

NW Parking SAC
Wednesday, August 16, 2017
4 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

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

Meeting Notes

Members in Attendance

Elizabeth Aaby, Tavo Cruz, Nick Fenster, Karen Karlsson, Rick Michaelson (Chair), Thomas Ranieri, Phil Selinger, Don Singer, Mark Stromme

PBOT Staff

Chris Armes, Scott Cohen, Lynda Viray, Antonina Zaytseva

Public in Attendance

Jim Anderson, Allan Classen (NW Examiner), Megan Cross, Karen Czopek, Tom Ford, Jeff Reingold, Alyssa Sena, Roger Qualman, Christine Warden, Alexandra Zimmermann

Welcome & Public Comment

Rick calls the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. and welcomes Nick Fenster to the committee. Nick will complete Judy Kafoury's term as the Nob Hill Business Association (NHBA) liaison, which extends through September 2019. Rick mentions that the SAC is looking to fill two vacancies by October and that there will be an advertisement for the at-large positions in the September issue of the NW Examiner. The committee is looking to add a property manager and someone from the retail sector, and the committee is always looking to recruit renters.

Phil explains that there are two terms expiring in October – one position from NHBA and one from NW District Association (NWDA).

Rick invites public comment and attendees express the following concerns:

Karen Czopek, from KBC Management, expresses concern with the quick motion to limit permits for buildings with 30 or more units. Per her research, other cities do not have parking restrictions and the 30-unit cut off seems arbitrary. Property management companies with more than 30 units will experience financial hardship if they are unable to provide parking for tenants but smaller buildings still have that option. Karen encourages the SAC to talk about the restrictions in depth and push the limits off for one year, taking into consideration that the restrictions will only “save a minimal number of permits.”

Rick explains that the 30-unit cut off came from staff recommendation. The SAC is working on ways to reduce the permit count to get closer to an 85% occupancy rate. It's the first attempt and there are challenges to that.

Peter Rose urges the SAC to push off the restrictions based on the 30-unit limit. He reached out to Chris (PBOT) and requested information about cities with restricted parking. The list included Chicago, Eugene, Baltimore, Seattle, Annapolis and Toronto. None of the cities, except Toronto, restrict permits to anyone who can prove residency. Toronto restricts permits in two neighborhoods because of snow plows.

Peter emphasizes that he doesn't think there is a parking problem in NW and believes that the changes will have an adverse effect on the community.

Rick states that there is a parking problem in NW and he understands that other cities have not enforced restrictions. This is a new idea and the plan will be adjusted as time goes on. The community will experience growing pains but the changes will benefit everyone.

Don asks Rick to not be short with the public.

Rick explains that these concerns have been expressed many times and no solutions have been reached yet. He would prefer to address the problems and find a viable solution.

Don: "I understand, but we were given 30 minutes to decide it in the first place. Karen mentioned that 13 apartments would be impacted, it was first 12, now we read that it's 20, that's nearly a 70% increase. When we get to the discussion today about it, we should be open minded about whether we're going to go forward with it or not."

Rick agrees and closes public comment.

TDM Update

Scott updates the SAC on permit week. Of the 220 permit week attendees, approximately 75 were interested in providing feedback on transportation demand management (TDM) incentives. Scott thanked Phil for attending two of the three events.

Phil comments that several people came in unhappy and left satisfied and/or happy after purchasing their permits. The event was useful and well planned.

Mark asks which factors attendees were most unhappy about.

Phil answers that it was a range of things – the tripling of the fee, not understanding where the money went, thinking the City would profit, etc. He adds that it was useful to have SAC representation at the event because it helped people realize that it wasn't just the City making these decisions.

Tom says that the set-up of the event was inefficient because it was heavily focused on TDM incentives and didn't represent the other proposed solutions for the parking problem - which includes increasing supply. He understands that the revenue from permits will fund TDM incentives but argues that giving that look to the public seems unbalanced and staff should have requested a wider range of feedback.

Scott asks about the options Tom wanted to see feedback provided on.

Tom answers that, to his recollection, increasing on-street supply was not discussed at the event and it seemed disingenuous to the actual range of options the committee is talking about.

Scott clarifies that on-street supply wasn't available for people to vote on because it's not a demand management strategy.

Rick comments that the event should have been broader than demand management and should have included the entire package of proposed solutions.

Scott explains that everyone could agree that people want an increase in supply, but the first step is to manage demand.

Tom says that he doesn't want to wait five years before the committee moves forward with solutions for residents and employees. He shares that he thinks the SAC is not working to increase supply.

Rick asks Tom if he thinks the SAC should hold off on TDM initiatives before increasing supply.

Tom expresses hesitation with PBOT's goals statement to "manage existing assets more efficiently."

Scott clarifies that the language in the document is very intentional. From his understanding, the Parking Management Plan and City Council gave a very specific mandate to manage on-street parking before supply is addressed.

Don: "No, that wasn't the case. And when it was passed it was basically perceived as a three-legged stool where you had permits, demand management and supply and one didn't take precedence over the other."

Karen comments that the SAC is addressing the need for supply by adding shared parking lots and discussing under-utilized on-street parking options. She adds that supply isn't being ignored- nothing new is being built yet because it's not an easy thing to do, but the committee is addressing some of the easier things first.

Rick says that the event represented the TDM program but didn't represent the entire program and should be supplemented. The TDM initiative could be a "stand-alone exhibit" but it needs to be broader than that.

Karen suggests that selling permits and gaining more information could be combined with another neighborhood event. NHBA and NWDA co-sponsored an event on August 1st and that would have been a great opportunity to get more people to attend.

Phil points out that TDM programs take a while to build up and the SAC has discussed TDM initiatives and came up with very specific options that were well represented at the open house. The committee has not discussed, in any detail, building new supply. The SAC talked about low-hanging fruit for securing more supply and the event seemed like an appropriate time to hit TDM hard.

Mark points out that the SAC has been forward thinking by discussing parking decks in future developments. Conversations are happening with Legacy about future construction phases and if the SAC can partner with them to develop a parking deck in a building (to get a full block or half a block of parking). He adds that these are longer-range issues that don't just happen overnight, but are part of the conversation.

Don: "Phil has a good point. This stuff takes a lot of time to mature and get off the ground. My feeling is that there has to be balance and one doesn't come before the other. In that, when we have public outreach like this, and the TDM aspect was done really well, that it's an opportunity also to take measure from the public as to other ideas than just shared parking. Because shared parking is just that – it's shared for now but those sites will change over time and so, what was shared today may be an apartment building tomorrow. And so, they're transitory in use; they may have 5 years or they may have 20 years, but they're definitely not the solution. But there are things that this committee has worked on that the public doesn't know about and that is our whole effort with Joan Frederiksen in trying to get the requirement out that we would have required parking. It had the opportunity to take more measure of that so that we could go back to the Planning Commission, back to the City Council, because the Planning Commission does not stay static over time, there are members that are open to different ideas. There are different City Council people and positions turn over. So, I think from this point forward we do have these types of things it'd be a great opportunity to take the measure of the people that are attending so that if we have ideas like that

we then have more support saying, 'look, 200 people said yes to this one comment.' That has an impact when we go before Bureau of Transportation or a City Council person and those are the opportunities that we want to see."

Rick mentions that the Slabtown Festival will take place in September and the SAC could supplement shared parking information with another Board and prepare a display at the NWDA booth.

Karen agrees and adds that she likes the idea of using that opportunity to get more feedback. The more that people get involved, the higher the chance that people will go to council to advocate for the changes. There weren't enough proponents last time.

Scott updates the members on the Streetcar initiative. The SAC discussed and showed support for a financial commitment of \$50,000 - \$60,000 per year over 5 years to add more Streetcar services. The initiative would be a joint effort between NW SAC, Central Eastside Industrial District (CEID) and Go Lloyd. The funds would be pooled together and used as a local match to help purchase more Streetcars to improve service and potentially bring down headways, if TriMet is agreeable to the effort. Scott adds that the initiative has been discussed but he can't recall a formal vote.

Rick explains that a formal vote was taken 2 years ago, but was lost in the minutes. Rick recommends voting on the initiative again.

Phil points out that the initiative is a capital initiative and funding would come from meter revenue, not permit fees.

Scott explains that the SAC's \$250,000-\$300,000 commitment over the next five years, combined with a similar financial commitment from CEID and a smaller contribution from Go Lloyd (because they have less funding) would help reach a goal of approximately \$750,000 towards the effort. That money could be used as a match, at which point the City would come in with matching funds and then additional funding would be sought from an outside source. The SAC must be willing to contribute financially towards the effort to leverage more funding.

Chris adds that a financial contribution from the committee would show community support for additional service.

Phil explains that TriMet needs to be on board because they cover 2/3 of the operating costs and if the SAC is interested in increasing frequency, TriMet will need to contribute.

Scott agrees and adds that this will improve service because if something happens to a car that needs to come offline, another car will be available and those additional cars will reduce delays. Scott emphasizes that he's not promising that there will be 5 minute streetcars, but there will be more streetcars which will allow for increased frequency, if TriMet agrees. Scott asks the SAC to vote in support of a 5-year commitment of \$50,000 or \$60,000 per year towards the effort.

Rick asks Scott to explain the difference between an annual commitment of \$50,000 and \$60,000.

Scott explains that Portland Streetcar, Inc. has offered \$50 annual Streetcar passes for employees of small businesses in NW, if the committee contributes \$10,000 per year.

Rick asks if there's a limit.

Scott says that the limit is 200 passes.

Phil points out that the Streetcar contribution will not be immediately visible. He supports the proposal but thinks it's important to get some improvements on the ground sooner than later to demonstrate to the community the immediate benefits of the new sources of revenue the neighborhood has.

Scott responds that if this effort takes off, Streetcar is anticipating to add 5 cars – 2 new cars and 3 being purchased from Seattle in the fourth quarter on 2019. NW won't have to wait 5 years for Streetcar frequency improvements, the effort is expected to take effect around September 2019.

Nick asks for clarification, if the committee votes in favor of the effort, is the funding contingent on contributions from the other neighborhoods and the City funding coming through?

Scott explains that CEID and Go Lloyd have already committed. His understanding is that the money stays with PBOT (it doesn't move to Streetcar) and if the deal falls through the money comes back to the SAC to make further recommendations.

Tom suggests that the funding for the project be equally split between meter revenue and permit fees because improving transit service is a transit effort and falls into the TDM category.

Karen agrees, it would be helpful to have a financial accounting as things go on because it's hard to remember which funds are being allocated to which efforts.

Rick says that he would like to see an accounting of what's available in the meter fund and some indication of permit fees at the next meeting. He clarifies that Scott's request is a re-confirmation of a previous commitment of \$50,000 but the additional \$10,000 is new and is clearly a TDM effort and should come from the TDM fund. Rick says he will follow the lead of the committee and asks for a motion.

Karen makes a motion to support a \$60,000/year contribution over 5 years, contingent on a commitment from CEID, Go Lloyd, the City and TriMet. There will be a 50/50 funding split from permit revenue and meter revenue, but that should be revisited as funds change (might push more on one fund than the other) but initially it will be a 50/50 split. \$10,000 of that contribution will go to \$50 annual Streetcar passes for employees at small businesses. She adds that the \$50 annual pass fee is a good deal because an annual Streetcar pass is \$440.

Tom seconds the motion.

Elizabeth asks if the committee will work with NHBA for outreach.

Chris and Scott say yes.

Rick requests a vote on Karen's motion.

The motion passes unanimously.

Scott updates the committee on the status of the opt-outs. Permit holders have the option of opting out and getting one of the following incentives:

- \$100 Hop Pass and 1-year BIKETOWN Membership, OR
- 50% off an annual TriMet pass

To date, there were approximately 50 residents that chose to opt out – an estimated 5% impact. Residents who opt-out cannot get a permit in the coming year and must certify that they're living in NW for the year.

Scott continues that the committee approved \$50,000 to help incentivize businesses that met with him as part of the TDM requirement, but he is having difficulty contracting with TriMet to agree on the Universal Pass program. In the meantime, he has offered businesses a similar opt-out incentive option provided to residents (excluding 50% off an annual Tri-met pass). Employers can purchase a \$100 HOP Card and annual BIKETOWN membership for employees. There have been two businesses that signed up for the incentive and three others have expressed significant interest- and that's with very little outreach. The money that was approved by the committee last time for the Universal Pass program has been used on these incentives.

Nick asks if the business incentive is based on the number of eligible permits.

Scott answers that a business is eligible for a certain number of permits based on an FTE formula; whatever amount they want less of their allowance is what they can opt out of. The business is not eligible to get those permits later in the year (business can opt out of 20 permits max).

Phil suggests that the TDM subcommittee draft a letter to TriMet (with the committee's approval) to influence their involvement.

Scott adds that some of those conversations are happening internally at PBOT to determine the best way to move forward with TriMet.

Tom asks how Scott feels about the efforts with TriMet.

Scott says that he is optimistic because there are funds to help manage the demand on the system and that a big part of managing that demand is getting people on TriMet. He can't see why they wouldn't want to be involved.

Rick adds that the long-term goal is to have Universal Passes for all employees in NW, so even if people choose to ride the bus once a month it will help the demand on supply.

Scott comments that the City has a lot of programs coming in place where they'll want to engage with TriMet more and they'll find the right way to make that happen.

Tom asks if the committee has spent money on these TriMet/Streetcar initiatives yet.

Scott explains that the funding was approved, but it has not been spent.

Rick requests a financial report from Scott outlining the amount spent on residential and business opt out incentives.

Zone M Permit Week Summary

Lynda shares a document outlining statistics from permit week and the current count of permits sold:

- 220 applicants attended the event
- Issued 1,435 resident permits
- Issued 1,777 business permits

Rick adds that renewal letters were mailed to permit holders and PBOT staff will send a reminder letter advising residents to renew their permits around the beginning of September.

Chris explains that notices will be sent to residents who currently have permits but don't renew by September 1st. The letter will notify them that they have a certain amount of time to renew their permits - particularly focusing on the larger buildings with restrictions. If a letter is returned, it will be assumed that the permit holder moved out and the permit will be canceled.

Karen asks if an application rush should be anticipated towards the end of August.

Jay answers that last year there was a rush during the last week of August and first week of September.

Mark asks Jay if he has a projection on what the final permit count will be.

Jay predicts around 7,000 – 7,500 permits, because approximately 1,500 guest permits will be removed from the program. However, some residents will be switching their guest permits to resident permits.

Phil asks for comments and feedback on the number of low-income applications, since it was based on the honor system.

Jay shares that he is comfortable with the number of low-income applicants.

Phil points out that a percentage of 15% low-income applicants seems reasonable to him.

Karen points out that 400 out of 1435 applicants self-certified as low income (approximately 28%).

Elizabeth expresses concern that some employers that won't pay for permits and asks if employees qualify for the low-income rate.

Rick comments that the SAC should discuss the possibility of low-income business permits.

Rick mentions that PBOT staff assumes that residents will begin hitting caps in restricted buildings around November or December, at the earliest, so there is time to fix problems with the cap without throwing the entire system out.

Chris clarifies that the current permit numbers assumes that everybody with a current permit will renew for the 2017-18 permit year. However, based on experience with turnover in buildings, PBOT is not expecting that to be the case.

Phil is interested in knowing how many new units have come on line in the neighborhood over the past year and how many off-street parking spaces came with each unit to gauge the ratio.

Chris says she will see if that data can be pulled from TRACS, but there are challenges with figuring out when buildings got their occupancy permits and if the information is current.

Rick suggests that a unit report could become an addition to the annual inventory report.

Mark points out that one possible solution to diminish demand is having the cost of the permit become more commensurate with market value. He is interested to see the impact the \$180 price has on demand. If demand is down because of the new fee, the committee won't need to be concerned with capping.

Karen adds that people won't want to pay \$150 - \$200 per month for parking if the annual permit fee is \$60 or \$180. There are a lot of people parking on the street that wouldn't be parking on the street if the annual permit fee was commensurate of the monthly parking fees.

Chris comments that she's not comparing CEID to NW, but CEID has increased their permit price every year for the past three years and there has been a permit reduction in that area.

Tom inquires about parking in CEID.

Chris answers that CEID has installed meters and, as a result, reduced the number of permit spaces available because permits cannot be used at the metered areas.

Tom asks if permit reduction has solved their parking problem.

Chris answers no because while permits are being reduced, metered spaces increase. But, this year, permit spaces weren't reduced and a lot less permits were sold, compared to last year.

Rick points out that Zone N is no longer giving permits to residents.

Chris clarifies that two years ago, Zone N went through an attrition process. If a resident or an employer didn't have Zone N permits, they were ineligible to get one in the future. Zone N is phasing out permits and installing meters. Currently there are 150 residential permits in all the CEID and they continue to decrease as people move out. CEID has 600 new residential units that are coming on-line; residency numbers are increasing quickly in that area.

Karen comments that new construction is adding off-street parking and that there are off-street options available to residents.

Chris clarifies that only some buildings are adding parking, and there aren't a lot of off-street options for employees and residents. Only one parking lot entered the shared parking program.

Shared Parking Applications

Rick mentions that the NW SAC's Supply Subcommittee and PBOT staff is in favor of approving the following shared parking requests and requests a motion to approve.

1. Trinity Episcopal Cathedral – 97 spaces (new request)
2. Legacy Health – 177 spaces (renewal)

The vote passes unanimously.

Exceptions

Rick informs the committee of three exception requests:

1. Congregation Beth Israel is requesting 50 temporary passes for each High Holy Day (PBOT staff and Subcommittee is recommending approval).
2. William Temple House is requesting three 15-minute spaces, a nonprofit permit rate, and the inclusion of unpaid staff hours in the permit allocation formula. (PBOT staff is recommending two 30-minute spaces and, per the adopted plan, volunteers are not eligible for permits but interns can be in the allotment calculation.)

3. First Immanuel Lutheran Church is requesting to reinstate annual guest permits and increase the number of scratch-offs for community service organizations. (PBOT staff is recommending to not reinstate the annual guest permits and the exceptions subcommittee wanted to discuss the scratch-off request further.)

Karen asks if the committee should be doing something differently, like having clear exception qualifications to make it easier on applicants to request exceptions.

Phil mentions that the SAC needs to be careful every time an exception is made because it sets a precedent and similar situations need to be considered. Synagogues are requesting exceptions but there are churches and other nonprofits who have similar events.

Tom asks for clarification about William Temple House and asks if PBOT offered a counter proposal to their request.

Lynda answers yes. They wanted one 15-minute space in front of their store and two 15-minute spaces in front of their headquarters. However, the City only offers 30-minute short term spaces, so the City agreed to one 30-minute space for both locations.

Rick adds that William Temple House wants to count their volunteers as employees (PBOT staff and the Supply Subcommittee recommends against the request) because that changes the program.

Tom comments that even if a business has many permits, not all the permits are being used at the same time. Volunteer time is sporadic and people that volunteer their time are not being accommodated. It seems odd that the committee is saying "this doesn't fit the program."

Karen points out that 30-minute short term parking is standard in the City, it's not unique to NW. However, she believes that there needs to be a drop-off option and a 30-minute spot doesn't work well for drop-offs.

Chris mentions that PBOT is working on an exceptions process for time stays that are less than the 30-minute standard installed now. Certain factors need to be taken into consideration, like the type of land use, the location, etc. This is being worked on but is not in place right now. The City is trying to create a policy that accommodates different types of use.

Elizabeth adds that medical offices in NW would benefit from dedicated drop-off spaces (for patients).

Rick says that volunteer hours need to be discussed but the policy should be kept the same as it was last year - which is to not allow businesses to count volunteer hours towards permit allotment. There are two questions that need to be addressed 1) how many volunteers need to stay more than 4 hours and 2) is it fair to make them pay if they haven't in the past?

Tom asks if volunteers could rely on scratch offs.

Chris says that scratch-offs can be purchased for volunteer use, up to 10 books a year.

Rick mentions that he had an idea for variable scratch-offs rates. For instance, a certain number of daily passes would be sold for \$1/each and the next passes would be sold for \$4/each to help compensate for the lost meter revenue.

Rick asks if anyone wants to change the staff recommendation for the exception requests.

Mark makes a motion in favor of the recommendations. Tavo seconds and the motion is unanimously approved.

Pay-By-Plate Expansion

Lynda shares that expansion of pay-by-plate meters is being completed in CEID before it takes place in NW.

Nick inquiries about the installation date.

Chris answers that the installation is slated for the end of October. There will be a more specific schedule after the transition in CEID, to give the committee information about where the meters will roll out and how they'll move through the neighborhood.

Residential Permits

Rick points out that there was dissatisfaction with the allocation of residential permits in restricted buildings. The goal is to have a committee discussion today and think about the options. Rick reminds the members that Rick Williams Consulting recommended three ways to limit permits:

1. Set a hard cap on permits and create a waiting list.
2. Price permits at market rate (for example \$200/month).
3. Cap permit issuance for buildings (soft cap). *This is the option adopted by the SAC.*

The way it's written now, if a building has 30 units or more, it is eligible for permits at a rate of 60%, but there is no restriction on buildings with less than 30 units. Thus, a smaller building is eligible for as many permits as they request but a building with more than 30 units is restricted to 18 permits maximum. Rick comments that there is something strange about a resident in a 29-unit building having the ability to purchase 2-3 permits, while a resident in a building with more than 30 units might not be eligible for a permit at all.

Rick remembers the SAC agreeing to a 30-unit cap because it was feasible for Scott to develop special programs for the identified buildings.

Karen recalls the 30-unit number coming from a City mandate requiring off-street parking being built for residential buildings with 30-units or more. The assumption was that there was logic behind the number.

Rick points out two ways the SAC can proceed with current restrictions 1) get rid of the cap entirely or 2) assess the permit allocation granted to smaller buildings to ensure that there are no exemptions.

Don: "I wanted to make a couple of observations and would like to take a few minutes to do that. First of all, I'm against caps altogether. I appreciate getting the break down on the number of permits between resident, business and guest because we have close to 10,000 permits. Approximately 1,400 of them are guest permits which are transient permits and are very rarely used or if they're used, get used on a one-time basis and they're gone. So, to even count those, I mean, when people talk about this problem that we have so many more permits issued than we have parking spaces, that gets lumped into the discussion as if they're permanent and constantly used permits and that's absolutely not the case. So, if you take those out, you're already down to 7,700 permits that are more full-time in terms of use. That's kind of where, Rick Williams, comes up with 2017 recommendations. Additionally, we know that out of the 4,400 permits issued to businesses, not all of those are used all the time. Elizabeth has a perfect example of the way hers work where you have a lot issued but maybe 17-20 are used on any one day even though a ton of them have been issued. For restaurants, I know with the Fireside that my brother and I own, we have a

lot of people that have permits but they only work 2 days a week, so they're not there all the time. So, I think, really, it's a solution that's looking for a problem rather than the other way around. I just don't see it."

Karen points out that the total number of resident/business permits in 2016-17 is 8,500, not 7,500.

Don: "8,500, there are 1,000 (guest permits) out there. With parking, you have what's called 'float' so you're within the margin of error so I really think we may be on the cusp. I don't see the problem as much as maybe other people do. The other thing is that this 60% was really kind of a number that was pulled out of thin air. The cut-off then creates, as we saw in that letter, different classes of people, it treats 30-units different from a 29-units so, the fact that I live in a 32-unit this year and I decide to get a car and my building is at a cap, all of the sudden I'm in a situation where my neighbor who lives in a 29-unit building can get a car; the guy that lives down the street in a single family residence has absolutely no problem because there are no restrictions on him. We came up with this policy so quickly that we didn't think of the unintended consequences. We had issues of fair housing laws that we ran into, issues of administration that property managers didn't want. We have issues where we're looking at it that a studio, 1-bedroom, 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom are all being treated equally but we know that isn't the case. For all those reason, we have to totally step back and think about what we did and revise this in some ways. First of all, I wouldn't want to see a restriction. I want to see how the price increase impacts overall demand, just how Mark pointed out, and look at that for a year. If not, I would like to go back to the proposal I made at the beginning when I was objecting to this and, that is, that we go to a straight ratio, just like we did with the retail and the businesses where we have 80% FTE. You just say 80% of the units get permits. And you're not making a distinction between the 30-unit or the 29-unit or the one bedroom. Everybody is getting 80%."

Elizabeth asks that the 80% rule be applied district-wide. The NHBA approved FTE cuts because they believed they were approving a "whole package" (pooling residents and businesses together) to meet the 85% occupancy rate.

Rick shares that the plan calls for the 85% occupancy rate on an aggregate basis, not an individual or business basis. The SAC will need to come back to that discussion at some point but today the discussion is about resident restrictions.

Phil thinks there will be a problem with pooling because someone would get cut short. The recommended changes depend on the City's software abilities. He agrees with Don that the 30-unit cut off is arbitrary but supports caps. One possibility could be setting a cut off at 5 units for administrative purposes (to exclude ADUs, etc). Phil asks if the City has the ability to administer limits to buildings with less than 30 units.

Chris answers that the ability to do so is there, but there are limitations due to TRACS. Data tracking is labor intensive and PBOT is currently using spreadsheets to track everything.

Phil points out that there was talk of using the revenue to hire a staff person, but it appears the problem is more of a database/software problem.

Rick asks if PBOT is likely to have better software next year.

Chris explains that PBOT is working on getting software for a virtual permit program. However, such a program doesn't exist yet so even after PBOT gets the software, it will need to work with the programmers to implement the necessary components.

Karen asks how the City knows the number of units in each building.

Chris explains that PBOT staff used TRACS to determine the number of units in apartment buildings. However, if a house has been subdivided and is rented out, PBOT wouldn't know that.

Rick suggests that, with the right data, it would be possible to assign permits by square footage.

Karen comments that giving a house .8 of a permit doesn't make sense. Does that imply that an individual can park 80% of the time?

Chris clarifies that .8 equates to 1 permit.

Karen mentions that she's not concerned with single family homes. If the SAC wanted to set limits for a smaller number of units (like 5 units) who would administer that? The smaller buildings aren't equipped to handle permit limitations. As much as .8 for everyone seems like a good idea, the implementation would be a challenge.

Don: "I agree with that and I think that Mark brought up a really good point, I think that if you're going to put any type of restrictions, which I still disagree with, you have to be sensitive to the unit mix. If you're not sensitive to the unit mix, then you're being incredibly unfair. That a studio is put on the same footing as a 3-bedroom is not right."

Karen says that administering permits by bedroom makes sense to her.

Chris points out that it's practically impossible for the City to get information about the mix of units.

Rick points out that county records of square footage information is accurate but the types of units and what constitutes a bedroom is hard to pull.

Mark comments that exceptions will need to be made. He has 3-bedroom, 1,800 sq ft apartments with three tenants in them and .8 per unit would not work. He is not comfortable with the fact that 29-unit buildings can have 29 permits and asks if tiered pricing was adopted.

Chris explains that tiered pricing wasn't approved. The City Attorney was uncomfortable with existing residents paying one fee and new residents paying a higher price.

Mark states that inactive passes are part of the problem. The City can't micromanage people and request them to return permits. As a community, we need to assist in that process.

Rick says that part of the problem is that there isn't a good counting mechanism. It doesn't matter how many permits are out there, but how many are used in a day and the impact on streets.

Karen mentions that a parking survey was conducted to determine the number and duration of parked cars. The problem is that some areas have a 99% occupancy rate and some are barely used.

Nick asks if the SAC has discussed managing the cap like the way income tax is managed, wherein, if you limit buildings above 30 units, you start limiting the excess of 30 versus the total.

Rick explains that it was discussed but not pursued. He shares an idea of allowing buildings to get one permit per unit for the first 5 units, then .8 per unit for the next 10 units. That way, a building with more units gets more permits than a building with less permits.

Tom suggests an invite to the consultant to explain their findings to the committee again. Permits are not being used at capacity and actual usage of spaces should be considered when making decisions.

Rick reminds the committee that another data collection survey is scheduled for October. It would be helpful to have the consultant come in before that and reiterate their findings.

Don: "I'm in agreement with Tom. One thing that I don't think, especially early 2016, we were able to capture until maybe recently was that we do have turnover in these apartment buildings and so, if you have a 30-40% turnover rate and a lot of those people have permits that they never returned, all the sudden you have permits out there that are not being used because they moved to southeast or to Los Angeles or something like that. So, it kind of confirms what Tom is saying through the observation from the first count. Obviously, this year we're going to have a better idea of how many permits we have but we'll still have that problem. But again, I think it's the solution looking for a problem at the moment."

Phil points out that there is a natural incentive for apartment managers to get permits back because managers wants to be able to keep residents happy by maximizing the number of parking permits available.

Don: "Part of the problem was fair housing laws and the nexus between landlord tenant laws and the reissuance of the permit. Getting it back is one thing. Reissuing it and making that decision seemed to be more of a problem than not.

Chris reminds the committee that there is a \$50 incentive for residents to return permits. The information is printed on the back of the permit.

Karen shares concern over the legality of the proposed changes. She requests input on what is legal versus what is not.

Chris explains that all of the ideas that have been developed and discussed at the meetings have been discussed with the City Attorney. The attorney is aware of everything in the supplemental plan and hasn't determined anything to be illegal. He also received the letter from Michael Lilly and will provide a response.

Rick closes the meeting by reminding the committee that if caps are rejected, it goes against the basis of the program the City is trying to develop- which is a capping program for permits. It's okay to say that this approach to parking doesn't work.

Chris adds that the proposal to revamp the APPP didn't pass council and the members from the SAC came to council and requested to pilot a parking program. The plan can be adjusted. No one expects a perfect program right off the bat; it will take time as we work through challenges.

Meeting adjourned.

Zone M Permit Week Totals

	Full Price: \$180 per permit	Income Based: \$60 per permit	Books of Scratch-Offs: \$10 each	Total Items: (each day)
Tuesday July 25	101	8	66	175
Wednesday July 26	51	17	16	84
Saturday July 30	50	31	65	146
Total Permits: (each type):	202	56	147	

	Transactions Total:	Payment Total:
Tuesday July 25	80	\$19,340
Wednesday July 26	59	\$10,360
Saturday July 30	81	\$12,060
Total:	220	\$41,760

Current Total of Zone M Permits Sold

16/17	
Type	Total Permits:
Business	4445
Resident	4143
Guest	1356
Total Permits	9944

17/18	
Type	Total Permits:
Business	1777
Resident	1435
Total Permits	3212

17/18	
Zone M Permit Costs	Total Permits:
\$180 permit	2972
\$60 permit (low income provision)	409
Total Permits	3381