy. Also, the approach effectively charges everybody for free parking whether they use it or not. Market prices for parking make its costs apparent to its users and allow a parking equilibrium to be reached. Housing will cost less, be produced at higher density in more locations, and result in less controversy.

The city should pursue three reforms: charge market prices for curb parking throughout its jurisdiction; use Parking Benefit Districts to return the revenue to local communities for discretionary expenditure; and remove minimum parking requirements. Donald Shoup summarizes it best: “If cities deregulate off-street parking and charge the right price for curb parking, market forces will improve transportation, land-use, the environment, and urban life. You will not pay for my parking, and I will not pay for yours. Instead of planning without prices, we can let prices do the planning.”<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> City of Portland, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, *New Apartments and Parking Zoning Code Amendments*.

<sup>25</sup> City of Portland, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, *Cost Comparison*.

<sup>26</sup> Shoup, Donald, *The High Cost of Free Parking*.

## Bibliography

- City of Portland, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability. *Cost Comparison: Parking Prototype Impacts of Form and Affordability*, Portland. November 2012.
- City of Portland, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability. *Parking Impacts for New TOD Along Portland Inner Corridors Parking Study*, Prepared by David Evans and Associates, Inc.. Portland. November 2012.
- City of Portland, Bureau of Transportation, *PBOT Staff Response to Dr. Shoup's Editorial on Overnight Parking Permits*, by Sara Schooley. Portland, March 1, 2013.
- City of Portland, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, *New Apartments and Parking Zoning Code Amendments*, Ordinance 185974. Portland, May 10, 2013.
- City of Portland, Portland Housing Bureau. *State of Housing in Portland, Phase 1*. Portland. April, 2015.
- City of Portland, Office of Transportation. *Update of Transportation System Development Charges*, Prepared by Henderson, Young & Company, Portland, July, 2007.
- Jia, Wenyu, and Martin Wachs. "Parking and affordable housing." *ACCESS Magazine* 1, no. 13 (1998).<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3cn3q9qk> (accessed April 5, 2015).
- Litman, Todd. "Parking requirement impacts on housing affordability." (2011). <http://vtpi.org/park-hou.pdf> (accessed April 5, 2015).
- Manville, Michael. "Parking requirements and housing development: Regulation and reform in Los Angeles." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 79, no. 1 (2013) 49-66. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01944363.2013.785346#.VSgXvEJH29Y> (accessed April 5, 2015).
- Manville, Michael, and Donald C. Shoup. "Parking requirements as a barrier to housing development: regulation and reform in Los Angeles." University of California Transportation Center (2010).<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1qr84990> (accessed April 5, 2015).
- McDonnell, Simon, Josiah Madar, and Vicki Been. "Minimum parking requirements and housing affordability in New York City." *Housing Policy Debate* 21, no. 1 (2011): 45-68. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10511482.2011.534386#.VSgY7kJH29Y> (accessed April 5, 2015).
- Mesh, Aaron. "Blockbusters: the Urban Density Charlie Hales championed has arrived on Division Street. Why isn't he celebrating?." *Willamette Week*, September 19, 2012, <http://www.wweek.com/portland/article-19687-block-busters.html>.
- Portland Business Alliance. *Middle Income Jobs in the Portland-metro Economy*, Prepared by ECONorthwest for the Value of Jobs Coalition. Portland, 2014.
- Shoup, Donald C. *The High Cost of Free Parking*. Vol. 206. Chicago: Planners Press, 2005.
- Willson, Richard W. *Parking Reform Made Easy*. Island Press, 2013.

---

Tue 8/11/2015 10:09 AM  
MELISSA CRENSHAW  
Portland's Parking Problem

Why re-create the wheel?

Look to cities that have systems already in place and glean from them a system that would work well for Portland.

Note: Nobody 'wants' to pay for things they have gotten for free but this city has grown up very fast and the current systems do not suffice for the current population. The population is just going to have to find ways of dealing with it.

Very few people who live IN San Francisco actually drive in town. They use public transportation or taxi services. Parking is also VERY expensive, so that deters people from driving in town. Let the visitors and those with the expendable cash pay the high prices.

---

**From:** Rebecca Kennedy  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 24, 2015 1:20 PM  
**To:** Morehead, Grant <[Grant.Morehead@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Grant.Morehead@portlandoregon.gov)>  
**Cc:** Mary Kyle McCurdy  
**Subject:** Comments on proposed neighborhood parking districts concept

Hi Grant,

I am leaving town this afternoon for an out of town wedding, and won't be able to attend the meeting this evening. Mary Kyle McCurdy (copied here) will be in attendance to represent Housing Land Advocates. I also wanted to send you some comments generated at our last board meeting regarding the neighborhood parking districts concept that we discussed at the last meeting.

We appreciate the thought and analysis that went into creating the proposal, as well as the tool-kit approach that provides flexibility for both the City and neighborhoods as they work to address parking challenges. Thanks to you and your team for this thoughtful approach.

We have more detailed comments on the neighborhood parking districts proposal. Generally, HLA is in support of a neighborhood permit system along commercial corridors, and support many aspects of the current proposal, including the opt-in option, the neighborhood ballot process, and minimum district size. Our primary concern is that it limits on-street permits to people who live in residential zones. The current proposal leaves residents of mixed-use buildings along adjacent commercial corridors without access to a permit. We believe this will place an unfair burden on renters, and will add to their overall housing costs.

Housing cost burdens are now understood as encompassing both the actual cost of housing as well as the cost of transportation. In recognition of this, and in order to address the concern raised above, we suggest that the concept include all residents of the district, including those living in both residential and mixed-use zones. While we support efforts to reduce vehicle ownership rates, particularly in corridors with frequent transit service, any parking district program should also recognize that some renters in mixed-use buildings will still need to own a vehicle.

At the last meeting, you asked us to stay in the trees and avoid getting down into the weeds, which I appreciated. I would like to take this opportunity to make a couple comments about the weeds though, since the HLA board raised these issues and I won't be in the meeting tonight. First, we are concerned that the proof of residency requirement for obtaining a permit could be a barrier to low-income families,

particularly those that may need to move around frequently. Second, we have some questions about how the cap on total number of permits within a district will impact renters. Renters tend to move more frequently, and I can imagine a scenario where a new renter is not able to get a permit because some are held by, but not used, by folks who previously lived in the neighborhood but have since moved. The design and implementation of the program can address both potential issues, but we think its important to raise them now.

Finally, we want to make a general observation about a tension between affordability and policies that were designed to reduce vehicle ownership along frequent transit corridors. Many committee members are understandably upset about the proliferation of mixed use buildings in their neighborhoods with no on-site parking and the resulting impact on neighborhood livability. They will likely make the argument that the public should not subsidize the developers twice- through zero parking minimums followed by the provision of on-street parking to building residents. Our concern is that renters who live in these buildings will pay the cost for this issue in the form of increased parking costs, when they received none of the benefits. Access to the public ROW for all residents of a neighborhood is an issue of equity, and renters should not be left out.

Thank you,

Rebecca

--

Rebecca Kennedy

---