

**NW Parking SAC**  
Tuesday, April 3, 2018  
4:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Friendly House  
1737 NW 26<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
Portland, OR 97210

## **Meeting Notes**

### **Members in Attendance**

Nick Fenster, Jeanne Harrison, Karen Karlsson, Rick Michaelson (Chair), Thomas Ranieri, Peter Rose, Don Singer, Mark Stromme

### **PBOT Staff**

Chris Armes, Antonina Pattiz

### **Consultants in Attendance**

Rick Williams

### **Public in Attendance**

Michael Lilly

### **Welcome & Public Comment**

Rick Michaelson calls the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

### **Residential Permit Options**

Rick reminds the members that at the last meeting Rick Williams Consulting (RWC) recommended reducing permits by 325 or increasing the number of parking spaces by 325 for the 2019 permit year.

Rick Williams makes a correction to his statement at the last meeting. His previous calculation didn't account for float. The reduction of 325 permits equates to 164 stalls during the peak hour. The SAC would need to add 164 stalls to the system to achieve the same result as removing 325 permits from the system.

Rick says that reformatting 30-minute and 1-hour stalls should open more than 164 stalls.

Chris points out that all the 30-minute and 1-hour stalls would free up 109 spaces.

Rick asks Peter to outline his proposal.

Peter makes a correction to the form he passed out. If residents are limited to one permit per unit, the total permit reduction would be 573 permits. He asks for the committee's input on limiting residents to one permit per address and allowing exceptions for residents who prove they need a car for work. <sup>1</sup>

Rick asks if both apartments and single-family residences would be subject to the limit.

Peter confirms.

---

<sup>1</sup> Attachment A: 60% Cap Vs. Equal Permit Distribution Proposal

Jeanne asks about situations where unrelated adults live in a one house.

Peter explains that they could apply for exceptions, provided they need a vehicle for work.

Don: “Up to a maximum of three permits per address. So that, at least, with multifamily, that takes care of a situation where you have studios, one bedroom, 2-bedroom, 3-bedroom type units. You can accommodate that without penalizing, at the same time meet the goals.”

Karen suggests a situation where she lives in this neighborhood and owns a sedan and a pickup truck. She asks if she would be required to get rid of one car. Would the exception only be valid if there's a different resident at the same address?

Peter confirms. The idea is that another individual at that residence would need to apply for the exception. This is the Jay Leno argument. If Jay Leno had a lot of cars, he could take up all of the parking spaces on 23<sup>rd</sup>. There needs to be a balance. If an individual needs a car for work, the SAC would accommodate that.

Karen asks about students who need cars for school or volunteering. Similar to employment, they can prove they need a car.

Don: “That would be valid.”

Mark says he doesn't like the idea of limiting units to one permit. He thinks it's too invasive and restrictive. He's a small landlord and owns one building that has 2/3-bedroom apartments. To immediately put residents in a situation where they need to ask for exceptions to the rule doesn't seem appropriate.

Don: “It seems to me, being a landlord, it seems to be more equitable because what you're saying is everybody gets one, but you have situations where you have a few bedroom units and you could have three nurses that go to Linfield, University of Portland and one at OHSU and they all need cars, so this could accommodate that. Not that there are that many 3-unit bedrooms in the neighborhood, but they still need to be accommodated in situations like that. And I think this does it easily and I think that's what it is intended to do. I think this makes our roles in that regard. It gives us some certainty that, you know, if you have something that you can certify, substantiate and justify. You know, that's fair.”

Chris suggests that changes can occur through attrition. Every resident with a permit this year would be eligible to renew next year. The new changes would apply to residents who move in after September 1, 2018.

Peter says that he's done research and noticed that some of the residents in his building have more than one permit. One resident has three permits, some couples have a permit each. He provides an example - him and his fiancé live Zone M, she has an on-street permit and he pays to park off street. It would be cheaper for him to park on the street, but he chooses to pay more money to park in a private lot. The proposed policy would encourage more of that behavior.

Don: “When you consider the alternative, where you're stuck with a ratio against units but no flexibility, at least this has the flexibility.”

Rick points out that, no matter what the limit, this policy is still placing a cap on buildings based on the number of units.

Tom asks how many parking spaces would be gained if residents were to use driveways.

Chris explains that that information is not yet known. Driveways are inconsistent in NW and some are not wide enough to park in and some have multiple entrances for one driveway. PBOT staff looked at GIS to see how many single-family homes were connected to a driveway and based on that research, there were 1,253 homes. PBOT staff then conducted additional research using Google Street View, and found that maybe 20% would be eligible for a driveway permit. In order for a resident to be eligible for a curb-cut permit, their vehicle would need to fit within the width of the curb cut. Additionally, the curb cut can't access multiple driveways.

Peter mentions that the he noticed some driveways are close together and asks if it would be possible to stripe them.

Chris explains that there's not enough room between some driveways to stripe them because the striping would encroach on other driveways. PBOT has begun drafting a list of criteria for obtaining a driveway permit.

Don: "A couple of comments. I like the simplicity of Peter's proposal a lot. It's not arbitrary like the fixed ratio is and it doesn't penalize one group against another. The fact that you're in a larger apartment building, you're more restricted than somebody in a small building just doesn't seem right. The other thing that I'd like to encourage us to do in conjunction with adopting that is to follow up on something Rick mentioned last meeting which was doing the Toronto option. Where we begin to get a database of off street parking supply that single family housing and apartment vehicles have and beginning to balance the amount of permits issued to those that have plenty of off street parking supply. Do they qualify for a permit at that point? I have lots of friends that have rental houses around here and other people that have homes and a lot of the of them with curb cuts- the older ones have long driveways and something in the back. It just seems that if you want a realistic application of permits, you first have to understand that as well. So, I encourage us, irrespective in a sense, of what we adopt to also spend some money in that process. Because I think that's where you're going to get a realistic view of capacity of number of spaces available on the street and fair allocations."

Rick asks if Don is advocating to deduct permits based on off-street parking availability.

Don: "Yes."

Chris asks for clarification. If a building has ten units and five off-street parking spaces, would the building only be eligible for five permits?

Don: "Something like that. Or six or seven. Something that recognizes the fact that they have that availability. In some senses that will be some hardship on some multi-family because not all the spaces that are available are being rented by people in that project. But I think that type of behavior will take care of itself over time. What you mentioned is really great."

Rick Williams mentions that Bend, OR is looking at a similar system, where they deduct permits to residents with curb cuts.

Rick asks if anyone objects to deducting permits for residents with off street parking available to them.

Peter answers that a lot of his property's garages are leased to people who don't use the stalls for parking, but for storage.

Don: "You don't necessarily need a permit associated but you're getting deducted for that. I see what you're saying. But we're also thinking that we want to do it on a one-to-one basis too. I think that these are little catches that you find are nibble that maybe so small that changing it for that group will make an impact. But you don't know until we have a GIS system built with the inventory. I think that we might as well start it now and get our arms around it sooner rather later because I think this information will be needed for future decision making."

Karen says that she has wanted to figure out, for a long time, how much off-street parking is available and if people are actually using it, especially in the newer buildings. People seem to use parking for storage, and there are storage options at different places, we need cars off the street.

Peter argues that rules about how a stall must be used limits users. He says that if he offers a stall for a certain amount and no one in the building wants it, it gets listed on Craigslist as storage space.

Rick says that parking permits don't appear necessary in that case, since no one in the building wants parking. He suggests the possibility of another option- having the ability to purchase additional permits that are sold at market rate.

Chris points out that a tiered pricing structure was discussed last year. It's a possible option, if the SAC would like to pursue it.

Karen says that tiered pricing makes a lot of sense.

Marks asks Karen how she would feel about owning the second vehicle (in her hypothetical scenario) if she had to pay a higher price for the second permit.

Karen answers that she would feel better. There are long-term property owners in NW who have a second car for various reasons. She says the hard limit would discriminate against them, but tiered pricing accommodates their decision to own two cars.

Mark says that he believes tiered pricing does accommodate their situations and makes them look at the financial incentive of getting rid of a car, if they so choose.

Peter asks what the price would have to be to motivate a resident to completely get rid of their car.

Karen argues that in some cases, it's not the cost of off-street parking, it's a matter of availability. She doesn't have off-street parking offered to her, she has not been able to find an available spot.

Peter comments that, in order for tiered pricing to be effective, it needs to be significant. He saw an advertisement of \$170 per month for a parking spot, that's \$2,100 per year. He can't imagine charging \$2,100 for a permit.

Karen answers that, if you tell a resident they can't have a permit for a second car, they have three choices – sell the car, find off-street parking or pay a "bonus price" to get a second permit.

Rick says that some people argue that parking permits should match the market, for example, pricing parking permits at \$100 per month.

Jeanne asks if that would be for the first permit.

Rick says that is the argument.

Jeanne wonders if the SAC did that for the second permit instead and kept rationing up for each additional permit.

Peter asks if the permit should be slightly less.

Rick agrees and says that there's an advantage to off street parking

Jeanne points out that there could be unintended consequence of losing on-street parking as people decide to park in their curb cuts (for example, creating new curb cuts that would take away on-street parking). She mentions that it's happening on her block.

Don: "It's happening everywhere."

Chris asks for clarification- under the scenario Don mentioned, permits wouldn't be issued to residents with off-street parking options.

Karen finds it interesting that off-street spots aren't utilized in NW. She wonders how the SAC could get people to use those spaces.

Jeanne points out that some condos offer parking but not all of those residents have cars, so they don't use the parking space.

Don: "But that's HOA dependent, obviously."

Rick asks if there are other ideas for discussion.

Mark addresses the cost of permits. He believes that the permit price is correct for the next year.

Jeanne agrees and believes changing the price again so quickly wouldn't be appropriate. She asks Rick Williams what happens to people's attitudes when the price increases.

Rick Williams says that a price increase was an option because such great progress was made from the year before. Long term parking should be off-street and short-term parking should be on-street. He argues that the SAC would want to push as many people off street as is possible, feasible and appropriate.

Karen comments that getting people off-street is a challenge in NW because there are so many people that don't have access to parking. The other elephant in the room is increasing supply. It's something the SAC might ultimately have to start factoring in.

Rick adds that the goal might not be to get everyone parking off-street but to have the option available of parking off-street to even out the demand.

Don: "Yes, but like Karen said, you have to supply the capacity off street to do that. I think that's a great comment. We should convene the supply subcommittee again."

Karen mentions that she found at least 10 parking spaces that are designated as no parking for no particular reason.

Chris asks Karen to send her the location of those stalls, it will be sent to the traffic engineers.

Tom asks who reviews curb cut applications.

Chris explains that applicants apply for curb cut permits at Development Review at the 1900 building.

Tom asks if Parking Operations has any say in the curb cut process.

Chris answers no.

Tom asks if Parking Operations should have any say in curb cut applications.

Jeanne mentions that the last curb cut that was installed on her block, she wrote to the city to express her concerns about a resident with a double-park garage.

Tom asks what the sense is of talking about a reducing resource and not having any input into how many parking spaces are lost in the process.

Chris explains that it's a combination of Title 16 and Title 33. The City doesn't require parking with new development, but then there is a design piece that comes back to the placement/width and all those requirements. That is something that happens at development review.

Rick asks if it would be possible to change the code to prohibit driveways.

Jeanne mentions the possibility of changing code to limit driveways to one per address in NW.

Mark suggest that residents who get a curb cut are no longer entitled to a permit.

Karen asks how the SAC would deal with an apartment building that needs to build a garage opening with an in and out.

Chris explains that that would just be one in and one out, two cuts.

Rick suggests requiring developers to build more parking off street than they take away on street.

Rick brings up tiered pricing.

Jay asks if the SAC is looking at tiering permits by address. Would a 3,000-square foot house get one permit at one price and the second one at a higher price? He asks if the same would apply to a 300' studio apartment.

Karen expresses concern and says it seems unequitable to limit permits per address.

Don: "It's not going to be perfect, but at least it's lining up potentially with the number of bedrooms to the number of addresses. And again, if you have a three-bedroom house you could potentially get three, if you have a two bedroom, you could get two up to two. At least it matches where you're going to generate potential use of a car."

Mark asks for clarification. If he has a five-bedroom house, he can only purchase a maximum of three permits and that would still have to be according to the exception?

Peter confirms.

Mark says he's warming up to the idea. He adds that tiered pricing should be significant. Anywhere between \$270 and \$360.

Peter agrees and adds that the price could be double the first permit but lower than the market rate.

Nick asks if there is an absolute maximum number of permits that can be purchased.

Peter answers that the proposal recommends a hard cap of three permits per dwelling unit (apartment and house).

Chris asks for feedback, should the first permit be \$180 and any additional would be the increased price? Or is the preference to charge \$180 for the first permit, more for the second and more still for the third?

Karen says tiered pricing per unit seems unfair. If she lives in a studio apartment she gets charged \$180; however, if she lives in an apartment with two other roommates, she would have to pay a different price for the same permit.

Jeanne says that three roommates could split the cost equally amongst themselves.

Tom asks if permits for residents with exceptions would be sold at a different cost.

Peter answers that the proposal doesn't discuss cost.

Rick comments that tiered pricing may be a substitute for the exception or it could be used in combination.

Mark says he sees the limit of one permit per unit as being a soft cap because most people drive to work and that's the reason they have a car. He believes the SAC is targeting people who have two or three cars and can't demonstrate the need for additional vehicles and those are the people that get hit by the increase in the tiered pricing. If there are three roommates in a three-bedroom dwelling unit, they are all entitled to a parking spot at the same cost.

Rick asks if Mark is implying limiting individual residents to one permit?

Mark says that is correct.

Peter asks Chris to explain low-income self-certification.

Chris explains that residents have the option of self-certifying as low income. The low income criteria is linked to the Housing Bureau's eligibility requirements for Section 8 Housing program.

Peter asks if residents have to provide proof.

Chris answers no, residents self-certify.

Tom asks what percentage of residents self-certified as low income.

Chris answers that 44% of residents self-certified as low income.

Mark answers that the SAC didn't want to certify income. If it became a problem later, it would be addressed. At 44%, the number seems appropriate to him.

Karen agrees and recalls a statistic that said the median income in NW is 33k - 35k. If an individual makes \$20 an hour and works full time, they would earn \$42,000 per year. There's a lot of people in NW that don't have \$20/hr jobs, or people that don't work full time. Those numbers don't look unusual.

Mark asks if the committee should vote on tiered pricing.

Rick explains that tiered pricing might impact the number of permits allowed to be issued. For instance, if Peter's proposal is amended to allow two permits per address and the third needs to be certified, that would be a different application on the tier. He understands that there is a certain number of permits that can be removed from the system- one way is to limit permits and the other way is through tiered pricing.

Rick asks if tiered pricing should be kept as an option as the committee moves on to the next step.

Karen and Mark say yes.

Rick asks if the hard cap of three per unit should also be considered as an option moving forward.

Karen says yes.

Nick asks if tiered pricing would apply only after a resident receives an exemption. It doesn't seem appropriate that after receiving a "hardship" exemption (because a vehicle is needed for work/school) a resident is charged a higher price. He recommends going one way or the other.

Mark agrees. If a resident receives an exemption because they demonstrated a need for a vehicle, they should get charged the base rate.

Chris asks if tiered pricing would only apply to residents who own more than one car.

Mark says that would be his understanding.

Antonina asks if a resident could self-certify as low income if they have two cars to their name and apply for permits for both cars.

Mark says the resident would have to pay the tiered price.

Chris asks if there is no low-income eligibility for residents with two vehicles.

Don: "I think that's a great assumption."



Karen says that if the committee puts anyone in a position where they cannot own a car, they have to give residents ample amount of time to find alternative options.

Chris says that all changes would occur through attrition. The new rules would apply to residents who move in after the changes are implemented, because they would have that information available to them and can make a decision accordingly.

Don: "I think that's fair. It's what we did last year and it seemed to work reasonably well."

Peter asks if there's a way to weed through potential abuse. One of the residents in his building has three permits.

Chris explains that through attrition, the resident could renew permits for all of their vehicles regardless of the cap, but they would be subject to tiered pricing.

Rick confirms that tiered pricing would go into effect without attrition.

Nick asks why the changes couldn't be phased in over the course of three-five year for new residents.

Karen answers that 3-5 years would take too long.

Don: "I don't know if you can say that though because you don't know what five years could bring. Five years may bring a neighborhood funded parking lot where everybody could park."

Rick asks if there are other ideas.

Jeanne asks if the new changes being discussed supersede the old system of restricting residential permits. She asks if business permits would be impacted by changes.

Rick points out that one of the recommendations from RWC is that business permits be reduced to .7 FTE. He says that the SAC needs to know which businesses have purchased permits for .7 or more of their staff, to see the impact of reducing the FTE.

Don: "Personally, I think we could live with .2, I think .3 really begins to press it. Especially in service, people who have a ton of turnover like restaurants. One month you're going to have 60%, one month you're going to have 20%. It's a moving target. I think getting to .3 is too restrictive. Plus, if you look at the reduction of demand on permits that Rick presented, the businesses type permits saved over 300, the residential increased by a could hundred. So, they've done their part."

Karen points out that there was a big reduction in business permits this year so she is less inclined to change the FTE.

Tom asks if the float is different for residents and businesses.

Rick Williams answers that the float for businesses is 460%, the float for residential is 290%.

Tom says that the actual use of business permits is fairly low.

Rick Williams says yes. At the peak hour, there are 729 business permits parked, of the 3,300 allocated.

Tom says reducing FTE won't impact parking significantly, it will only make it more challenging for businesses to obtain permits.

Mark makes it clear that he's not making a recommendation, he asks if business permits should be priced the same as residential permits.

Tom asks what an alternative pricing structure would look like.

Rick answers that, similar to residential permits, the first 60% of employees pay base price, the remaining 20% pay the surcharge which could encourage businesses to manage their permits more efficiently.

Rick adds that one of the lessons the SAC learned the past few years was that business permits and residential permits operate very differently, so it's worth looking at them differently. It was a good question.

Rick Williams informs the members that during the data collection, some vehicles displayed both a resident and business permit.

Karen says she's seen cars have two permits but they were for different zones.

Rick says the permits were verified and both were Zone M.

Jeanne asks if the changes being discussed, and reformatting 30-minute and 1-hour stalls, would achieve the goal occupancy rate of 85%.

Chris says it's too early to say.

Jeanne asks how the current restriction on apartment buildings compares to what the SAC is proposing. She wonders if there will be an increase in renters asking for permits.

Karen asks how many people are on a waitlist.

Chris answers 20.

Jeanne expresses concern that there might be a lot of pent up demand where, once the restriction/cap is removed, residents will be rushing to get a permit. Additionally, new people will be moving into the neighborhood, and they would be eligible for permits, even though (because of the cap) they're not eligible now. She asks if her understanding is correct.

Chris answers yes. For example, the new building that came online is limited to .4. If the SAC changes the program, they can get up to three permits per unit.

Jeanne says that's what she's worried about. Buildings can get more permits.

Rick points out that the SAC could discuss possibly doing something different for new buildings.

Nick asks if anyone knows the average cost of a private lot.

Chris answers that \$175 appears to be average.

Tom says that the biggest demand for on-street is from new buildings that don't provide parking. A new building was built on 21st Ave. He understands that parking is offered there.

Rick says the SAC needs an inventory that specifies units per building, number of off-street parking spaces, etc.

Chris asks what kind of information PBOT needs to get in preparation for next year's changes.

Rick answers that the SAC doesn't need inventory for this year's changes, but inventory information will be needed for the year after. He mentions that Karen keeps a list of new buildings that have been built since 2007.

Mark asks if parking spaces in new construction are being utilized by tenants or if tenants are choosing not to pay those rates and opt for a parking permit. He asks if research possible. He's curious to know what's happening with the supply that's being added and if it's too expensive for tenants in buildings.

Rick adds that the other piece of data that needs to go with that is the vacancy rate in the building.

Rick Williams says that inventorying off-street spaces is possible but labor intensive. If it's an off-street lot, it's easy to count the number of stalls available. If it's a garage, you can walk in - if it's closed you can call the owner. However, understanding vacancy rate and occupancy rate of the stall is not inventory, it's a capacity analysis and that can be very difficult because it's on private property.

Karen says that there's a difference between vacancy rates in apartments and vacancy rates in lots.

Don: "You will change the behavior of property owners as well because, all of the sudden, there's going to be a lot more encouragement to pay attention to those tenants to make sure they have first shot at those spots, to ensure you're not crowding them out, because otherwise you're being penalized for non-utilization. Which is the behavior you want to encourage anyways."

Tom asks if parking spots are provided to people in condos.

Karen says that sometimes parking is sold separately from the unit because some condo residents don't own cars.

Chris asks to go back to Peter's proposal. The first part of the proposal suggests limiting the number of permits per address, the second part suggests limiting permits to single-family residences with curb cuts. Is the SAC still looking at pursuing the curb cut limit?

Don: “I would say, personally, keep that one off the list for now. Given the change that Peter proposed plus the change of some of the one-hour zones, we may hit it. Why add a layer of complexity and busy work that get folded anyway into all this other stuff that we’re going to be doing from here on out.”

Chris appreciates the feedback and says she wants to make sure everyone is on the same page.

Rick says that the committee will table curb-cut limitations for the time being.

Karen suggests looking at curb cuts that aren’t necessary. Some of the curb cuts were used for garages a while back but the garage is no longer there.

Nick asks if there are things to be mindful of from a regulatory standpoint regarding curb cut permits, for example, would driveway permits pose fire code issues?

Chris explains that driveway permits were discussed with a traffic engineer. There’s certain criteria that would need to be met (like size of street, length of curb-cut, distances between driveways, etc.) but if those conditions are met, he didn’t see concerns.

Mark asks Rick to explain his handout.<sup>2</sup>

Rick explains that his handout outlines a possible permit calculation. This would address the equity issue by being less restrictive on the number of permits issued per building. This calculation is intended to even things out so that every building with more units than another building would be able to get more permits. He’s unsure if it would be easy to administer.

Karen says the SAC needs to discuss how the exemption would work. If we’re going to have people self-certify that they need a car for work we’re going to hear that everyone has a job and needs a car. Are we going to require something more rigorous?

Peter points out that the percentage of low-income applicants seems to be on par with the income statistics of the neighborhood. There doesn’t seem to be a lot of abuse with the current system.

Karen says that everyone probably works (at least part time). Even if someone lives and works in the neighborhood, sometimes they’ll need to drive their car across town for a meeting. She believes that everybody is going to say they “need a car.”

Rick suggest giving residents the choice of a second (tiered price permit) or a really good alternative.

Karen says she doesn’t plan to solve the problem now, but encourages the SAC to think about that.

Nick suggests creating very specific criteria, where certain requirements have to be met in order to apply.

Karen recalls the public meeting where residents thought the price of permits was going to increase. If the SAC is going to change the permit system, how is that information going to be conveyed neighborhood? How can the SAC get feedback from the public?

---

<sup>2</sup> Rick Michaelson’s suggestion for limiting permits

Chris says she's open to suggestions. Last year, PBOT posted articles and advertisements in the NW Examiner, mailed postcards to residents, and contacted the Oregonian and other local news stations to get information out.

Karen says that getting information out is one thing, she asks how the SAC could get input/feedback from the public. She doesn't want people reading about the SAC making a decision behind closed doors. These are public meetings, but people don't attend.

Chris suggests hosting an open house.

Rick says that the goal should be to have a proposal by the end of the April meeting that can be publicized, along with an open house in May/early June. The committee would take a final vote at the June meeting.

Mark agrees with the timeline.

Chris suggests hosting a meeting for public comment in May so that the committee could review public feedback and come up with final proposals, so that in June the final package can be prepared and sent to all businesses and residents.

Tom asks if there are other options besides open houses. At open houses people have the option to respond to the issues at hand, but these parking changes are more complex. Residents probably wouldn't vote to have their permit price increase, or limiting themselves to one permit per unit. He asks if hosting an open house is the best way to get public input.

Karen says that residential input is valuable because it would offer situations that the SAC hasn't even thought to consider. If the public understand that the committee is at the proposal stage, a public house would offer a variety of unique situations that can/should be taken into account.

Mark asks who is in favor of keeping the permit price at \$180.

All in favor of keeping price at \$180 for next year.

Mark asks who is in favor of introducing tiered pricing for next year?

All in favor.

### **New Business**

Tom read in the Oregonian that the new Streetcar cars are being funded by net meter revenue from Lloyd, Central Eastside and NW. He asks why the funding came from net meter revenue rather than TDM funds.

Rick explains that the committee voted for that. Streetcar improvement is a capital item. Net meter revenue can be spent on any transportation expense. Permit surcharge can only be spent on TDM.

Rick says that the article said that service would increase on the A and B loop, he assumed that by funding the initiative, service would increase in NW as well but the article doesn't mention NW.

Jeanne says that she was told by Streetcar that service would increase in NW as well.

Chris says that she has not read the article, but there will be increased service in NW because of the contribution towards more vehicles.

Don: "Let's verify that."

Nick asks about the status of viable parking options that were identified before (like Metropolitan Learning Center).

Don: "Based on work that was done, working to bring out those 99 spaces and get that whole thing going, and the meter and all that, the next step on our agenda was MLC. And I think we were also going to outreach to Doug Caps about the Episcopal Trinity site.

Rick explains that the Shared Parking initiative has started on the Episcopal lot. Trinity mailed postcards to most residents about offering parking, but it wasn't clear it was only available to employees and residents in the neighborhood, so he spoke with their parking manager.

Tom asks about the progress of Legacy Good Sam lots.

Chris answers that Good Sam has received the parking agreement drafted by the City Attorney. Chris has been in contact with Piseth Pich from Legacy on the other shared parking lots - that is being reviewed by BPS right now.

Don: "we should make sure that when Rick does a survey, that it include looking at the number of unique vehicles they are seeing, so that we can see if we are getting more turnover and throughput of vehicles in the neighborhood, or not. If we are seeing more uniques as time goes on and occupancy is decreasing, we have achieved a lot. If we see uniques decreasing and occupancy declining, we know we are shooing people away, which is not what we want."

Rick says that unique vehicle data was collected this year but not last year. RWC will collect unique vehicle data for 2018 so that it can be compared to 2017.

Meeting adjourned.

## 60% Cap Vs. Equal Permit Distribution Proposal

### Current System (60% Cap on Buildings Over 30 Units)

#### Ethical Issues

- Legal argument aside, treats residents in larger buildings differently from other residents in the neighborhood
- Inequitable privilege to utilize parking between renters and homeowners
- Homeowners should not have more of a right to off street parking than renters as everyone contributes to our neighborhood
- Higher income residents of NW Portland getting the benefit
- All residents including renters pay property taxes

#### Effectiveness Issues

How many permits is the cap actually 'saving' us

Table is as of 3/16/18 evaluating buildings over the cap

Address	Units	Permits Used	Delta	
120 NW Trinity	32	27	5	
1955 NW Hoyt	30	19	11	
2015 NW Kearney	32	23	9	
2151 NW Johnson	46	28	18	
2186 NW Glisan	30	19	11	
526 NW 21st	43	26	17	
1975 NW Everett St	53	32	21	
2010 NW Pettygrove St	49	35	14	
2215 NW Irving	39	21	18	
31 NW 22nd Pl	39	26	13	
325 NW 18th Ave	35	21	14	
530 NW 23rd Ave	32	21	11	
			<b>162</b>	<b>Total</b>

- The 162 delta is assuming that everyone owns a car in every unit that does not currently obtain a permit
- 2016 poll estimates households without a car is 14%
  - Can be assumed the % is higher for renters given affordability and the neighborhood
- Reduction occupancy at peak hour is most likely from the increase in cost and employment restrictions NOT the 60% cap on permits for buildings over 30 units
- Of the proposed 900 reduction of permits to achieve the 80% occupancy at peak hour, the cap only accounts for at a maximum 18%

-The percentage is likely lower as not every unit will own a car yet the impact of the policy has a significant impact on renters and owners

**Solution: Eliminate cap which is discriminatory against residents in our neighborhood AND isn't main source of reduction of permits**

**Alternative Solution: Equal Permit Distribution W/ Single Family Curb Cut Permit**

**Equal Permit Distribution: Limit every household (residential and multifamily) to 1 permit**

Addresses w/ more than 1 Permit	
Total Permits Under Same Address	Number of Permits
2	520
3	84
4	0
5	2
<b>Would Save</b>	<b>696</b>

\*124% greater reduction of permits compared to the 60% cap

List of Exemptions:

- If resident can prove that a car is a necessity for work they may be granted another permit provided they sign a verification (similar to the poverty exemption)
  - This would discourage a household from holding more than one permit unless they have to due to employment
  - Exemption would only be valid under a different residents name at the same address and NOT if it was the same resident applying for a second permit
- Hard cap per address at 3 permits with the exemption
  - Excluding reasonable accommodations
  - Eliminates the Jay Leno analogy of one resident taking up a block of spaces

**Single Family Curb Cut Permit**

- If a single family residence has a curb cut they will be authorized to park on the street blocking their driveway
- SAC to fund study of curb cuts and associated addresses
- Special curb cut permit issued
- City to stripe restricted residential owner's spaces
  - Some curb cuts are small in width, we can determine adequate size for striping with average length of vehicle and recommended dimensions from PBOT
- City to erect towing signs signifying restricted space to public



-Single Family owners with a registered curb cut are restricted to one curb cut permit with the same Equal Permit Distribution exemptions allowed above

-The three permit cap per address would be two Zone M permits for owners with a curb cut as the one curb cut permit should be applied to the total three permit maximum

-City to NOT charge for the curb cut permit to incentivize owners to utilize space that is not useable to the public already and not take up any additional lineal on street parking for other residents and visitors

-Assuming the curb cut leads to private off street parking, owners would have more than two spaces without taking up any additional lineal footage of on street spaces

-The curb cut permit has the potential to reduce a significant number of permits in addition to the 696 reduction in Equal Permit Distribution proposal

### **Conclusion**

The cap should be eliminated as it unfairly grants privileges to residents of smaller apartment buildings and single family owners. Legal argument aside, restricting parking privileges to 0 at any address is not the right thing to do ethically speaking as every resident contributes to our neighborhood.

In addition, the system has proven itself to be ineffective in reducing an impactful number of permits which it was intended to. Considering that at a maximum impact, the cap only has an 18% share of the total desired reduction of permits, the burden it has on renters is not in balance with its effectiveness to maintain.

New proposal is equitable for all residents regardless of if they are single family owners or renters. It also reduces the number of permits by 148% greater than the cap. Curb cut permit allows owners of single family residences with a driveway one restricted space in front of their residence which they already have but cannot use. The benefit of the new proposal in terms of utilizing the existing lineal footage of on street parking while also equally distributing permits for all residents across a diverse income spectrum significantly outweighs the upside of the cap.

POTENTIAL PERMIT GRADATION

one - five units	1 per unit plus 1		sixty units and more	44 plus .4 per unit above 60 rounded up	
1	2		60	44	44
2	3		61	44.4	45
3	4		62	44.8	45
4	5		63	45.2	46
5	6		64	45.6	46
six-twenty nine units	6 plus .8 per unit above 5 rounded up				
6	6.8	7	65	46	46
7	7.6	8	66	46.4	47
8	8.4	9	67	46.8	47
9	9.2	10	68	47.2	48
10	10	10	69	47.6	48
11	10.8	11	70	48	48
12	11.6	12	71	48.4	49
13	12.4	13	72	48.8	49
14	13.2	14	73	49.2	50
15	14		74	49.6	50
16	14.8	15	75	50	50
17	15.6	16	76	50.4	51
18	16.4	17	77	50.8	51
19	17.2	18	78	51.2	52
20	18	18	79	51.6	52
21	18.8	19	80	52	52
22	19.6	20	81	52.4	53
23	20.4	21	82	52.8	53
24	21.2	22	83	53.2	54
25	22	22	84	53.6	54
26	22.8	23	85	54	54
27	23.6	24	86	54.4	55
28	24.4	25	87	54.8	56
29	25.2	26	88	55.2	56
thirty - fifty nine units	26 plus .6 per unit above 30 rounded up				
30	26	26	89	55.6	56
31	26.6	27	90	56	56
32	27.2	28	91	56.4	57
33	27.8	28	92	56.8	57
34	28.4	29	93	57.2	56
35	29	29	94	57.6	58
36	29.6	30	95	58	58
37	30.2	31	96	58.4	59
38	30.8	31	97	58.8	59
39	31.4	32	98	59.2	60
40	32	32	99	59.6	60
41	32.6	33	100	60	60
42	33.2	34	101	60.4	61
43	33.8	34	102	60.8	61
44	34.4	35	103	61.2	62
45	35	35	104	61.6	62
46	35.6	36	105	62	62
47	36.2	37	106	62.4	63
48	36.8	37	107	62.8	63
49	37.4	38	108	63.2	64
50	38	38	109	63.6	64
51	38.6	39	110	64	64
52	39.2	40	111	64.4	65
53	39.8	41	112	64.8	65
54	40.4	41	113	65.2	66
55	41	41	114	65.6	66
56	41.6	42	115	66	66
57	42.2	43	116	66.4	67
58	42.8	43	117	66.8	67
59	43.4	44	118	67.2	68
			119	67.6	68