

NW Parking SAC
Wednesday, November 29, 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, Nick Fenster, Rick Michaelson (Chair), Thomas Ranieri, Peter Rose, Don Singer, Brent Soffey, Mark Stromme

PBOT Staff

Chris Armes, Scott Cohen, Antonina Pattiz, Lynda Viray

Public in Attendance

Tim Griffin, Jeanne Harrison, Walt McMonies, Christine Warden, Rebekah Wright

Welcome & Public Comment

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

Christine Warden, a resident in the neighborhood, asks for clarification about “plugging the meter.”

Chris explains that plugging the meter refers to purchasing parking time beyond the meter’s time-limit and not moving the car. Essentially, paying to stay longer than the posted time limit. Plugging the meter is unique to Zone M and doesn’t apply to any other district in the city, it was a decision that was approved by the SAC in the NW District Parking Management Plan. Special code changes were made to Parking Kitty to accommodate meter plugging in the district. Parking Kitty is a different means to pay, it doesn’t change the rules in a parking district.

Christine asks how Parking Kitty impacts Timbers event days since meter plugging could occur from within the stadium and expresses concern with overtime parking during game days.

Don: “It’s a software thing and we’ve discussed this. We asked Chris and the City about this and the City has already established a contract with a given software package from the vendor and it would seem that it would be something easy to code, having done a lot of software development, but according to the vendor it’s not something that would be in the cards for the duration of the 10-year contract.”

Chris confirms and explains that the only way to address the issue would be to eliminate meter plugging in NW.

Rick adds that the SAC is looking at other options but hasn’t found a solution that would work with the contract or the vendor yet.

TDM Update

Scott announces his promotion and informs the committee that he will transition into project management at PBOT. He will still staff the SAC as a Transportation Demand Specialist for a 6-month transition period.

Scott shares that the Active Transportation team brainstormed ways to give TDM incentives to residents and businesses. The team tested a product in the Central Eastside Industrial District (CEID) called the “Transportation Wallet” which includes a \$50 Hop Card, an annual Streetcar pass and annual BIKETOWN membership for \$99. The effort was well received, and of the 1,000 applicants notified, approximately 100 applied.

Scott informs the SAC that he plans to amplify the Transportation Wallet and offer the same incentives in NW in 2018. NW residents and businesses will be able to purchase a \$100 Hop Card, an annual streetcar pass and annual BIKETOWN membership for \$99. The idea is to test the effort on the 35 organizations that were the largest permit holders last year to see if it resonates in NW.

Scott outlines the 3 TDM approaches planned for NW in 2018

- Offering the Transportation Wallet to large businesses
- Promoting BIKETOWN Summer pass (passes are available from last year)
- Continuing opt outs for residents and amplifying employer opt out incentives

Brent asks if the Transportation Wallet will only be offered to large employers.

Scott answers that the “Wallet” will be available to any resident or employee of Zone M. For \$99 the applicant would receive \$700 worth of transportation incentives - \$100 Hop Card, annual BIKETOWN membership (\$144) and an annual Streetcar pass (\$440).

Tom asks how Scott purchases Hop Cards without an intergovernmental agreement (IGA).

Scott answers that he pays retail value for the Hop Cards, plus a \$3 service fee.

Rick mentions that he likes the variety of options provided by the Transportation Wallet.

Tom asks how much of the program gets subsidized by PBOT.

Scott explains the breakdown:

- Hop Cards are sold at retail value but TriMet would cut the \$3 fee (if an institutional account is created)
- Biketown has agreed to reduce the annual membership fee from \$144 to \$99
- The SAC has committed \$60,000 towards Streetcar -\$50,000 towards a down payment for new cars and \$10,000 to reduce the cost of Streetcar passes to \$50 (for up to 200 passes)
- Of the funding that the SAC allocated for TDM incentives, there’s \$100,000 that hasn’t been spent. That \$100,000 will cover the \$50 Streetcar pass and \$100 Hop Card; the applicant’s \$99 will cover the BIKETOWN membership.

Rick believes that \$100,000 hasn’t been committed to TDM incentives yet.

Scott comments that a \$100,000 commitment was approved two meetings ago.

Mark asks how much Streetcar will be receiving.

Chris answers that Streetcar is receiving a total of \$60,000 from the SAC: \$30,000 from net meter revenue (NMR) and \$30,000 from the permit surcharge. \$50,000 is being reserved for future cars and \$10,000 is reserved for discounted passes.

Scott confirms that Streetcar receives \$10,000 plus \$50 for each pass sold.

Rick requests a memo from Scott for the next meeting so that the committee could take a vote on the effort.

Scott explains that, because the funding was already approved, he wasn't aware that another vote was required but he will prepare a memo for the next meeting.

Don: "I think Rick brings up a great idea because it would be interesting and instructive to us to understand it on a per pass and per purchase basis so that we know how much subsidy essentially has been given per pass."

Scott agrees and adds that the subsidy will depend on how many passes are sold.

Peter asks how Scott plans to get the word out about the \$700 value of the Transportation Wallet because it is a substantial sum.

Scott answers that the main means of marketing is electronic communication (email). He will bring marketing materials to the next meeting.

Rick recommends that the information should be included in the mailers. He adds that the committee will want to monitor the success of the incentives in an effort to adequately fund the program.

Nick asks if there is a way to monitor BIKETOWN usage.

Scott answers that surveying is the best monitoring tool and one will be conducted to gather information about usage/habits.

Rick asks if TriMet is monitoring individual Hop Card use.

Dan comments that, if a Hop Card is registered, the owner of the pass can look up their use history.

Rick asks if that data would be accessible to the SAC/PBOT.

Scott does not believe that TriMet's customer history is public data; but believes it's a worthwhile question.

Rick comments that it be good to know how many people used the passes. It might be easier to pull the data for TriMet than it is for BIKETOWN.

Don: "You may be able to because it's electronic and there's an account we provide BIKETOWN. So, is there a way to relay the cards that we issued relative to how many times that card has been used on BIKETOWN because BIKETOWN gets such an overwhelming use during the tourist season by tourists that we want to know, are these things being used? Is our money well spent? I think a survey is going to be less beneficial than maybe what Dan's talking about."

Dan points out that Hop Cards map to unique numbers and the SAC could request data specifically for those cards.

Scott believes that TriMet sees that as “personal data” and would be reluctant to provide that information. The City Attorney said that there were issues with tracking BIKETOWN data but Scott will look into Hop Card data.

Don: “We’re just talking about use; has it been used, period. Not where people are going.”

Dan points out that TriMet fare is reduced for honored citizens.

Scott answers that honored citizen fare is being captured.

Dan references Seattle’s ORCA card and suggests that Seattle may have investigated the rules around private/public data of transportation use.

Scott asks if Dan has a point of contact PBOT could reach out to.

Dan says he does not.

Scott says he will research the options and update the SAC.

Brent asks how PBOT prevents fraud? He received the BIKETOWN Summer Pass incentive and it seems like it would have been easy to give it to someone else.

Scott explains that applicants for the BIKETOWN Summer Pass must use a NW address to apply. When buying the Wallet, the applicant must pay \$99 and provide a NW address to get the items mailed to them.

Brent asks how PBOT/SAC markets to the community and asks if there’s a SAC Facebook page.

Chris answers that there is no NW SAC Facebook page, but PBOT does use Facebook ads/social tools.

Rick adds that the SAC relies on PBOT’s NW SAC webpage to reach out to residents and businesses. The information on the website it kept up to date.

Shared Parking Applications

Rick explains why Legacy Good Sam’s Shared Parking application was turned down for their current garage. The zoning code was changed for EX (Mixed Use) and RH (High Density Residential) zones, but Legacy’s building is in the CO (Office Commercial) zone, so the code changes didn’t apply. When the Compensation plan goes into effect in the Spring, Legacy will be in an institutional zone and paid parking is allowed in those zones, so it should not be a problem at that time.

Rick also explains that the shared parking request for 18th and Irving is on hold. There are some doubts about whether or not that parking lot was operated legally. City code mandates that lots be in compliance with zoning laws but BDS will not verify if something is legal without an \$850 zoning confirmation letter. That fee is not fair to the applicant, but it isn’t the responsibility of the committee either.

Chris points out that there is another option. The owner of the parking lot could locate his permit on the BDS website, if he is inclined to do so.

Rick says that there is no permit. He recommends voting on the application at the next meeting and either denying the request because of unmet requirements or approving the request.

Lynda shares a Shared Parking application for Flanders Professional Building. The application was received November 9, 2017 and met all requirements and the Supply Subcommittee has unanimously approved the request. Lynda requests a vote from the committee.

Dan makes a motion to approve.

Don seconds the motion.

The application receives unanimous approval, Mark abstained.

NW Transportation and Projects Discussion

Rick hands out a spreadsheet that outlines the committee's finances.

The committee has approved/committed the following funds:

- \$10,000 towards stop signs (none have been approved by the City yet)
- \$100,000 allocated towards the parking and circulation study
Chris comments that she will meet Zef Wagner with Transportation Planning about a scope.
- \$20,000 for curb extension planning on Glisan and 21st/23rd
- \$44,000 for BIKETOWN 2017 Summer Membership (successfully completed)
Scott explains that PBOT sold 500 summer passes and has 500 leftover that can be used next year. Essentially, the committee "pre-paid" for the passes.
- \$50,000 towards the Shared Parking Program (spent \$7,425)
- \$60,000 for Streetcar - \$50,000 for new cars, \$10,000 for reduced Streetcar passes
- \$275,000 for Streetcar rolling stock and passes (spent \$30,000) (5-year commitment, matched with \$5,000 per year from surcharge)

Remaining funding:

- The committee has approved a total of \$499,000 towards projects and has spent \$81,425.
- Revenue for 2015/16: \$294,278, spent \$45,600
- Revenue for 2016/17: \$719,887, spent \$35,825
- Remaining funds: \$932,740

Rick explains that there have been requests for how to spend the funds.

- \$65,000 for an annual survey
The agreement between PBOT and the SAC stated that PBOT would pay for the first two years of the annual survey and, after that, the expense would be the responsibility of the SAC.
- Additional \$65,000 (if the survey is to be conducted 2x/year)
- \$275,000 as a match for curb extensions
- \$100,000 for a dedicated staff member
- \$9,000 towards equipment for the shared parking lot at 22nd and Kearney

Chris explains that the staff member would need to be a City staff person, so Chris would need to know the individual's role to prepare draft a job description and prepare the recruitment process. If the committee wants to hire a staff member by next fiscal year, they will need to start the recruitment process now.

Rick requests two levels of involvement from the committee. One, active involvement with the job description and two, having at least one member serve on the interview committee.

Tom asks why this role couldn't be filled by a contractor.

Chris explains that it could be a contractor if they have a contract with the City (the contractor would have to go through the City's procurement process instead of HR).

Tom asks which is easier.

Rick answers that if the SAC is looking at this being a long-term arrangement, it's better for it to be a City employee, rather than a contractor.

Tom suggests starting with a contractor and then transition them to become a city employee.

Rick explains that hiring a contractor is a harder process because you have to create a job description, draft a proposal, and bid. If the allocation was under \$10,000, the process would be easier.

Brent asks why the hiring process takes so long.

Chris explains that the process itself is straightforward- develop a job description, post an announcement, advertise, review applicant, create a short list, interview and hire. However, the process take time.

Rick adds that the committee would be creating a new position and that position needs to be included in the budget before there can be a hire.

Brent asks if the allocated \$100,000 needs to be committed to the budget first. He asks about the challenges of hiring if the funds are available.

Rick answers that it's not about the money, every city position has to be identified.

Chris explains that the City runs on a fiscal year, right now the City is drafting the operating budget. Creating a position/hiring can occur throughout the year, but this is the time when PBOT could create a position if there is a job description.

Mark asks if there's any way to short circuit the hiring process and hire a contractor.

Chris explains that there is not.

Rick asks the members to draft their preferred qualities/experience for the role and email a copy to him and Chris. They will review the suggestions, create a job description and send it out for review.

Brent asks if PBOT or the SAC hires contractors to conduct surveys.

Chris explains that the City goes through an RFP process. Because RFPs can be lengthy, PBOT signs multi-year contracts.

Brent asks if the committee could allocate \$100,000 to hire a consultant to conduct this job for the first year.

Chris explains that it is possible, but, if the committee is looking for a long-term commitment, the individuals would need to go through the City's hiring process and there's no guarantee that they would get the job. If they hire a contractor, once the contract is complete, we would need to go through the same RFP process again.

Brent asks for clarification: if PBOT gets a position in the budget before June, the soonest this person could get hired is July/August because it would have to be in that fiscal year?

Chris confirms.

Marks recommends that everyone brainstorm and briefly discuss ideas about job responsibilities for the staff member.

- Mark suggests help on parking inventory recommendations, assisting with capital project ideas/research, and data collection assistance.
- Peter comments that, because he is new to the committee, he is not sure if a dedicated staff person is necessary. He defers to the other members for their input.
- Tom asks if the City has anyone in mind, they should have a background in transportation. Chris says that PBOT has talked about it, but she has not come up with a name for an existing city employee.
- Nick also defers to the committee for input. I want to understand the problem we're attempting to solve before recommending qualities.
- Mark suggests that the committee should look to relieve the burden placed on Rick.
- Don: "I have to agree with Mark on that. As somebody who is your assistant, because you can get burned out, trying to figure out and keep your pulse on everything that's going on in the intervening periods of the month that we meet. It could be somebody who goes to all the different subcommittee meetings, making sure that they're following through on the things that they're supposed to be following through on. Keeping track of the money allocations, keeping track of projects that are ongoing, how they may relate to goals that we have or to each subcommittee. So that we don't have people duplicating efforts and things of that nature. It's things that you are doing that you're overburdened with. One person can't do this all. As we expand our allocation and money on different projects, somebody has to have a more holistic view and nearly managerial overview of the whole thing. You have to keep track of what Scott's doing. Just TDM in and of itself is a complete subject. And I don't necessarily think its somebody who has to be sophisticated in terms of transportation issues. They have to be somewhat familiar but it's something they can learn. It has to be someone who is adept at organizational skills and communication I think would be their strong point. We always can learn stuff, but you can't learn how to communicate or organize, you either have it or you don't."

- Dan recommends a focus on social media and establishing one-on-one connections with owners of potential shared parking resources. Focusing on getting more engagement from stakeholders in the NW.
- Brent agrees with Nick and Peter, and defers to the committee.
- Rick explains that there are a lot of moving pieces that are hard to keep track of. There is fund/project follow-through with PBOT staff but no follow through with coordination. It would be more effective to have a dedicated NW contact who could be more effective and have more time to devote to the outreach effort. We need a classification for more than just a secretary, we need someone who is able to call up the school district and set up a meeting to talk about the shared parking lot opportunities, for example. Rick mentions that he doesn't have the time for outreach and it isn't PBOT's role either, at this point. He says that a dedicated staff person could discuss options, share the program, etc. If someone was employed full time, the committee would make a lot more progress with the projects.

Rick asks Chris to explain the complications of providing equipment to a private property owner, like Legacy.

Chris explains that there are questions about how the SAC saw this working because these are public funds that get transferred to a private entity and an agreement needs to be in place. Chris met with City Attorney last week and the SAC can purchase equipment for a private lot but an agreement must be established and signed by Legacy (or any other property owner that the SAC wants to buy equipment for). The agreement would outline the proper use of the equipment - the amount of time it needs to be in place, that it needs to be available to the public for a certain number of days or hours per week, etc. PBOT/SAC must be able to say, in good faith, that this public money is being used for the public, rather than a private entity. The agreement can be made, PBOT is working on the specifics.

Nick asks if the SAC is required, if they make the funds available to Legacy, to honor similar requests from other shared parking applicants. He asks if requests can we dealt with it on a case-by-case basis or if there's going to be a rule that applies uniformly.

Rick explains that the committee is in the experimental pilot stage, he believes it would be okay to test this without setting any hard rules at this time. He points out that one of the complications is that Legacy has an exclusive parking vendor and the City has an exclusive parking vendor, and they're not the same company.

Chris explains that PBOT doesn't want to manage, operate or enforce private parking lots. The owner of the lot would buy the equipment and PBOT would reimburse them, or give them the money so that there isn't an ongoing operation piece.

Mark comments that, as someone who has envisioned asking the same request, he believes that if the City provided money for a parking kiosk at the Flanders Building, it would remain the City's kiosk. Mark's lot would have the opportunity to use it for a period of time and could pay a monthly lease fee or the cost of maintaining it. Once the kiosk is no longer needed, it goes back to the City and can be reused by some other parking facility.

Tom asks when Chris expects to hear from the City Attorney about the agreement.

Chris answers that she expects to hear from him next week with a draft outline.

Rick states that here are two sources of revenue - net meter revenue and the permit surcharge. TDM funds can only be spent on TDM efforts (bus passes, etc.) and the permit surcharge can be spent on almost any transportation related expense. There is a big picture goal of providing pedestrian improvements and making the neighborhood an easier place to live, even without a car. The other goal is to provide additional parking in the neighborhood. The NWDA has created a comprehensive list of traffic improvement projects; the SAC needs to develop a process to take the NWDA list and meld it with other committee members' ideas to come up with a reasonable selection process. The committee's parking improvement effort is a multi-year project. Rick suggests that, rather than divvying up the funding each year, the committee could establish a general percentage allocation towards determined categories (research/administration, pedestrian improvements, parking supply, etc). He asks Scott to share the pedestrian improvement project the City is currently working on.

Scott shares a bicycle and pedestrian livability project (on 20th between Raleigh and Jefferson) being funded by Fixing Our Streets. The project will focus on traffic calming, pedestrian improvements, bike lane improvements, signage, etc. The project brings resources from gas tax funding, Transportation System Development Charges (SDC) and can bring in more funding from outside sources to improve the project.

Scott asks the committee to fill the \$275,00 gap between funding obtained from Fixing Our Streets and the Transportation System Development charges. The overall project will include pedestrian improvements- like shorter crossing walks, better marked crosswalks, guideway signs, speed bumps, etc. Scott displays a map that shows how the project fits into NW. There's a Limited Improvement District (LID) where property owners pay to improve the street they are on. The property owners on Naito and Front Avenue (between 9th and just shy of 21st) have agreed to join the program to improve pedestrian bicycle elements and improve the streets in that area.

Scott adds that there's an LID at Raleigh and 20th that will essentially create a new street on 20th underneath the 405 overpass. Those are not Scott's projects. Those are projects that the City and property owners are funding. The City is also funding a new bicycle and pedestrian bridge over NW Flanders that will include bike/pedestrian improvements down to the river, over Interstate 405 and then up to 24th to connect to other infrastructure (estimated construction date is 2021). Coming sooner, there will be pedestrian improvements on the 18th Ave and 19th Ave crossings at Burnside.

Scott's project covers the area from Flanders to Raleigh. It includes adding speed bumps, pavement markings, bikeshare, new speed limit signs (bringing the limit down to 20 MPH). The project would boost the pedestrian environment by building curb extensions at Northrup, Lovejoy, Glisan and Everett and will provide benefit for people who are bicycling. This is a prioritized Safe Routes project. There was a lot of feedback from the community and pedestrian improvements at Everett and Lovejoy were some of the highest priority for MLS and Chapman students. Scott asks the committee to provide the missing funding to build better pedestrian infrastructure.

Nick asks if the research specifically identified 20th as a street that needs improvement and asks if it is based on current usage. He doesn't perceive that as being a heavily used route, he asks if the effort is a means to shift traffic to that street.

Scott answers that the Safe Routes project identified 20th as a main connection for how residents access the schools. The residents identified 20th/Everett and 20th/Lovejoy where they found the most confluence.

Rick asks if Everett and Lovejoy were identified more than 20th/Glisan.

Scott says yes but clarifies that 20th/Glisan was also identified as problematic.

Don: “I want to go back to Karen’s email. I think Karen had a lot of good points there. I’m all for spending some money and making the crossing at 20th and Glisan and 20th and Everett better than it is, but to go the entire length of 20th for pedestrian improvements, I don’t see it. I see that we should be spending that money towards existing pedestrian areas that are still bad. 21st/Glisan and that whole intersection right there is a nightmare; 23rd/Glisan is a nightmare, Raleigh/23rd is a nightmare. There are other things to move people up to Chapman that go East to West that probably could use those funds. I think 20th and where it hits major intersections is fine, but to go the entire length is too much.”

Peter shares that as a resident in the neighborhood, he avoids 20th due to the stop signs. He uses 18th/19th because it’s one way traffic. He personally doesn’t see the need for additional speed bumps and bike lanes. 18th/19th are good thoroughfares for bikeways.

Brent shares that he lives on 20th/Everett and is in favor of improving that intersection. He agrees with the other members and understands the need for improvements on for Everett, Glisan and Lovejoy but doesn’t understand the need for improvements at the smaller intersections.

Scott points out that the only other intersection in the project is Northrup, which he sees as a major intersection because of the Streetcar and 2-way traffic.

Rick mentions that he was told that if Northrup is proposed in the project, the committee will vote the effort down.

Rick points out that this is a typical big project. He asks how much time does the committee want to take sorting through the details. He doesn’t believe it to be the committee’s role to place city projects on hold. He doesn’t know where to draw the line.

Don: “I think there’s a difference, I don’t want the committee or the funds that we have to be the Christmas ornaments that everyone reaches for because it’s a great idea that we build this whole thing out, so let’s go for this pot of money. We all have good ideas and projects that we want, but there’s a certain limit. If people really want it, maybe they can do their own LID and fund it.”

Rick clarifies that the committee isn’t going to make a decision at this meeting, he asks them to brainstorm ideas. He recommends improving lighting for pedestrian crosswalks on 21/23rd avenues.

Tom asks how neighborhood greenways are decided upon. He notices that the greenway on 19th is infrequently used.

Scott explains that the greenway on 19th is fairly new. The neighborhood greenways vary from neighborhood to neighborhood and some are more utilized than others. He explains that he doesn’t expect to see thousands of cyclists by building a greenway on 20th, this would be an effort to get people more comfortable. It would become a family/friendly route where cars wouldn’t want to drive.

Rick points out that there were no objections with improving 20th/Everett, 20th/Glisan or 20th/Lovejoy. It’s whether this project is fixing problematic intersections or building a whole new pedestrian route through the city.

Don: “And the desire to take existing pedestrian routes and really improving them with lighting or pedestrian access because there are some still that are real nightmares.”

Scott explains that members from the community (people walking their kids to school) identified 20th as their route and pointed out the problems. NWDA also identified this route as one they would like to see improvements made to.

Rick asks if PBOT would be more open to putting in 4-way stop signs on 20th than they have been in the past.

Scott explains that 4-way stops are an engineering matter.

Ricks says that is a problem, it should not be an engineering problem, but a pedestrian issue.

Rick asks for feedback, he points out that the SAC could fund this project and still have \$300,000 left for other projects. It doesn't forestall other projects but the committee is hesitant to spend money on this if it isn't useful and doesn't directly impact the committee's charge.

Nick agrees and recommends prioritizing projects before discussing individual projects. We don't have any frame of reference for opportunity costs.

Rick asks Don and Tom to get a list of projects/priorities from the NWDA.

Rick asks Scott if there is a deadline for this project.

Scott explains that phase one will be moving forward in the next fiscal year.

Chris points out that projects, such as 21st/Glisan and 23rd/Glisan curb extensions would be more financially efficient for the committee if they fold them into other approved projects. That way, several intersections can be surveyed, designed, constructed, etc. all at once; as opposed to doing one intersection at a time.

Rick concludes by saying that this will be discussed further at the next meeting.

17/18 Permit Update

Antonina updates the members on the current Zone M statistics:

- Business permits issued: 3,311
- Resident permits issued: 3,414
- Total permits issued: 6,725
- 10 buildings at 60% capacity
- 9 buildings nearing capacity
- 10 applicants on a wait list
- 13 residents received the \$50 return incentive
- 99 residents and 24 employers have opted out

Antonina informs the committee that property managers of restricted buildings were contacted last week. PBOT staff asked if any residents have moved out since 10/01/2017; most of the property managers supplied vacancy reports and several permits were cancelled. Additionally, postcards were mailed 11/22/2017 and are expected to arrive next week.

Rick explains that postcards were sent to all residents with active permits. If a postcard is returned as undeliverable (due to address change, etc.) the permit associated with that address will be cancelled.

Antonina adds that applicants placed on the waitlist receive a complimentary month-long temporary permit to look for other parking options.

Dan appreciates PBOT's active management of the permit program and removing move-outs from the system.

Nick asks if the businesses opt-outs are still just the two employers mentioned last time.

Scott confirms and mentions that the business opt outs were conjured up quickly to accommodate the business that inquired. Thus, business incentives have not been advertised. Several businesses have requested incentives but haven't followed through with PBOT.

2017 Data Collection Update

Lynda informs the committee that data collection was completed mid-November. Lynda and Chris will be meeting with Rick Williams Consulting on December 7th to discuss the data and the contract. An update will be provided at the next meeting.

Rick asks if an interim report will be provided at the January meeting.

Chris confirms and explains that data is being collected differently than it was in the past. Data collection used to occur on paper but is now being collected on tablets in real time, in the hopes that it will be easier to get the results more quickly.

Don: "Are there two different firms doing this? Is somebody doing the data collections and Williams (Consulting) is analyzing it?"

Rick answers that Rick Williams Consulting is doing both pieces.

Don: "Since when?"

Chris explains that typically, there is only one contractor collecting and analyzing data. The reason PBOT has had two separate consultants in the past was because of the deadline- getting data collected before the sigs were installed.

Don: "Is there any other firm, other than Williams doing this type of work in town? That we can send an RFP (request for proposal) out to?"

Chris answers that PBOT posted an RFP and two firms applied, but they didn't meet the minimum qualifications.

Rick adds that the consultant collects data for the entire city, not just the NW.

Chris explains that Rick Williams Consulting had a two-year contract with PBOT and is currently collecting data for NW, CEID and the downtown area (truck loading zones, etc.)

New Business

Rick confirms that the next SAC meeting will occur on Wednesday, December 20, 2017.

Meeting adjourned.