



PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION

1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185  
Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Chloe Eudaly Commissioner Chris Warner Interim Director

**NW Parking SAC Meeting Notes**

April 3, 2019  
4:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

NW Library  
2300 NW Thurman St.  
Portland, OR 97210

**Members in Attendance**

Dan Anderson, Nick Fenster, Jeanne Harrison, Lisa Higgins, Karen Karlsson, Rick Michaelson (Chair), Thomas Ranieri, Peter Rose, Mark Stromme, Don Singer, Ron Walters

**Members Absent**

Parking McNulty, Brent Soffey

**PBOT Staff**

Antonina Pattiz, Kathryn Doherty-Chapman – NW SAC Liaison

**Public in Attendance**

Adela Basaybe, Walt McMonies

**Public Comment**

No public comment.

**Timbers CTMP**

Ron shares that the Timbers’ Comprehensive Transportation Management Plan (CTMP) will go to council for approval on April 17<sup>th</sup>. The SAC sent a letter to the Stadium Oversight Committee (SOC) sharing concerns that the CTMP wasn’t credible and had deficiencies. The Timbers responded to the SAC’s letter by going into more detail, but it was clear that the concerns raised wouldn’t be addressed until after the CTMP is approved by council. Additionally, progress monitoring and metrics are still lacking. He thinks council will either approve the CTMP outright or approve it with conditions. He encourages members to attend the council hearing to provide alternative solutions and request measurable metrics.

The SAC makes the following comments:

- The CTMP should be a one-year program that will be reevaluated throughout the course of the year. There must be an implementation plan, ways to monitor the impact/solutions of the expansion, a project manager, regular meetings between the SOC and a report should be presented to council at the end of the year.
- Additionally, the SOC should hire a consulting firm to set clear metrics for the CTMP.

- There is interest in potentially pursuing a surcharge on game day tickets to be used on TDM incentives.
- It's imperative that data be collected to determine the impact on parking during game days. The data collection effort could be funded jointly between the SAC and SOC. But the Timbers must be willing to collect data to measure the impact of the stadium expansion, if they are unwilling, the SAC will need to go to council.
- The SAC would like to dedicate resources to data collection and would prefer to be the keeper of the data for game days to compare occupancy on non-game days.

Rick will draft a letter on behalf of the SAC with the following concerns/requests:

1. Acknowledgment that parking is already a problem and the stadium expansion will only exacerbate parking demand.
2. We need real data comparing game day to non-game day parking occupancy rates. Data is so important that the SAC would be willing to contribute some funding.
3. This needs to be a one-year agreement that will be revisited by council at the end of the season.
4. The SOC should be meeting regularly to monitor the progress of the expansion and the impacts, leading up to City Council's review of the CTMP post-implementation.
5. The SOC should hire a project manager or consulting firm to manage the plan.

Kathryn mentions that TriMet will be running one line 24 bus after game days.

### **Permit Program Discussion**

Kathryn reminds the members about the schedule for next year's permit changes. The SAC will need to approve proposed changes during the May 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, an open house will be hosted May 7<sup>th</sup> for public input and a formal vote will be scheduled during the May 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. If someone is unable to attend the open house but would like to provide public comment, there will be a survey and comment section on the NW parking webpage.

Proposal on permit surcharge price

- Rick asks for consensus on the proposal to keep the permit surcharge at \$120. Last year, the city raised the base parking permit fee from \$60 to \$75, so the surcharge for Zone M permits was reduced to \$105. He asks if the SAC wants to maintain the \$120 surcharge and increase the cost of the permit to \$195.
- Members ask that it be clear in the recommendation that the surcharge is separate from the city's base parking permit fee.
- Mark thinks the permit could stay at \$180 because the point of the surcharge is to manage supply and demand, not to generate revenue.

- Rick says the SAC will approve the proposal for the \$120 surcharge but will rely on public input during the open house before making a formal vote.
- The SAC might want to consider changing the low-income waiver. Currently, to qualify for a base permit fee, an applicant's income must be under 80% of the Housing Bureau's Average Median Income (AMI), the SAC might want to considering increase that to 100% to encompass more people in the low-income qualification.

#### Business permit ratio & permit limits to businesses:

- The SAC is not interested in reducing the business FTE ratio from .8 to .7 at this time. Instead, the SAC's efforts will focus on permit changes to big businesses that exceed a certain permit threshold by potentially creating a hard cap, to be determined on the number of permits a business can buy. Currently, only seven businesses purchase 50 or more permits.
- Nick points out that the float on business permits is very high, therefore, restricting business permits might not equate to lower parking occupancy.
- **Rick says the proposal will reflect .8 FTE as the ratio for business permits. The SAC will consider managing larger businesses differently, Kathryn will do outreach to those businesses before a proposal is drafted.**

#### Residential Permits:

- Rick asks if the SAC would like to reduce the cap of permits allowed per address from 3 to 2.
- Kathryn shares that 39 households have 3 or more permits, 14 of those permits are newly issued and the remainder are renewals.
- Mark and Karen believe that, based on the current numbers, the number of permits impacted by reducing the max permits allowed per address is not sufficient enough to warrant a change.
- The SAC requests a report on how many households have 1 or 2 permits.
- **Rick asks how many members would be interested in reducing the cap from 3 permits to 2 permits per unit for new residents. The group is split on this and there is no consensus. Rick says this possibility will remain open while considering other options for reducing residential permits.**
- The SAC discusses limiting residential permits in accordance with available off-street parking.
- Kathryn asks if the grandfathering clause would apply to off-street parking restrictions or if this would be in effect for everyone moving forward.
- If the SAC chooses to grandfather current permit holders with available off-street parking, not much impact will be made by the new rule. The SAC would need to strongly consider applying the off-street rule uniformly throughout the neighborhood.

- Antonina shares that limiting number of eligible permits in accordance with available off-street parking is currently administered in Zones F, H and I. In those zones, applicants must self-certify the number of vehicles owned at the address and the number of available off-street parking. That calculation determines how many permits the applicant is eligible to purchase.
- Karen comments that if a resident is eligible for less permits because of available off-street parking, the permits should not be tied to a specific vehicle but to an address so that it is interchangeable between vehicles. Additionally, residents who are not eligible for parking permits because of off-street options would have to pay to park when driving to different areas of the neighborhood.
- Regarding the off-street restrictions, members might want to consider allowing residents the ability to purchase at least one parking permit per household, even if off-street space is available, to ensure that residents can park in other areas of the neighborhood if needed.
- Karen worries that if we allow residents with off-street parking the ability to purchase at least one permit, we won't notice any changes to the parking demand in the area.
- Kathryn reminds the members that scratch-offs are available for purchase for situations like that.
- Ron points out that the SAC should try to encourage people to use their driveways and sometimes the price of the permit makes it convenient to just purchase a permit and park in the street. By setting a hard restriction, a resident would have to park in their park-able driveway because they wouldn't have the option of buying a permit.
- Lisa is concerned that some apartment buildings might have parking but those spaces might not be available to residents, we have to be mindful not to cause hardship to those residents.
- The language on the form would clearly state that the off-street parking must be available "to you."
- What about instances where people use on-street parking in lieu of long-term storage? Could the SAC require that cars be moved every 24 hours or 7 days?
- The Bureau of Transportation has a rule that a vehicle must be "movable" within 24 hours if the need arises. However, a vehicle will not be cited and towed for being parked longer than 24 hours unless the vehicle looks abandoned – i.e. flat tires, expired registration, etc.
- Members ask if there is a way to quantify how many spaces are occupied more than a week at a time. Turnover is essential in the neighborhood, if a car is stored long term, it deters visitors and customers from parking in the neighborhood. Ron would like to keep this idea in consideration.

- Rick points out that new multi-family buildings have permit restrictions, based on the building's age. Should the SAC limit permits to buildings based on how much off-street parking they have?
- Kathryn says the changes will need to be applied uniformly throughout the neighborhood.
- **Rick hears a consensus on limiting number of permits based on off-street parking available. The details of the proposal will have to be worked out and will be discussed at the next meeting.**

### **New Business**

Kathryn updates the members on the meter expansion project. Meters are expected to arrive by the end of June and the focus is on the NE section of the neighborhood because that is where occupancies were highest. The other section being discussed for installation is between 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> and that won't take as long to work through. The challenge is that the fall occupancy and turnover utilization study is coming up and the goal is to have meters installed with enough time for people's behavior to adjust. She spoke with the consultant, and they can collect data 4-6 weeks after installation and it would be considered a credible parking study. The goal is to start installing meters August 1<sup>st</sup>. She asks about the SAC's priority in terms of where meters should be installed and if we should halt installation until after data collection is completed.

- Karen asks why there needs to be 4-6 weeks for behavior to settle. She believes that if meters are installed, behavior will change very quickly.
- Kathryn answers best practice dictates that it takes a few months for behavior to adjust after change is implemented. People will get warnings the first time around and citations thereafter.
- Rick says there's a significant chance all meters might not get installed before the data collection in October. Should the SAC wait until January to install the meters?
- Karen says no, as many meters as possible should be installed before the data collection. We want the timing of the data to be consistent from one year to the next.
- **Kathryn says as many meters as plausible will be installed before the data collection in October, after the data collection is completed, meter installation will recommence.**
- Rick says the SAC will rely on the city to determine the most efficient process/places to install meters.

Meeting adjourned.