

Parking Management Manual SAC

Monday, June 19, 2017

4 p.m. – 6 p.m.

Portland Building

1120 SW 5th Ave, Suite 800

Portland, OR 97204

Meeting Notes

Members in Attendance

Reza Farhoodi (Pearl District N.A.), Heather Hoell (Venture Portland), Deborah Howe (OCOM), Tony Jordan (Portlanders for Parking Reform), Juliana Lukasik/Peter Stark (CEIC), Rick Michaelson (NW Parking SAC), Owen Ronchelli (Go Lloyd), Pia Welch (Freight committee), Felicia Williams (DNA)

Project Team in Attendance

PBOT: Chris Armes, Malisa McCreedy, Nicole Powell; Kimley-Horn: William Reynolds, Dennis Burns; Rick Williams: Rick Williams; Spencer: Joseph Spencer

Additional Attendees

Scott Cohen (PBOT), Michael Jacobs (PBOT), Bill Sinnott (PBA)

Workshop Outline

- Introductions
 - All attendees introduced themselves (see attendance above).
- Committee Charge Recap
 - Guide the development of comprehensive citywide parking management manual, share lessons from individual areas of expertise
 - Develop a data driven and performance based approach to parking management
- Project Schedule
 - 1) Meter Districts/APPPs, 2) Pricing & Time Limits, 3) Loading Zones, 4) Enforcement
 - 5/15: Manual Intro, 6/19-7/17: Meter Districts/Revenue Allocation, 7/17-9/18: Price/Time Limits, 9/18-10/16: Exceptions/Event Districts, 10/16: Loading Zones/Enforcement, 11/13 or 11/27 Draft Manual
 - Meeting scheduled for August is cancelled due to eclipse, schedule shifts back one month, determining if November meeting will be 11/13 or 11/27.
- Logistics
 - There are two topic focus areas for the meeting: establishing new meter districts and update to revenue allocation.
 - Use name card to request floor, need to hear from everyone.

Focus Area #1: Establishing New Meter Districts

1. Meter District Policy Background

- Recap: clarify how process begins, discuss size of meter districts, avoid language that implies prioritization, and tie to mode split goals.
- Existing 1996 Meter District Policy has broad objectives, support economic vitality by: encouraging parking turnover, improving circulation, encouraging use of off-street parking, maintaining air quality, promoting use of alternative modes.
- Provide 1-2 open spaces per block so customer can find convenient parking.
- Priorities: short-term parking, carpools, and long-term parking (greater than 4hrs).
 - Dennis – Surprised not to see urban design as part of the plan, newer plans tend to include an urban design component now.

2. Discussion: Meter District Objectives

- Objectives: support economic vitality, minimize impacts on adjacent areas, encourage use of transit/carpools/bicycle/pedestrian modes, cover maintenance and operating costs, allocate meter system revenue fairly
 - Heather – Do recommendations apply to existing districts with existing rules?
 - No, this is guidance for new districts - guidelines for size, revenue allocation, etc. are for new districts.
 - Heather – Should objective be prioritized for commercial use because these are commercial districts? Why are adjacent impacts considered? Concerned about the use of livability and relation of livability to no parking. Need to strengthen the language around livability.
 - Dennis – Residential permits used to be in place to protect residential parking, there is new thinking around managing public right of way for best interest, how to get the most out of resources in a balanced way.
 - Pia – Different needs and requirements in different areas. These are overarching, but not very specific. Ex: A shopper and a delivery service have different needs. We don't do a good job of encouraging people to park downtown, where you have to pay to park. Need stronger language about resource allocation – why does the money get spent more broadly? Spend money on projects that help these areas.
 - William – We will dive into revenue allocation in the second hour.
 - Pia – Would like to see different language for new meter districts, there are enough projects that the money can be spent on in the districts
 - Rick M – The problem isn't the 51%, it's the 49%. The 51% is spent in the neighborhoods.

- Chris – The existing policy states 51% of net meter revenue (in districts established after 1996) goes back into the district will be maintained, not looking at reducing that.
- Rick M – Districts need to be large enough to encompass commercial and residential areas, have meters on commercial streets and then an APPP pops up.
- William – We won't modify the APPP process, it is established policy.
- Chris – The Centers and Corridors committee had a recommendation based on zoning, meters in commercially zoned areas and permits in residentially zoned areas; look to maintain this recommendation like what is happening with the pilot in NW, believe it will work well in NW and we can learn from that pilot.
- Heather – Was that the one in December that didn't pass? It isn't an established way to form APPPs around the city?
- Malisa – Yes, but we were directed to start a pilot project in NW. Currently APPPs can be formed because of commuter parking, not for residential parking - part of the concept was to change that and to cap permits, charge a surcharge, but this failed at City Council in December. Have meter district with companion permit program for parking management. Each district will have its own personality, keep it vague, yet specific.
- Heather – Separation of use is hard in dense urban areas.
- William – Key issues related to objectives are clarifying relationships between commercial and residential areas, trying not to focus so much on prioritizing one over the other, but how they can work together as a system.
- Tony – Can there be stronger language around encouraging and promoting transit, carpool, bike, and pedestrian that is tied to City climate action goals and in conjunction with City policy?
- William – Great point, this is 20 years old, and we can tie it into current policies.

3. Draft Guidance for Establishing New Meter Districts

- 5 key requirements: 1) established commercial parking management district, 2) existing parking management (time limits), 3) minimum meter district size, 4) minimum parking demands, 5) outreach to surrounding areas
- Rick M – Clarification around existing parking management. Unregulated, to time limits, to meters. Do we have any areas that went from unregulated to meters?
 - Chris – People call and ask for meters, but if we haven't done any parking management there we start at the lowest management tool and increase. If there has been no management, we need to start with data.

4. Discussion: Establishing New Meter Districts Process

- Felicia – Are requirements 1 and 2 by request only? Who makes the decision to put parking meters in?
 - Yes, by request. Comes from the business district. We are just trying to focus on commercial areas.
- Juliana – Concern of new districts vs. established, CEIC was forced to have plans and meters.
 - Chris – That is why we are working on the parking management manual. To establish a process for new meter areas.
 - Malisa – Trying to get some consistency moving forward because there will be a lot of demand for future districts.
- William – Clarifies that map with green boxes on previous slide from Venture Portland shows existing business districts. This is related to requirement number one, everything is initiated through a commercial parking management district, essentially formalize that arrangement, likely driven by a business district. Establishes foundation for advisory committee structure. The second requirement is that there must be some form of parking management. Parking management tool kit establishes hierarchy, when time limit doesn't achieve turnover, meters can be used.
- Group discussion: Who requests? Step one is triggered by step 2. Not a PBOT decision, it is community generated request. It is based on data. An organization calls to request parking management, need data before making changes. Reference page 2 footnote 2.
 - Deborah/Felicia – There needs to be a step before step 1.
 - Malisa – An organization calls and asks for parking management, then data analysis takes place.
 - Heather – You are either a district that has nothing and then go to time stay or you have time stay and you go to the next level of management.
- William – Understand the confusion now, the document was written for time limits to meters, not from perspective of no management.
- Deborah – Can you have time limits without a formal commercial district?
 - Yes
- Dennis – The request for management should trigger a defined assessment process.
- Rick W – First an area says we have a problem, we need help. Community and staff work together to define the area where the problem is occurring, gather data, if time stays exist you can collect data based on those. Then, based on data we evaluate the issue and determine if there is a need to adjust limits? Add enforcement? Etc. Then after adjustments are made another round of data collection occurs and analyze again, see results and determine if more changes are needed.
- Rick M – Where do time limits function better than meters?

- Rick W – Ex: Everett, WA has on street occupancy, time stays shifted employees off street and there was no need for meters because on street occupancy decreased.
- Heather – The map of Portland business districts is produced annually with Planning & sustainability, available on Portland maps.
- William – We know this is somewhat confusing because the document has a narrow focus, an area that has current time limits in place and they are interested in going to meters. There is a much broader issue of commercial districts and implementing time limits.
- Key requirement 3: minimum size of at least 80 on-street stalls and at least 10 contiguous block faces. Based on Seattle, you'll likely have meter area surrounded by other management, ex: time stay or APPP.
- Reza – Does the City stripe spaces? Why?
 - Malisa - No pavement markings due to various car sizes, driveways, maintenance, and people tend to park closer together (5-7/block).
- Key requirement 4: minimum parking demands (at least 2 weekdays in 2 separate weeks) – demonstrate occupancy of at least 3hrs with 85%+ occupancy and at least 5hrs with 70%+ occupancy. Above 85% occupancy is challenging to find a parking spot, with below 70% time limits might be working effectively. Standard enforcement hours of 10am-7pm, guidance from Vision Zero to help to stop impaired people from driving because they can pick up their vehicle before enforcement hours begin the next day. Demand profiles might fluctuate once pricing is implemented.
- Reza – Have a hard time rationalizing that inebriated people won't drive impaired because of meters.
 - Malisa – Thought is that people will leave vehicles overnight. Enforcement discussion will take place at a later meeting.
- Tony – Vision Zero is to allow prepayment. If technology doesn't allow, they could use Parking Kitty to pay for the next day. Shouldn't this reference Vision Zero language and talk about prepayment?
 - Malisa – Technology doesn't currently allow for prepayment before midnight. Trying to get away from prepayment because if you don't have to pay at all there is more incentive to leave your vehicle. This is for meters. Currently each district has its own time restrictions and enforcement hours.
 - Are time stays publicized?
 - Yes, they are posted on website and hours are listed on meters. Trying to have some consistency, if the group doesn't like it we can change it.
 - Heather – Why 7 not 6?
 - Malisa – Based on date, there are later peaks that need to be enforced.
 - Rick M – NW peak is at 8pm and meters are underused until 11am.

- Juliana – This is really complicated and not the place for this, not accomplishing Vision Zero, ex: Central Eastside employees need to park and can't park because enforcement isn't until 10am. Not equitable, there are different uses in different districts. Strange place to put something like this.
- Felicia – Encourage personal responsibility.
- William – The whole point of having this was to come up with standard hours and use data to refine them.
 - Rick M – Part of the problem might be the word “standard,” maybe default or starting point or another word.
- Key requirement 5: Outreach to surrounding areas to notify them of meters. APPP process is separate, current policy is that occupancy must be 75%+ and 25%+ of vehicles are from outside the zone. Result of notification is that it informs folks in the area that they might want to consider an APPP, still have to meet APPP thresholds. They don't get an opportunity to reject the meters. Residents, businesses, and property owners would be informed.
- Heather – Concerned because residents keep being referenced, inflating amount of power and notice to residents and not businesses. Is it just residents or residents and businesses?
 - William – Notify everyone in the area.
 - Malisa – People in metered areas are already notified of the change.
 - Owen – All residents and businesses within 1000 feet of corridor with proposed meters are notified of the study.
 - Heather – Who pays for the notice and how?
 - Chris – PBOT does.
 - Tony – Intent is to involve members of community about parking management, residents of meters and businesses of permits.
 - Rick M – Would meters only be on commercial street or would they go around the corner? Zoned for commercial 1000 feet from edge of red (commercial corridor), the people that are being left out are employees.
 - Chris – Looking at zoning to determine where meters are placed. Employees would have access to permits if the new APPP rules are adopted by Council.
 - Rick W – Put employee permits in unused residential parking during the day.
- Pia – Are commercial/delivery trucks included in studies?
 - Yes, they are included.
- William – Need to clarify some of the language (standards), consider how we discuss commercial areas and surrounding areas. Clarify what CPM district is, the process of how you can go from unregulated area to time limited area to metered area.

- Heather – If a business district association asks for management do they need to create a separate volunteer group to manage this?
 - Malisa – Yes, separate stakeholder committee would be established and is open to residential and business representatives.

Focus Area #2: Revenue Allocation

1. Meter District Revenue Allocation Policy Background

- Recap: Local guidance is key and parking supply is limited.
- 1996 Meter District Revenue Allocation Policy: the first priority is capital costs and operating costs (before you calculate net meter revenue). Of the remaining 100% net meter revenue 51% goes back into the districts. Existing policy has some specifics, but is pretty broad, so our goal is to provide specific examples. In existing policy: improvements, public education programs, improvements to the pedestrian environment, maintaining and improving the right-of-way, short-term off-street parking facilities, promoting transit service and facilities, implementing programs which reduce the demand for parking. Written to capture a lot of things.
 - Chris – PBOT makes expenditures based on committee recommendations.
- Background on existing meter districts: Go Lloyd is funded with Enhanced Service District funding and 51% of net meter revenue, demonstrated long-term success in net meter revenue expenditures; Marquam Hill is a small district with ad hoc Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC), SAC has elected to save funds to move forward with larger projects; CEIC operates through non-city affiliated CEIC business membership group, the Transportation and Parking Advisory Committee (TPAC) advises PBOT on expenditures, affiliated APPPs (G and N) have \$150 surcharge; and NW is a SAC of varied community members make recommendations to PBOT, SAC members apply through public process and are appointed by Transportation Commissioner, affiliated APPP (Zone M) has \$120 surcharge.

2. Draft Revenue Allocation Guidance for New Meter Districts/APPPs

- Existing net meter revenue policy states majority of funds go (51%) back to district, long term funds, management objective vitality not revenue, customers and visitors are source of funds.
- Permit surcharge has 100% invested back into APPP area, surcharge is optional, local residents and employees/employers are source of funds.
- Heather – How is surcharge eliminated?
 - Driven by stakeholder process and need PBOT approval.
- Juliana – Why move towards SAC? I feel like PBOT is trying to take TMAs and TPMAs out of the toolkit, these have been successful in other cities.
 - Chris – Go Lloyd is the only TMA that the City has, they are independent and not collecting a surcharge. What we are looking at here are use of surcharge funds or net meter revenue. The City is not opposed to the formation of a TMA in the future, but

that can be a longer process and there would need to be a committee that staff would work with to help achieve the goals.

- Malisa – Not opposed to TMA as a separate nonprofit.
- Rick M – City Council wanted NW to do a SAC not TMA.
- Juliana – If you use an SAC only it would follow that PBOT has a high level of control over the funds because the Transportation Commissioner appoints the committee members.
 - Malisa – It is an advisory committee and the funds always remain PBOT's funds. The advisory committee is to help determine where the community would like the funds to be spent to achieve the goals to invest and reduce demand on parking. Funds are not handed over to the district, it is an advisory committee. Nothing is changing about how the funds would be allocated.
 - Peter – Loosing ability to control, SAC are appointed by the City and not the business or neighborhood associations.
 - Scott – The word appoint might be what is hanging people up. In NW the businesses and residents that want to be part of it apply, they are recommended by their association.
 - Juliana – Want to discuss more.
 - Peter – Central Eastside TPAC asks for volunteers, go through neighborhood and business associations, and go at large to find people that are currently not members. No approval from Commissioner.
 - Rick M – There are advantages and disadvantages to both.
 - Malisa – For the new APPPs we have specific recommendations for the SAC make up, requires certain types of representatives (business and residential), have to be appointed to committee, don't say who specifically it has to be, but type of perspectives needed.
 - Felicia – Understand weaknesses of a volunteer system and having bureaus and commissioners hand pick people who will do what they want them to do, there is a balance there and don't believe this gets at that balance.
 - Tony – Given that there is a potential for virtual permitting in APPP, would there be an option for plate based virtual permits that are not meter or APPP? Ex: want to park not at a meter, but at a time stay and want to stay longer than the limit, could there be a permit that can be purchased to park longer than time stay? Revenue that would be somewhat a gray area.
 - Malisa – Revenue would have to be meter or permit. A visitor cannot park longer than the visitor limit in an area. If it is a hybrid district it would function like NW. You are either in a meter district or a permit district, Zone M is a hybrid, but you either park in a metered area or a permit area. You can park for visitor time limit.

- William – It sounds like you are thinking about the future and if there are different ways to manage the permit area.
 - Reza – In the Zone M SAC, did the City ahead of time decide which stakeholders should be on the SAC?
 - Chris – It is in the adopted plan, 4 representatives from NWDA and Nob Hill and 5 at large. People who want to be on the SAC apply.
 - Juliana – That’s not what happened with the Central Eastside, it is self-managed and the City signed off.
 - Reza – Is Legacy Good Sam represented on NW committee?
 - Chris – No, they declined.
 - Heather – A lot of discussion is around enforcement. Is enforcement included in operating costs?
 - It comes out of base permit fee and gross meter revenue.
- Each advisory committee has the following
 - Mission: to advise the City on transportation and parking issues, managing the system.
 - Membership: residents and business owners who apply and are appointed by Commissioner.
 - Function: meet regularly to compile a list of recommended programs and projects, develop work plan to document allocation of funds.
 - PBOT’s Role: attend meetings and support SAC activities, lead outreach and marketing efforts for funded programs and projects.
- Juliana – PBOT’s role ties directly into the other discussion about the TMA issue and want to make sure that is part of what will be discussed further.
 - William – Yes, that topic will be revisited.
- Rick M – Concerned about 1:1 match and ability to raise funds from outside sources.
 - Malisa – Looking for consistency to provide staff to assist all SACs.
 - Felicia – Concerned about PBOT having an unreliable role during budget cuts. A nonprofit TMA like Go Lloyd is pretty lean.
 - Juliana – I believe that PBOT’s goal is to have SACs so PBOT can staff them, in essence each district would be required to purchase staff support and it becomes policy as part of this parking management manual, then PBOT will have a legal footing to do so. I think that is where we are heading. I don’t agree with that policy and we need to discuss that further and want to be assured that existing TMAs will be grandfathered in.

- Chris – Go Lloyd is the only TMA that PBOT currently works with and has 51% net meter revenue. We are not looking to change how they function or their mission. They meet this requirement.
- William – This is about the new meter districts and want to hear your insights.
- Heather – It is important when looking at the membership to look at existing structural organizations, but go outside of them and clarify that you work with existing structures in an area. If you are going out and creating this whole other advisory group without an organizational structure, asking them to have to fundraise outside is not set up for success.
- Rick M – A minimum number of members should be a consideration.
- Pia – We should review existing project lists before creating new ones and make sure everything is ADA compliant.
 - Chris – Anything with City funds would meet City standards.
- Tony – How to determine if TDM is being maxed? There should be a way to determine long-term viability of off street parking structure to make sure it is economic viable.
- Juliana – Have intense parking demands that will increase. How do you figure out if funds go to structured parking? Go back to data, make sure it is data driven to help understand if a structure makes sense.

3. Discussion: Revenue Allocation Process and Prioritization

- William – Open it up to any types of projects, some on the list are required: Program management and outreach; TDM; capital projects. Goal with the list wasn't to limit any projects, more to demonstrate some ways in which these funds have been used in the past. Want to draw attention to why there might be a distinction between net meter revenue and surcharge allocation investments.
- Heather – A number of business districts are interested in signage on neighborhood greenways that direct to services, where would that go in the list?
 - It is wayfinding and could be Capital Projects or TDM
- Reza – Have a problem with subsidizing carshare memberships as part of this, not helping congestion and not promoting use in the community the vehicle is located in if vehicles are used for commuting. Would like to see a price increase during commute times, cheaper to drive in carshare than to use a ride service.
 - William – That is potentially a debate for that advisory committee.
 - Scott – Zipcar has shown that it is able to reduce car ownership, there is potential, but potential for abuse as well depending on the neighborhood.
 - Malisa – The free floating model has been studied, a study coming out of Australia. Colleen just got back from a conference and we can follow-up with her to see if there are other studies to look at to help determine why we would or would not want to

include a carshare subsidy. Based on study done by PBOT staff that most of the free floating carshare models are not parked for longer than 2 hours.

- William – All of this will likely change in future years, want to make this broad enough to capture future changes.
- Juliana – The only reason we can't use surcharge to support staff needs or projects because it might not be there in the future isn't a good enough answer, have money now, want to use it now. Surcharge funds are finite, they are paid for by residents and employees/employers (through permit purchase), while meter funds can be paid by anyone.
 - Dennis – Nature of funds, the surcharge funds could go away, they are short term, not long term, like a meter.
 - Malisa – Part of clarification is also about the City's bonding capacity, if we go out to bond something, using permit surcharge funds is not a way we can do that.
 - Chris – NW and CEIC are very large, areas moving forward most areas won't be as large, so they won't create as much funds.
 - Juliana – Won't know if they will be larger or expand, short sighted to limit how funds could be spent.
- William – We will revisit advisory committee format.

Wrap-up

- Group will revisit the advisory committee formation process.
- If you have any specific comments on any of these projects, you can share comments by email to William.
- Next meeting on 7/17 will wrap up outstanding items from this meeting's topics and then discuss price and time limits.
- Will send out documents ahead of time, look out for those.

Meeting adjourned.