

NW Parking SAC
Wednesday, October 18, 2017
4:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Friendly House
1737 NW 26th Ave.
Portland, OR 97210

Meeting Notes

Members in Attendance

Daniel Anderson, Tavo Cruz, Nick Fenster, Karen Karlsson, Rick Michaelson (Chair), Thomas Ranieri, Peter Rose, Don Singer, Brent Soffey, Mark Stromme, Ron Walters

PBOT Staff

Chris Armes, Scott Cohen, Gudrun Utz, Lynda Viray, Antonina Zaytseva

Public in Attendance

Elizabeth Aaby, Allan Classen (NW Examiner), Jim Kennett, Walt McMonies, Jeff Reingold, Alexandra Zimmermann

Welcome & Public Comment

Rick Michaelson calls the meeting to order at 4:00 pm and invites public comment.

Jim Kennett, from NW Portland International Hostel, explains that hostels are grouped in the same category as bed-and-breakfast proprietors in the Zone M NW District Supplemental Plan District. He points out that hostels are commercially zoned similarly to hotels and asks the committee to reconsider the scratch-off limit for hostels. He anticipates running out of scratch-offs around Spring.

Rick tells Jim that the Exception Subcommittee will connect with him to discuss viable options.

Ron expresses interest in hearing the Exception Subcommittee's decision-making process. He would like to see how they ensure a principal-driven set of rules that are fair and continue to limit the number of permits, while trying to accommodate businesses at the same time. He believes that scratch-offs aren't the long-term solution.

Mark asks Jim if he has looked for shared parking opportunities. He recalls mentioning Trinity Church as a possible option.

Jim answers that he was unable to connect with Trinity Church but he did connect with Childroots and was turned down. Additionally, he reached out to Congregation Beth Israel and they had availability but too many restrictions on times/days.

Rick says he will connect Jim with the subcommittee and closes public comment.

Overview for New Members

Rick starts the meeting by sharing a brief history of the committee. City Council adopted the NW District Plan in July 2013 and the first SAC meeting occurred October 2014. Rick Williams Consulting collected data in the Fall of 2016 to establish a base of data for the committee to work with. Based on those results, the committee received a recommendation to reduce the number of parking permits from 10,000 to

around 6,000 to obtain a parking occupancy rate of 85%. Additionally, meters were installed in the district on Feb 15, 2016 and data will be collected in the Fall to compare last year's data to the current year.

Based on the results received from the data collection, the committee will consider format changes for:

- Hours of operation for the meters
- 30-minute spaces
- Permit-only spaces - the last survey revealed an imbalance in the occupancy rate of permit-only spaces on commercial streets (74% occupied) and residential streets (95% occupied).

There are 3 task forces (subcommittees) that make recommendations to the committee:

- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) discusses incentives for businesses and residents.
- Supply finds ways to better utilize the parking supply currently available.
- Exceptions reviews exceptions requests and shares recommendations with SAC members.

Rick closes by reminding the members that all decisions on the committee are reached by consensus.

17/18 Permit Report

Lynda shares current Zone M statistics:

- Business permits issued: 3,224
- Resident permits issued: 3,200
- Total permits issued: 6,424
- 7 buildings at 60% capacity
- 4 buildings wait-listing applicants
- 6 applicants on a wait list

Building	Address	Percentage	Waitlist and Number
Bell Court Apartments	120 NW Trinity Place	94%	
The Regent	1975 NW Everett	62%	Yes - 2 people
Chester Berry Apartments	2015 NW Kearney	69%	Yes – 1 person
The Marcella	2151 NW Johnson St.	63%	
Linfield College Hall	2215 NW Northrup St.	62%	Yes – 1 person
St. Francis Apartments	526 NW 21 st St	60%	Yes – 2 people
The Worthington Apartments	708 NW 19 th	93%	

Tom asks if the number of permits processed to date is comparable to the number of permits processed this time last year.

Chris explains that it's hard to compare numbers from last year to this year. Everyone with a permit during the 2016-17 year had an opportunity to renew for the 2017-18 year if they did so by September 22nd. PBOT staff mailed postcards to residents in restricted buildings to inform them of the deadline. Of the approximately 900 postcards mailed, almost 400 were returned because the resident moved out. We plan to do this throughout the year to keep the permit record current for residents who moved out.

Don: "We're two months into the new year and we have another 10 months to go. Each month we will be issuing more permits as new people come in. Do we have any idea as to how many buildings are close to the cap that could be triggered over the 10-month period?"

Antonina explains that PBOT staff maintains a live document to track the permits issued to all restricted buildings. Whenever a restricted building reaches 60% capacity it gets flagged and all additional applicants are placed on a wait list.

Don: “We know that 7 are over that, how many are close to that?”

Antonina answers that 9 buildings are nearing 50% capacity.

Don: “So the total is 16 buildings within the first two months that are meeting, exceeding or close to the cap?”

Antonina explains that one of the buildings is at 53% capacity, but there are still 4 permits available to that building. So even though some buildings are near the cap, it doesn’t imply that they are going to be placing applicants on waitlists soon.

Don: “That’s good to know.”

Chris explains that many people move out without notice so PBOT plans to mail postcards every 2-3 months to restricted buildings to track/cancel inactive permits. If a postcard is returned as undeliverable, the permit associated with that address will be cancelled and the first applicant on the waitlist would be notified. She adds that PBOT works to maintain an accurate assessment of valid permits.

Ron points out that permit issuance was averaging 300 per month last year and asks if the same trend is expected for this year.

Chris explains that approximately 50 permits were processed in October.

Rick adds that everyone who wanted to renew a permit has probably already done so. Monthly growth of approximately 50 permits is more reflective of a stable turnover. As demand rises, many of the applicants will probably be replacing permits from people who moved out.

Chris says that PBOT will mail postcards in November as well, to catch residents that have moved out since the last mailing.

Ron believes that the natural loss of demand for parking permits is less than the current increase. He points out the importance of tracking permits to accurately monitor demand and inquires about pain points. He asks if the City has received any complaints about guest permits.

Chris answers that PBOT staff haven’t received complaints about the elimination of guest permits.

Ron asks how many applicants have applied for the low-income exception and asks if there has been any change in behavior based on price. He adds that there doesn’t appear to be any abuse of the program and is happy to see people using the low-income exception.

Chris answers that 1,109 residents self-certified as low income (approximately 33% of applicants).

Karen add that 33% seems to be on par with income statistics from the neighborhood.

Peter states that having 7 buildings at capacity and 9 nearing capacity is alarming. He argues that, in the past, permits weren’t being canceled and many of them were unused but were calculated to determine the 60% cap.

Scott restated that is why we are sending postcards out so that we can keep better track of residents who have moved and permits can be cancelled.

Don: “We need to keep close track of that. And, as Ron said, you’re going to identify some of the pain points. But, it looks like if you start issuing 100-200 permits a month. We’re going to have a lot of these buildings being oversubscribed at that point. We’re only two months into it so it’s hard to get a full picture. But I agree with Peter, that number is substantial.”

Mark asks Chris to interpret the impact price has had on demand.

Chris explains that the committee adopted several changes that had the potential to impact demand. It’s hard to separate one variable from the others.

Karen asks about the 7 buildings at capacity. The analysis from last year’s study showed 13 buildings at 60% capacity.

Chris explains that some buildings are near 100% capacity and don’t have a waitlist.

Dan recommends creating a system and/or incentive for returning permits. Central City Parking charges a deposit for parking credentials and if a customer doesn’t return their credentials they don’t get their deposit back.

Chris explains that a \$50 Fred Meyer gift card is offered as an incentive to resident permit holders who return their permits before June 1st. She adds that the City is not able to hold deposits; it would be challenging given the current software limitation. It might be a possibility in the future, but it isn’t be possible currently.

Peter asks how the Fred Meyer gift card was decided upon. If a permit holder moves to a state without a Fred Meyer they wouldn’t be able to use the gift card incentive.

Chris clarifies that PBOT staff will work with the applicant to find a solution.

Peter asks if an applicant would even apply for the incentive if they knew they wouldn’t be able to use it.

Scott explains that a permit holder has the option of applying for the incentive or, PBOT staff will cancel their permit once they are informed of the applicant’s move (via returned postcard)- making them ineligible for the incentive.

Karen asks how the incentive is advertised.

Chris explains that a notice is written on the back of the permit and the incentive is advertised on the website.

Rick recognizes that limits are being reached faster than he anticipated. He informs members that restricted buildings will be tracked closely and limits will be considered/adjusted accordingly.

17/18 Budget Report

Chris shares a spreadsheet and explains the committees’ funds.

Net Meter Revenue

- For Fiscal Year (FY) 15-16, the Net Meter Revenue (NMR) was \$294,278. Of that, \$1,600 was spent on a shared parking outreach consultant and \$44,000 was spent on BIKETOWN membership, leaving a remaining balance of \$248,678.
- For FY 16-17, The NMR was \$719,887 with a carryover balance of \$294,278 (from FY 15-16). Of that, \$35,100 was spent on Streetcar passes and a remaining balance of \$5,100 was paid to the shared parking outreach consultant, leaving a total balance of \$933,465.
- In sum, there is \$933,465 of NMR to be allocated for projects.

Permit Surcharge Revenue

- \$649,800 from the permit surcharge has been collected to date. Of that, \$23,668 has been used for resident opt-out incentives, \$30,000 has been used on Streetcar passes, \$5,856 has been used on business incentives, and \$9,900 has been committed to permit return incentives. Leaving a remaining balance of \$580,376 (to be spent on Transportation Demand Management).

Don: “Is there a separate account set up for the SAC where these funds are kept, or is it co-mingled in PBOTs funds?”

Chris explains that the funds are tracked by district.

Don: “You track it by district but there is no set account that says, ‘this is where your money is,’ it could get co-mingled into some other account.”

Chris explains that is not the case - payments are tracked by transaction data (meters in the district) and point-of-sale records for parking permit sales.

Don: “But that still could be spent in any one year. If we don’t spend all our money, it’s essentially a credit against the City funds.”

Chris says no and explains that the district’s funds carry over from one year to the next.

Rick expresses the importance of discussing the allocation of the funds and making recommendations for projects. The SAC should be developing a list of prioritized projects to bring to the City for review.

Ron mentions that the NWDA Transportation committee has a list of priorities that could be sent over to the SAC.

Karen points out that the list was received and acknowledged. The Circulation Study was the highest priority on that list and the request was funded. She adds that she would like to bring the neighborhood into the decision-making process but is unsure what the outreach would look like.

Rick comments that the outreach effort for 2017 – 2018 permit changes didn’t reach many people.

Chris explains that PBOT is currently undertaking some projects as part of the Central City in Motion effort. The project managers working on these efforts will want to be involved in the decision-making processes and would be interested in finding ways to work with the SAC to increase bicycle/pedestrian/transit use.

Karen recalls reviewing a list that categorized projects and the funding required for them.

Chris says that she will email with an updated spreadsheet of the funding available to the committee.

Rick remembers the committee reviewing and discussing the list, but not formally adopting any of the recommendations.

Ron likes Karen's idea of asking for public input and working with businesses to determine the right TDM incentives to offer.

Karen suggests brainstorming ideas and sharing them with the neighborhood for feedback. The committee could share ideas by buying ads in the Examiner, emailing residents, etc.

Rick shares his priorities: pedestrian improvements that benefit residents and businesses, spending funds on parking supply (encouraging shared parking) and more outreach to the community to better help the neighborhood.

Mark asks if private-for-hire (PFH) services (such as Uber and Lyft) are included in the TDM concept in any way. As people weigh the expenses of owning a vehicle, they might be willing to consider those services more.

Scott explains that there is no consensus on the impact PFH services have on reducing transportation demand. Using Uber/Lyft doesn't free up parking spaces in the neighborhood or reduce traffic congestion, so those services are not included in the TDM concept now.

Karen suggests helping people realize the cost of maintaining a car so they could compare the costs for themselves.

Ron shares that the Timbers Oversight Committee and the Comprehensive Transportation Management Plan are looking for ways to use Lyft and Uber to get people to/from games. One thought is to find specific drop-off and pick-up locations that are close enough to be helpful but far enough away that they're not contributing to congestion.

Tom asks if anyone on the committee thinks Uber/Lyft are inexpensive. He believes that a person would need to get rid of their car altogether to save money.

A member from the public shares that the average cost of owning a car is roughly \$9,000/year and Uber offers a \$4.99 monthly pass wherein all rides within a certain range are \$4.99.

Rick suggests looking at potentially offering incentives in addition to the transit pass at a future time. Such as offering 2 hours of Uber services per year, for emergency purposes.

Residential & Employer Opt-Out Update

Scott shares the opt out statistics:

- 93 residents have opted out of renewing their Zone M permit
- 11 requested the TriMet annual pass
- 2 businesses requested incentives – PBOT wasn't offering opt-out incentives for businesses but worked with the two businesses and offered the same incentives that were offered to residents (\$100 transit card and annual BIKETOWN membership).

Walt asks if the opt out option is permanent or just for the year.

Scott answers that the opt-out incentive is good for the permit year (September 1 – August 31). He adds that there was no advertising for businesses and yet they requested opt-out incentives.

Rick expresses concern with businesses getting incentives for something they would have done regardless.

Nick comments that his organization did just that. They didn't get permits last year and wouldn't have purchased them this year, but because the incentive was an option, they took advantage of it for the employees.

Scott explains that the TDM program won't solve all the congestion problems in the neighborhood. TDM can help change 5-10% of behavior but, unless the committee is offering free annual transit passes, the neighborhood won't see sweeping huge behavior changes.

Ron shares his approval of citizens getting incentives and utilizing the program.

Scott informs the members that PBOT is starting the outreach process to buildings and employers with more than 30 permits. The committee agreed to set aside \$50,000 in funding for incentives for large buildings/employers to kickstart a healthy TDM program. Scott tried to partner with TriMet but was unable to secure a contract and the conversation has been moved to a higher level at TriMet and PBOT.

Ron mentions that the Timbers rely on TriMet to get fans in/out of the stadium. He suggests talking with Scott to see if there might be a way for the SAC to mimic the model the Timbers have set up with TriMet.

Tom asks if Scott pays retail value for the incentives provided to residents and businesses.

Scott confirms. PBOT needs to have an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with TriMet to pay them and TriMet is unwilling to sign an IGA at this time. The challenge is that the NW SAC's TDM efforts don't match the requirements/fit the mold of TriMet's programs.

Don: "The Universal Pass Program that you mentioned sounds great. That's available to a business to go directly to TriMet, so why couldn't you have those businesses we're targeting go directly to TriMet and then we reimburse them?"

Scott explains that TriMet suggested that as well, but having PBOT write a check to a business would pose challenges. The business isn't providing a service that PBOT needs to fund. It's one thing to have a council plan/clean IGA with TriMet, where PBOT provides specific funds from the parking surcharge for incentives, and it's another thing for PBOT to write checks to businesses.

Don: "But if the net amount is the same and it's the result that you want to get, essentially, by taking that position, we're just as bad as TriMet so you have a catch 22 where nothing gets done."

Rick suggests writing a check to TriMet and sending it to the business.

Mark suggests writing a check to both TriMet and the business and requiring a dual endorsement.

Chris explains that writing a check to TriMet is not possible without an IGA.

Don "This is a catch 22, this is PBOT's fault as much as it is TriMet's."

Scott disagrees and explains that there is a system in place where it would be easy for PBOT to pay TriMet. IGAs occur frequently and TriMet has no problems accepting PBOT funds for engineering or

capital projects. The fare division is different than the engineering/capital projects division. PBOT is trying to meet TriMet halfway but the SAC's TDM program doesn't fit the mold of TriMet's programs.

Elizabeth asks if PBOT could "credit" organizations by discounting their permit cost based on the amount they paid to TriMet to join the Universal Pass Program.

Chris explains that PBOT needs to have a process that is clear and can be audited and easy to track. She says that Elizabeth's suggestion could be considered if TriMet doesn't agree to work with PBOT.

Tavo asks if there's a way to categorize the reimbursement as a "TDM Incentive" and have the business provide documentation afterwards. He asks if the problem is how this idea is being categorized.

Chris explains that all City business requires a contract. There needs to be a service provided for which the City is paying. The City's procurement process must be followed and any service over \$5,000 must be auditable and would require a contract.

Tavo says it appears to be a question of degree, not mechanism.

Don: "You can be creative and get something done."

Shared Parking Applications

Rick informs the committee that 2 shared parking applications are in process.

1. Legacy Health's share parking renewal request (for 222 NW Lovejoy St.) was approved by the SAC but denied by the Bureau of Developmental Services (BDS).
2. City Center's shared parking application is placed on hold for their review.

Rick informs the committee that Legacy cannot use the garage they used the previous year for the Shared Parking Program. He requested that a representative from BDS attend the next meeting to clarify the criteria on these two applications.

Don: "Somebody has been hired at BDS to look at conditional use permits and they have found that the agreement that was struck years ago, that we could share parking garages, well, the parking garage at Good Sam violates the conditional use section of the code. We don't understand exactly what that means and that is why we need them to come and explain it to us. Problem there is that that wraps them up in the NW District Plan where we allowed a lot like Mark's to be conditional use for parking and shared parking and that may be in jeopardy as well. We need to get our arms around it to understand what the City's and BDS's objective are to that whole thing. We don't know currently what the objectives are."

Rick points out that enforcement is complaint-driven and asks if anyone would complain about being able to park.

Ron is surprised and doesn't understand how the BDS limitations would achieve the goal of reducing demand for on-street parking on game days. He wants to hear the logic if one person is going to undermine the ability to share parking lots, he would like to hear the logic.

Mark explains that when a conditional use permit becomes granted by the City, it becomes a recorded document and has language that refers to how that conditional use can operate. The analogy that comes to mind is Strohecker's (out-of-business grocery store) where there was a conditional use that it must be used as a grocery store. A prospective buyer would have to work with the City to remove the agreement and use the property differently. Mark wonders if there is a mechanism in place to lift conditional use.

Rick suggests talking with BDS personnel at the next meeting to better understand the rules they look at.

Don: “Whether or not it’s based in the NW District Plan, it may be in the language there that allowed the conditional use of these various lots that may be a problem. We just don’t know.”

Karen agrees and adds that the process is difficult to understand. There must be some language that implies parking must be of a “specific use” and cannot be used in any other way. Since shared parking wasn’t explicitly stated in anyone’s conditional use, it might be prohibited, even if other code permits shared parking use. She adds that it might be a matter of dueling codes.

Tavo says that there were code changes that were supposed to prevent this from happening.

Chris explains that PBOT was also surprised to hear the information from BDS.

Ron says that he hopes this is a bureaucratic or legal mix-up as opposed to a “philosophical argument.”

Tom asks why the committee is being asked to consider the new shared parking applications in light of this news.

Rick answers that Legacy’s shared parking application was pre-approved.

Chris explains that PBOT sends all shared parking requests through BDS now because they denied Legacy’s renewal request.

Tom asks if BDS explained the reasoning behind their decision to approve/deny requests.

Rick says that BDS personnel will be requested to attend the next meeting to answer those types of questions.

Rick informs the committee that there is one proposal today that needs to be voted on. The Supply Committee met with Legacy and talked about the surface parking lot across from Serrato (942 NW 22nd Ave). They can share the lot during evenings and weekends and are open to a variety of ways of operating it, but might ask to share operating costs with the SAC as a stipulation. Rick asked Legacy to estimate costs/ figure out logistics. He asks the committee to vote on Legacy’s shared parking application– not the possible stipulations.

Don: “They’re very open in terms of working with us to where ingress and egress will be we were talking about Kearny ingress and egress on 22nd and Lovejoy. How all of that is going to happen with the striping and the gates. The nice thing about that lot is that it’s an open lot where people are more likely to use it. They feel safer than going into some type of structure. The other thing is that it’s primarily an employee lot. They don’t have nursing staff; the shifts change and hours are a more flexible by having more overlap than they would in parking garages that catered to medical staff itself. It seemed like a really good deal.”

Nick asks for clarification- would this be a temporary solution while PBOT/BDS resolve issues around the primary Legacy lot or would this remain a shared indefinitely?

Rick explains that this would be in addition to the other lot. This would become the primary shared parking lot and the other lot would be used for overflow.

Tavo makes a motion to approve the request.

Mark seconds.

The motion passes.

2017 Data Collection Area

Lynda reminds the committee that data collection will occur in the Fall. The survey area proposed will be the same area that was surveyed last year.

Don: “Is it possible to do this every 6 months? It seems like there’s a huge lag between information once a year.”

Karen asks how much that would cost.

Chris answers that PBOT receives cost estimates based on the areas being surveyed. She isn’t aware of what it would cost to survey an area every six months but will look into it.

Karen suggests that data gathering should be a category on the priority list.

Rick comments that the problem isn’t how often the data is being collected, but how long it takes to get survey results.

Chris explains that the data collection app streamlines the data collection process. Initially, the surveys were conducted on paper and the data was inputted manually. Now, data is being collected on tablets and occurs in real time. It should result in a faster turnaround time.

Karen asks how long it takes to collect data.

Chris explains that it depends on the time of year and how many people are available to help. Data collection tends to be conducted in the summertime by interns, and right now most college students are in school. Ideally, PBOT looks to have 20 people surveying in a day.

Brent asks for clarification – what data is being collected?

Chris explains that the data collectors monitor parking spots in a specified area over the course of several hours to document the duration of stay, permit status, if they paid to park, etc.

Pay-By-Plate Expansion

Lynda informs the committee that Pay-by-Plate implementation is being delayed, she will continue to update the committee on the status.

Rick requests an explanation of Pay-by-Plate for the new members.

Chris explains that the new parking meters allow visitors to pay by license plate, like the Parking Kitty App. Parking Enforcement can pull license plates on handheld devices and confirm payment. The previous meters operated by printing paper receipts - “Pay and Display,” but PBOT is moving away from paper for efficiency purposes (more than half of the service call for meters are due to paper jams, etc.).

Ron reminds the committee that Parking Kitty could cause problems by allowing meter plugging from inside the stadium during Timbers’ games. He asks if this has been resolved.

Rick answers that the issue has not been resolved and recommends having the Timber's push the City on meter plugging.

Chris clarifies that the decision to plug meters came from the SAC. If the committee chooses to restrict meter plugging during games, the challenge would be communicating, with the public, when the meters can be plugged, when they can't, when there are exceptions, etc.

Lynda informs the members that the next SAC meeting will occur Wednesday, November 29, 2017 instead of the usual third Wednesday of the month.

Meeting adjourned.