

PBOT

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

May 29, 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, Parker McNulty, Thomas Ranieri, Peter Rose, Brent Soffey, Mark Stromme, Don Singer, Ron Walters

PBOT Staff

Corrine Montana, Kathryn Doherty-Chapman – NW SAC Liaison

Public in Attendance:

Sharon Kelly, Mike Janniro, Gad Alon, Phil Selinger, Walt McMonies, Gail Natawa,

Permit Program proposal on residential limitation

Dan Anderson leads meeting.

Public Comment

Mike Janiro lives at Johnson and 23rd. “I have one car parking spot in my driveway and I have a permit to park on the street, for my convenience. I had a pipe replaced in my home and a plumber had to park for a couple of days. Now need work done that will take two weeks or more. There is no street parking to accommodate contractors and their tools. For older relatives, I leave a space for them, so they don't have to drive around and search for parking. We all park in our driveways and we only use the permits for convenience when other situations come up. You're trying to get rid of 1,200 permits?”

Dan Anderson: “We are trying to balance supply and demand for parking. It is a work in progress. The balance we are working toward is 85%. We want to see one spot available on every block.”

Mike Janiro: “The problem is you are not addressing how we got to this problem. The problem is that the city allows new development with no new parking. There are no parking spots on weekends and people park in my driveway.”

Dan: Everyone on the committee lives here or owns a business here.

Member of the public: “It is expensive to own a couple of cars and have to pay for permits. I live on fixed income and this is very expensive for me.”

Dan: “Price is one of the demand tools we use. Permit price is a way to manage the demand.”

Member of the public: "Are these the only options – to buy permit or pay to rent on private market?"

Ron: "Yes, however there is a financial hardship exception available for permits."

Member of the public: "I wrote a letter breaking down how much I spend every month with the percentage that I spend on parking permits. I buy three parking permits and it's really expensive on a fixed income."

Ron: "We are all local, we are all volunteers. We have the meetings to hear comments like this. Frankly, when members of the public come to meetings and say, you haven't thought of this, we often have thought about these scenarios. When trying to balance supply and demand, some people seeing increasing supply as the solution and others see reducing demand as the solution. Everyone has a different idea of what is fair."

Nick: "I said this at the last meeting, but we have both a TDM and a supply committee that look at both of these issues so we are looking at both the supply and demand sides."

Member of the public: "These proposals were brought up without adequate notice. You have sent postcards from PBOT, ads in the NW Examiner and sent emails. It is being jammed down our throats. The city notifies people in the most inefficient manner possible."

Dan: "If you have ideas for how we can improve our notices and outreach, let us know. We reach out broadly, but we may miss people."

Member of the public: "The problem is that the city is allowing new buildings without adequate parking. Some new buildings have parking, but it is too expensive, and people choose to park on the street."

Member of the public: "Can I add parking to my property?"

Answer: "Yes."

Member of the public: "I suggest that film companies not be permitted to close streets. It would help the neighborhood not to adjust to their schedules. They take up street parking."

Member of the public: "Why should religious organizations get free parking?"

Response: "They have to pay as do residents and businesses by buying scratch offs or permits if they are eligible."

Sharon Kelly: "It feels unfair that businesses get preference over residents. They don't have to subtract from their existing parking before purchasing their permits. If you are looking for equity, that is a good place to look."

Nick: "It may be helpful to think of businesses like multi-family, they are more comparable to multi-family in terms of density."

Ron: "A building with multiple businesses gets the same treatment as a building with one business."

Don: "You say add supply and we have said the same. We hired a planner to bring this to city council and it was turned down. You will have to go to the ballot box to resolve this."

Aaron Sannes: "We (at Legacy) are really worried about the cap of 50. That will have a detrimental impact on us."

Phil: "We know some people will need a car. We hope that some people will choose other options."

Member of public: "The unintended consequence of disincentivizing car commuting is that people leave their cars parked on the street all day. It seems like the problem is car ownership and the solutions you are presenting don't match that problem."

Kathryn: "We offer incentives to business and residents that opt out of parking permits, so we are trying to use multiple tools to encourage people to drive less, park on-street less, or give up a car."

Member of the public: "The solution seems to offer incentives to businesses and rules upon residents."

Brad: "The parking problem exists before and after work. The goal would be to reduce the number of cars."

Member of the public: "Where I live the problem is during the day when people are trying to park near 25th and Lovejoy."

Ron: "I have a process question, are we going to vote and discuss each issue alone or together?"

Dan: "Let's hear additional public comment that Kathryn has been tracking and then go one by one."

New public comment

Kathryn: "I have already shared all of the emails I have received with you. One of those was from someone here, so you have heard from them. One member of the public raised issue of being told what to do with her private property.

The other issue that has come up is should we allow nonprofits and religious organizations to buy over 100 scratch offs? Most survey respondents said no, keep at 100. Responses to how is parking in NW notably different than previous survey from last year, but the sample sizes are so different I am not sure it's statistically valid."

Dan: "How many emails have we received?"

Kathryn: "About 38 email correspondences in addition to in-person comments."

Proposed Changes

1. Recommend keeping permit surcharge the same, at \$120, plus the \$75 base City cost of the permit for a total of \$195 per year. Second vehicle is double, \$390.
2. Recommend residential applicants complete declaration of how many useable off-street spaces they have.

3. At least one permit for each residence (with CO prior to 8/7/2013). Guaranteed to get one, even if you have declared off-street parking.
4. Propose that vehicles connected to an address instead of a vehicle, so they can be used for different vehicles.
5. Propose to add cap to business permit in addition to FTE requirement. Businesses that want more than 50 would be required to meet with us and talk through parking demand solutions. We would vote as a committee on each individual case. Permits issued to businesses over the 50 would cost \$390 for each additional permit."

Don: "It is outrageous for a small business with multiple locations to bear this cost. We are disincentivizing businesses coming into this neighborhood and growing. They will go somewhere else."

Ron: "I have no idea if these requests will be legitimate or not. We need to have principles in place that can be applied to all businesses equally. It could be merit-based. If you are a for profit large company, I would expect you to handle parking management. Look at what benefits the company or organization is bringing to the community."

Parker: "We need to think about the long-term plan. Nobody is talking about the 43 undeveloped acres in Northwest Portland. We need to have a better plan. It does not matter if it is a nonprofit or a for profit organization. We should have the same rights. We need to think about how we are going to get more parking supply long term and build from where we are now. We should not have bias. This is a form of taxation to prevent people from driving."

Dan: "I'd like to remind everyone that these are not major changes compared to last year."

Dan reads Rick's message—

"As chair of the SAC I do not feel that it is appropriate for me to make specific comments about specific portions of the proposal without being in attendance.

I would, however, like to make the following points:

1. Given the timeline it is important that the SAC make a final recommendation today for the permit year 2019-2020
2. I have been following the development of the staff proposal during the past weeks and have made comments and suggestions to move things forward
3. Given the way the process works it is better to approve tough policies and give exceptions as needed than weak ones that cannot be strengthened for another year."

Member of the public: "There should be an exceptions process for residents if there are going to be exceptions for businesses. There are always exceptional situations."

Member of the public: "This is a big change for the residents of Northwest."

Member of the public: "I have a question about the supplemental plan language, it says "All addresses will be allotted one permit and then something about a CO. What does CO refer?"

Dan: Certificate of occupancy.

Peter: "SPD3 residential portion doesn't clarify multifamily versus single family."

Kathryn: "It's one per licensed driver and unit, one permit allotted to residents with off-street parking in buildings with CO prior to 2013."

Actions

- Motion to approve surcharge: Ron moved, Parker seconded
 - **Unanimous vote to approve \$120 surcharge and tiered pricing.**
- Motion to approve package of residential changes (1 permit per address, declaration form): Jeanne moved, Brent seconded
 - **Unanimous vote in favor to approve residential off-street declaration form and reduction in permits available.**
- Motion to approve business changes: Ron moved, Jeanne seconded.

Discussion

Kathryn: "Rick suggested a subcommittee to evaluate exception cases. We will need to develop clear criteria to base our decisions on ASAP. I suggest we look at the existing TDM mixed-use zoning criteria to start."

Ron: "We don't want to put a burden on any one group. We want to apply the principle of fairness. We want to use the subcommittee process to avoid undue burden. We need to convey this intent so that future committee members understand what we are aiming to do now."

Don: "We need to add frequency to our occupancy surveys."

Kathryn: "We are adding a spring occupancy survey in addition to fall utilization surveys. So, we are doing that."

Mark: "In the spirit of working together, can we reduce cost of passes after 50?"

Nick: "Is the proposal that once these five businesses reach 50, they will then work with the committee to see what options are right?"

Ron: "Access to permits is more important to businesses than price. If they had to choose, they would probably choose to have the pass, even at a higher price."

Motion to approve business cap at 50 with hardship exceptions:

5 support, 2 opposed, 1 abstained

Kathryn asks the two opposing voters to share what their opposition was, or what we could do differently to get their vote.

Don: "There is not a long-term plan for getting more off-street supply. We are too focused on demand. I'd like to live long enough to see more parking built in NW. When are we going to hit a point where the neighborhood is negatively impacted. We have the financial resources to make an impact so let's work on that."

Ron: I agree with Parker and Don that we need to have a vision for ten years and further into the future. We want to get to a point where we have a common vision. Right now, we disagree on what to do about parking supply.

Tom: "A long-term plan will have to incorporate the city's goals and vision for this neighborhood. I worry about our net meter revenue going away."

Kathryn: "There is adopted net meter revenue policy and an adopted NW Parking Management plan by ordinance, changing either of those would take years of public process and is extremely unlikely. Your meter revenue is protected."

Parker: "I don't mean to offend anyone when I speak with spirit. I think it's a slippery slope when we start to add more policy. I think we already have enough stacked up against business. I am not pro-business, I am pro-everybody. We need to ease off and come up with a better long-term plan."

Jeanne: "I have suggested that the supply and demand committees establish where we are going and hammer out our principles to bring to the larger committee later in the summer."

Nick: "It seems like we are coming at it from the wrong direction. I do support the idea of sitting down and working with these businesses. I think we should approach it positively."

Kathryn responds to the member of the public who pointed out a typo, in the draft Supplemental Plan in SPD3, she will correct.

Meeting adjourned.