

NW Parking SAC
Wednesday, April 18, 2018
4:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

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

Meeting Notes

Members in Attendance

Dan Anderson, Tavo Cruz, Nick Fenster, Jeanne Harrison, Karen Karlsson, Rick Michaelson (Chair), Thomas Ranieri, Peter Rose, Mark Stromme

PBOT Staff

Chris Armes, Antonina Pattiz, Jay Rogers

Consultants in Attendance

Rick Williams

Public in Attendance

Allen Classen

Welcome & Public Comment

Rick Michaelson calls the meeting to order at 4:00 pm. He welcomes Lisa Higgins to the committee – she was nominated to be a member but has not officially applied yet.

Funding Legacy's Pay Station

Rick asks the committee to officially vote on funding a pay station for Legacy's approved shared parking lot at 942 NW 22ND Ave.

Karen makes a motion to approve funding of up to \$10,000 to go towards purchasing a pay station for Legacy Good Samaritan's approved shared parking lot.

Tom seconds the motion.

Chris asks for clarification – is the motion approving funding pay stations for Legacy or everyone applying for the Shared Parking program? Additionally, is the \$10,000 for one pay station maximum, or up to \$10,000 per each pay station, if Legacy chooses to get more than one?

Rick answers that the motion is for one pay station, specifically for Legacy.

Nick asks if there a precedent being set that everyone applying for shared parking would get funding for a pay station. He asks if there should there be a threshold of the number of stalls being offered.

Rick answers that each shared parking lot application will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. He says it's a valid question and should be considered on a case-by-case basis.

There is unanimous approval to fund one pay station (up to \$10,000) for Legacy's shared parking lot at 942 NW 22nd Ave.

Propose 2019 Zone M Changes

Rick reminds the committee that a public meeting will be held Tuesday, May 1, 2018 to get neighborhood input/feedback on the proposed permit changes for next year. He explains the importance of proposing and voting on changes at this meeting. He recalls the committee being supportive of a permit system that limits permits by address and individual.

Karen asks if the choice is between keeping the current system (restricting permits for larger buildings), or moving to the new proposal of limiting permits by unit/individual.

Rick confirms that those are the two choices.

Karen says she does not have a preference.

Rick suggests keeping restrictions on buildings that received certificates of occupancy after 2012. He says that the buildings built in the last ten years have parking offered to them – it might be better to keep them under a restriction for the next year while the SAC tries to better manage parking. He recommends a .6 cap on any residential building built between 01/01/2012 - 08/31/2017 and a .4 cap on any residential buildings built 09/01/2017 and after.

Nick asks why those buildings should be treated differently.

Rick explains that an option previously discussed was reducing permits based on the number of off-street parking spaces available. Rather than lifting the cap/restriction this year and then re-enforcing it again the next year, it would be better to keep rules consistent.

Peter asks what percentage of parking spaces newer buildings (with first-floor retail space) reserve specifically for customers.

Jeanne answers zero.

Rick says visitors would be using the on-street parking meters.

Peter asks if the idea is to have visitors park on the street and reduce the amount of permits available to the business.

Rick believes that's a starting point and says the new staff person will be working with individual building managers and finding solutions that will meet their needs and the SAC's needs. The goal is to make it easier for customers to come to the neighborhood, which means on-street parking should be made available to them in many places.

Rick refers to the handout¹ and opens the discussion about limiting permits per address. There are two options:

1. Limit of one parking permit per address
 - o Exceptions available (via vehicle necessity self-certification form) for up to two additional permits per unit/address for work, school and volunteering.

¹ Proposed Zone M Changes for 2019

Result: Reduction of 3 permits based on current number of permits in Zone M. If the current waitlist (24) people purchase permits this would result in 21 more permits in the system.

2. Limit of two parking permits per address

Result: Reduction of 76 permits based on current number of permits in Zone M. If the current waitlist people (24) purchase permits this would result in 52 less permits in the system.

Karen mentions that the vehicle necessity self-certification form should not be a simple “yes” or “no” checkbox. It should encourage people to think about if they actually need a car. Additionally, if permits are limited to one per individual, how would the SAC ensure honesty? For instance, if a resident wants permits for both of their personal cars and says that one of the cars belongs to his younger daughter, would he be eligible for a second permit? Would we require the daughter's driver's license?

Dan asks if it's possible to request supporting documentation. For instance, requiring tax returns to qualify for the low-income permit rate.

Chris explains that PBOT does not want to collect sensitive/confidential information from applicants.

Rick suggest adding language that reads "if the information you submit is found to be incorrect, your permit will be revoked."

Tom asks if that's possible.

Jay confirms and says that if the language on the application clearly states the rules, it would be possible to revoke a permit because of misinformation/abuse.

Karen asks if additional documentation should be requested from applicants.

Chris explains that currently applicants must provide proof of residency and vehicle registration.

Karen asks what would happen if she provides proof for two cars.

Chris asks if the vehicle necessity exception allows three permits per person or per address.

Rick answers that the three-permit cap applies to units.

Karen asks how the SAC could distinguish the difference between a resident who owns two cars on their own and a resident who owns two cars but one is for his daughter who drives to school.

Mark says that if the daughter has a driver's license, she should be able to get a parking permit in her name.

Karen suggests asking if the applicant is the primary driver and getting a copy of a valid driver's license.

Rick asks Karen to work with PBOT staff to discuss application details.

Based on discussions, Rick believes the committee is more comfortable with option one.

Nick asks if the "results" calculation assumes that all residents will be requesting exceptions. If so, is it a reasonable assumption?

Rick confirms the assumption, he says the SAC cannot know with certainty if it is accurate because there's no way of knowing. If the changes for the upcoming permit year result in a net increase of permits, the committee will need to be doubly careful the year after.

Peter asks if the people of the waitlist are eligible for permits.

Rick answers yes and explains that the cap is the only reason they are unable to obtain a permit.

Nick asks if the SAC should be liberal with exemptions if they choose option one. Option two sets a hard cap of two permits per unit, but option one limits permits to one per unit but with exemptions, it's actually a limit of three. He asks if there could be a middle ground – such as limiting permits to one per address and offering only one exception for a second permit.

Karen expresses concern with a hard limit of two permits per address. She knows people that live in the neighborhood who rent out three rooms to three individual people and no parking is offered. Renting out rooms is the way some people pay for their homes.

Rick asks if anyone is in favor of option two.

Nick says he is in favor of option two and adds that the goal for next year is to reduce the number of permits issued. He adds that, option two might not be the exact mechanism for the desired change, but an option akin to option two, like a hybrid, might work.

Chris points out that changes could occur through attrition. Current residents will have the option to renew any/all permits issued in 2017-18.

Rick mentions that pricing could work in collaboration with limits to reduce permits.

Karen agrees and adds that there could be some sort of hybrid between options one and two. The hybrid would rely on cost. For example, the first two permits cost \$180, the third permit would be more expensive.

Rick says there are two options for pricing:

1. Keep all permits at \$180
2. Ad address can purchase more than one permit at a tiered price (\$180 for first permit, \$270 for second permit, \$360 for third permit, etc.)

Jeanne says the suggested tiered pricing is not reflective of the market rate. She believes that the price for the third permit should be higher.

Mark suggests, for an individual purchasing more than one permit, doubling the cost for the second permit to \$360 and tripling the cost of the third permit. He doesn't think tiered pricing should apply per unit.

Karen outlines a scenario where three roommates each have a vehicle. Does each roommate pay \$180 or should they be charged differently?

Mark believes they should all pay the same price for a permit, However, an individual with more than one car should be charged differently.

Rick thinks that, by limiting permits to one per licensed driver, some married couples will re-register the vehicle to two separate individuals.

Nick asks about the fee of re-registering in Oregon.

Dan says the fee for changing a name on vehicle registration is about \$100.

Rick suggest a scenario – two roommates share an apartment. One can certify that they need a car and the second cannot. Would the second person (who can't certify the necessity of the car) be charged a higher rate?

Chris points out that the roommates could apply in opposite order – the one that needs the car would apply after the one that doesn't.

Rick says that proposing a separate rate for a non-essential vehicle seems too complicated.

Nick says the goal is to discourage someone from parking more than one car on the street. The exception is intended for a separate individual in the same address needing a permit for their car, not for one individual to get two permits. He suggests denying an individual's request for a second permit.

Chris says that Karen's scenario suggests that if an individual wants to get permits for two cars, they should be able to.

Karen says yes, but the second permit would be at a higher cost.

Marks suggests keeping permits the same cost for different individuals at the same residence.

Jeanne comments that, if there are three roommates in an apartment, they can total the price of all three permits and split it equally between themselves.

Peter points out that permits are non-transferable. If a roommate moves away, they would have to be bought out.

Mark expresses hesitations with the language of "one permit per address." He suggests rewording it to something along the lines of "one permit per individual with a maximum of three per address."

Karen says the committee is trying to deal with the equity issue. If there's a hard cap of one per address, roommates/couples are restricted to one permit.

Rick reiterates what he believes he heard- every unit gets one permit and a second/third permit needs to be justified in some manner.

Karen says that there need to be other licensed drivers in the household using those cars and those individuals must claim that those cars are needed.

Rick points out that there would still be a hard limit of three permits per unit.

Tavo suggests changing the exception by requiring evidence of an additional licensed driver, as opposed to self-certifying the necessity of the vehicle.

Karen likes the idea, but would still like to get information from applicants about why they need their cars.

Nick summarizes that there will be a limit of three permits per address and every permit requires a valid driver's license.

Rick asks if the committee wants to introduce tiered pricing.

Nick believes that if permits are tied to unique licensed drivers, the permits should be the same cost for each individual in a unit.

Mark agrees and recommends keeping permits at \$180 for individuals. However, if an individual applies for more than one permit, they should be subject to tiered pricing.

Nick points out that every permit requires a unique driver's license so an individual would not be eligible for a second permit, even at a higher price.

Jeanne suggests no more than 2 permits per person, priced at \$180 each, or \$360 for the second permit. She adds that the max number of permits issued to an address cannot exceed three permits.

Nick asks what the compelling reason is for an individual to have two cars on the street.

Karen suggests a scenario where she works as a landscaper and owns a truck for work and a personal vehicle.

Jeanne points out that some residents have a car and motorcycle. PBOT should not be making judgement calls about valid/compelling reasons to own a second car.

Nick says that the space on the street is more valuable than increased permit surcharge revenue. The goal is to reduce permits. In an effort to be fair to everyone, the most obvious place to start would be curbing individuals with multiple vehicles.

Karen says she agrees with that idea in the long run, but changes need to occur step by step. Until there are alternative options for people to park their cars off street, the rules will be creating a class of people who can only own one car.

Rick says that he would like the neighborhood to appear inviting for individuals that choose not to have cars in addition to those with cars.

Chris remind the SAC that all changes can occur through attrition. The rules would not change on residents who currently live here and have more than one car. New residents to the district would have access to the rules and regulations before making a decision to move into the neighborhood.

Karen says that is a good reminder. She mentions that she doesn't want to punish people that have two cars.

Rick explains that there are two options

- 1 permit per person for new residents to the neighborhood
- 2 permits per person, but the second permit is double the cost of the first. Maximum of two permits per person.

Rick asks who is in favor of limiting permits to one per person for new residents.

6 in favor, Karen votes no.

Antonina asks about the price of the second and third permits.

Rick answers that the second permit would be \$360, third permit and more would cost \$540.

Chris confirms what she heard:

- Regarding limits: Anyone with a permit in 2017-18 would keep their permit, and if they have multiple permits, they would be able to renew all of them, at a tiered price. Residents who move in/zapply September 1, 2018 or after would only be able to get one permit per licensed driver, with a maximum cap of 3 permits per address.
- Regarding pricing: permits are \$180 per person; existing residents can renew multiple permits at a tiered price.

Mark suggests an example where a couple moves into an apartment in a new construction building. Each of them should be able to get a permit and each permit would cost \$180, no certification required.

Karen says that every time someone applies for a permit, they should provide vehicle registration, a license, reason for needing a car and proof of residence.

Dan points out that off-street parking is an option for new residents with more than one car.

Mark suggests adding a requirement so that if a resident applies for a second permit, they need to certify that they don't have off-street parking available to them at that address.

Rick likes the idea but adds that it is complicated and will require a lot of work at this time.

Mark mentions that there has been no discussion about changing the base permit rate. He asks if the \$60 low income price the right price for this year or if it should be raised to \$90.

Nick asks what the argument is for the price increase.

Mark says \$90 is half of \$180, it would be fairer.

Karen says that a lot of people live paycheck to paycheck. They could come up with a one-time payment of \$60, but paying more than that might not be possible. However, offering residents the option to pay monthly would make it more manageable. She asks when an online system is expected.

Chris answers that PBOT is working on an online permit system. However, testing would start in a smaller zone so that if there are mistakes, it'd be easier to manage and learn prior to implementing in a larger zone like M.

Karen wants to leave the base permit price as is until a monthly payment system is set up.

Chris asks if new buildings should be restricted to .4 permits per number of units in the building.

Rick suggests that new buildings that came on-line September 1, 2017 or after should be restricted to .4 and buildings that came on-line 01/01/2012 - 08/31/18 will be restricted to .6.

Jeanne believes that a restriction on buildings has to remain in order for permits to be reduced.

Chris says that off-street parking will be taken into the consideration next year. She adds that there are essentially two separate restrictions:

- Restrictions on buildings based on when they came online
- Maximum of three permits per address for any building 2012 and older

Tom asks where the 2012 date came from.

Rick explains 2012 is officially “post-recession” when things started picking up. Rick is open to a different year.

Nick asks if there is legal guidance from the City that this is okay to do.

Chris answers that the recommendation will be sent to the Attorney. The previous system restricted buildings based on size, not year.

Antonina reiterates what she heard:

- New residents that move in September 1, 2018 and after are limited to one permit per person with a hard cap of three permits per unit. All permits are \$180.
- Tiered pricing applies to all current permit holders: 1st permit \$180, 2nd permit \$360, 3+ permit = \$540.

RW- You were so close to the ideal number of permits. With the formatting changes and the inventory collection for the 2019-20 permit year, I think we can make an even better decision.

Karen- what info would be beneficial to get from residents. Are there a series of questions that might help us make better-informed decisions? I’d love that information, I’m not sure how to ask those questions.

RW- Are those questions going to be asked on the renewal form?

Karen confirms.

RW- Let us think about it. You don’t want to make the renewal too long.

Rick continues to page two of the handout. He explains that the business permit FTE is currently .8. Reducing the FTE to .7 would not have a large impact on smaller businesses but would save permits on big businesses. Of the 3,400 permits issued, only 700-800 were observed during peak hour. He asks if anyone is in favor of reducing the FTE for the next year.

Jeanne points out that the FTE has been at .8 for one year and should be reduced over time, but it doesn’t make sense to reduce it every year.

Tom points out that business float is high. He believes that, as long as the level of usage remains low, the current .8 FTE is appropriate.

Nick says that, given the size of float observed, reducing the FTE to .75 wouldn’t have much impact other than upsetting businesses.

Rick thinks that the FTE should remain at .8 for 2018-19.

There is a consensus to continue with .8 FTE for 2018-19

New Business

Tom asks about the status of the NW SAC new hire.

Chris answers that a candidate has been selected and the anticipated start day is in May. The hope is that the new hire will attend the later May meeting.

Tom asks about the status of the Legacy agreement.

Chris answers that Legacy is reviewing the agreement drafted by the City Attorney. PBOT is waiting on Legacy's feedback.

Meeting adjourned.

Attachment A

2019 RESIDENTIAL PERMITS

Recommendation is to reduce the permit number by 325 based on 2017 data collection.

Current permit allocation by address:

Addresses with 4 permits: 3

Addresses with 3 permits: 73

Addresses with 2 permits: 501

Addresses with 1 permit: 2,386

2018/2019 Permit Year – Starting September 1, 2018

- Anyone who currently has a permit would keep their permit. The limit/reduction to residential permits would occur by attrition.
- Continue the new building restriction: .4 permits per unit

Options for Reduction of Residential Permits

3. Limit of one parking permit per address
 - Exceptions available (via vehicle necessity self-certification form) for up to two additional permits per unit/address for work, school and volunteering.

Result: Reduction of 3 permits based on current number of addresses with 4+ permits. If the current waitlist (24) people purchase permits this would result in 21 more permits in the system.

4. Limit of two parking permits per address

Result: Reduction of 76 permits based on current number of addresses with 3+ permits. If the current waitlist (24) people purchase permits this would result in 52 less permits in the system.

Pricing Options for Residential permits

New Residents:

1. All permits cost the same \$180
2. An address can purchase more than one permit at a tiered price
 - 1st permit \$180, 2nd permit \$270
 - If an individual applies for more than one permit, they cannot self-certify as low income for any vehicles.

Existing Residential Permit Holders:

1. All permits cost the same \$180
2. An existing resident can renew any permit issued in 2017-2018 at a tiered price
 - 1st permit \$180, 2nd permit \$270, 3rd permit \$360, 4th permit \$450
 - If an individual applies for more than one permit, they cannot self-certify as low income for any vehicles.

2019 BUSINESS PERMITS

Zone M Business with Highest Number of Permit

<u>Business</u>	Current FTE	Current Permits	.8 FTE	.75 FTE	Permit Reduction Based on Current Number Purchased	.8 FTE	.7 FTE	Permit Reduction Based on Current Number Purchased
Business1	564	300	451	423	0	451	395	0
Business 2	137	110	110	103	7	110	96	14
Business 3	110	88	88	83	5	88	77	11
Business 4	92	60	74	69	0	74	64	0
Business 5	1385	59	1108	1039	0	1108	970	0
Business 6	63	50	50	47	2	50	44	5
Business 7	54	44	43	41	3	43	38	6
Business 8	66	43	53	50	0	53	46	0
Business 9	146	41	117	110	0	117	102	0
Business 10	44	36	35	33	3	35	31	5
Business 11	165	35	132	124	0	132	116	0
TOTAL					20			41

<u>Business</u>	Current FTE	Current Permits	.8 FTE	.75 FTE	.7 FTE
Business with 50 employees	50	N/A	40	38	35
Business with 40 employees	40	N/A	32	30	28
Business with 30 employees	30	N/A	24	23	21
Business with 20 employees	20	N/A	16	15	14

Based on current permit issuance to the 11 businesses with most permits:

- Reducing FTE to .75 would result in a reduction of 20 permits
- Reducing FTE to .7 would result in a reduction of 41 permits

Reducing FTE to .75 would not have a strong impact on smaller businesses:

10 Employees	20 Employees	50 Employees	100 Employees
.8 FTE = 8 permits	.8 FTE = 16 permits	.8 FTE = 40 permits	.8 FTE = 80 permits
.75 FTE = 8 permits	.75 FTE = 15 permits	.75 FTE = 38 permits	.75 FTE = 75 permits
.7 FTE = 7 permits	.7 FTE = 14 permits	.7 FTE = 35 permits	.7 FTE = 70 permits