



Bicycle Parking Code Update

Meeting #1 Summary: February 24th, 2016

Stakeholder Committee Members

PRESENT	NAME
Yes	Sarah Figliozzi, PBOT (committee co-manager)
No	Scott Cohen, PBOT (committee co-manager)
Yes	Phillip Beyl, GBD Architects
Yes	Todd Boulanger, Bicycle Transportation Alliance
Yes	Clint Culpepper, Portland State University
Yes	Kathryn Doherty-Chapman, Go Lloyd
No	Roger Geller, Bureau of Transportation
No	Tim Heron, Bureau of Development Services
Yes	Tom Kilbane, Urban Renaissance Group
Yes	Keith Liden, Bicycle Advisory Committee
Yes	Phil Nameny, Bureau of Planning & Sustainability
Yes	Jeff Owen, TriMet
Yes	Shayna Rehberg, Bicycle Advisory Committee, alternate.
Yes	Chris Smith, Planning and Sustainability Commission
Alternate	Susan Steward, Building Owners and Managers Association Alternate: Jessica Neufeld
Yes	Jean Pierre Veillet, Siteworks Design Build
No	Felicia Williams, Neighbors West-Northwest District Coalition
No	Rick Williams, Rick Williams Consulting

Agenda review and introductions

The city's bike parking standards have not been updated in over a decade. The code is good, but there is room for improvement.

Goals for today: Get to know each other, and walk away with a solid understanding of the committee's scope. This project will only focus on what is required for new buildings and buildings under redevelopment. We will look both at what is working well what can be improved—both problems and solutions.

Committee charter and process

The committee is responsible for providing direction to PBOT. The deliverable will likely be a summary of the Committee with draft recommendations. Exact code language may or may not come out of this process depending on timing.

Three city bureaus are involved in bike parking. The Bureau of Transportation guides the intent underlying the bike parking goals. The Bureau of Planning and Sustainability provides direction for citywide goals and code writing. The Bureau of Development Services implements the code when development proposals come in, and monitors development for compliance

Bike parking within the right of way may be overseen and monitored by PBOT. The zoning code, which is overseen by BPS, affects what people do on their private property. To take effect, committee recommendations would need to be made into code language and approved by the Planning and Sustainability Commission and then approved by City Council.

There will be 5-7 committee meetings over the next year. The preference is to carry everyone through to when we propose language to Council, but this is not a certainty.

Our scope of work is what is on-site (not the public right of way) for new or redeveloped buildings. This can include both short term racks outside and long term spaces in cages or locked rooms. It does not include racks on the sidewalk or bike corrals. We are only working within Title 33. Once buildings are built, the city does not have authority to require adding more bike parking to a development. Compliance issues are also outside our scope of work. We don't have control over that with code language.

This work is part of the citywide parking strategy, which gets funneled into the Comprehensive Plan. This committee's recommendations may go to Council as a separate piece or it may be packaged.

- Comment: Are developers allowed to put bike parking in the right of way?
Response: Yes, through a bicycle parking funding established in 2003.

- Comment: Will PBOT staff be presenting on what has worked and what has not? Maybe do some field trips?
Response: Yes, this would be a great idea. If there is interest from the group, we'll do that.

Regarding membership, we have tried to have broad representation—design, demand management, bike advocacy, property management, development review, etc. We are missing a small business at this point.

Are we missing anybody?

- Comment: Commercial real estate interests on this committee are primarily downtown. May want to have real estate interests from outside downtown. TriMet and Lloyd District are not quite downtown. But both are still very urban and have high mode splits.
- Comment: Maybe include a voice for when bikes get stolen? Bad racks or complex racks. Police Bureau, maybe.
Response: Clint Culpepper is on the Bike Theft Task Force, which has not been active.

Public comment: These meetings are open to the public. A project website will be up soon. Once we have recommendations from committee, we will put them through the standard BPS public process (discussion draft, etc.).

Decision making: We will not always come to consensus. What then? There are at least three options: require (1) full consensus (2) simple majority (3) two-thirds / general consensus. Another thing to think about: ideally, this will be a living document. So that should take some pressure off of having total consensus. This code will be updated again.

Quorum: Committee agreed that nine members be the minimum number of committee members that must be present to hold votes. This will be combined with the two-thirds rule for consensus, so that nine people must be present to hold votes, and at least six people must approve a motion for it to pass. Ideally, we will check before holding a meeting to make sure we will have a quorum. Anybody who dissents can write an opposing opinion.

Introduction to Portland's bicycle parking requirements

We want bike parking to provide sufficient capacity, to be easy to find and use, to make bikes hard to steal, and to keep bikes dry.

Since the last major update in 1996, bike use has quadrupled. There are very different bike use patterns throughout city, but the code is one-size-fits-all.

- Comment: 25 percent bicycle mode split is the goal by 2030 or 2035. We need to be thinking about future demand, not just today's demand. What we build will be here for at least 50 years.

Triggers for bike parking are for new construction and renovation projects where the value is over or about \$153,000. We have used incremental regulations. 1996 is when major changes went in. Updates in 2004, 2010, 2013.

Portland's bike parking code is in Title 33.266.200. Requires a minimum number of spaces based on "use." Requirements for short and long term, location, rack design, spatial issues, security.

Would it be helpful for this group to walk through code provisions? Yes, committee members agree that it would be useful.

Purpose statements are important because they set the intent; any building permit application requests for amendments must meet this intent.

Similar to motor vehicle parking code. There is a wide range of required car parking—from none to suburban style. Bike parking is simpler. There are many cases where car parking is not required but bike parking is.

- Comment: Portland has a green transportation hierarchy; single occupancy vehicles are the lowest priority.

There is only so much you can do on-site and on the first floor; there are many competing interests for space. Commercial leasing, garbage areas, lobbies, bike parking, car parking, etc. The bike parking fund provides some opportunity to give some flexibility.

- Comment: Why is there all or nothing bike use of bike parking fund? Why not allow mixing?

Response: The all or nothing clause was included to facilitate the administrative tracking of a property's requirements as well as encourage developments to design for bicycle parking rather than bicycle parking spaces crammed into afterthought locations.

Issue scoping: What is working and what is NOT working?

- Comment: 1.5 ratio is working well in the Central Business District. 1.1 is often too low, so developers have been choosing to do more in the Central Eastside. The 1.1 requirement is not high enough. Market demand is higher than 1.1 for close-in multifamily units.
- Where might 1.1 result in empty bike parking?
Response: West of 82nd.

- Comment: Bike parking is not being used unless it is very secure; people with \$6,000 bikes are taking them to their rooms.
- Comment: Chain link cages are failing. Too easy to cut through, remove a nut, jump over a fence. Cages are not secure enough, even when within a secure parking garage.
- Comment: Installation is often not done by people who do not know how a bike rack is supposed to work (e.g. racks are sometimes installed too close together). Why are some racks so close to buildings?
Response: May still meet code even if a staple will only allow one bike to fit.
- Comment: People are taking bikes into offices. Bike parking is often not secure or convenient enough. There are security issues and circulation issues in office buildings.
- Comment: Improvements are often made on a piecemeal basis. If bike parking is coordinated by building, this might help meet the minimum requirements. But it is not done that way. So you have individual tenants on the ground floor coming in trying to fit in spaces for bikes.
- Comment: Bike parking is not working well for cargo bikes.

Solution brainstorming

- Link bike parking requirements to geography, e.g. higher in centers and corridors and lower in residential areas.
- Allow long term office requirements in tenant spaces. Some offices are using their office space for bike parking. Current bike parking requirements for offices are miniscule.
- There is a tension in the long term portion of mixed use developments. Why can't you allocate bike parking if you exceeded it in another portion of the building? There are buildings providing more than what is required for long term bike parking; if offices are above retail, the retail may have a hard time meeting requirements for long term bike parking. It is hard to find convenient secure space. Sometimes bike parking is put in places that are very unlikely to be used, just to meet requirements.
- Bike parking doesn't have to be free; consider charging fee for most convenient spaces. TriMet and city both already charge for some bike parking.
- There are additional uses not currently noted in city code; could explore adding more.

Next steps

Before our next meeting, everyone will come prepared to discuss key issues from their perspective.

Emails to group members should be funneled through Sarah. Sarah should send Chris Smith's report out from Wonk Night (BikePortland event) with summary notes, and with staff recommendations, as encouragement for to members to identify issues. May identify issues online through email. This will inform the next agenda.

Next meeting will be in 4-6 weeks. Sarah will send out an email to identify times that will work for the next five months or so. In addition a time/date/venue for a field visit for interested members to see good and bad bicycle parking installations will be mailed out.

Thank you.