

NW Parking SAC | Friendly House
May 16, 2018 | 1737 NW 26th Ave.
4:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m. | Portland, OR 97210

Meeting Notes

Members in Attendance

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

PBOT Staff

Chris Armes, Antonina Pattiz, Jay Rogers

NW SAC Liaison

Kathryn Doherty Chapman

Public in Attendance

Sam Bailey, Allan Classen, Tom Ford, Michael Lilly, Piseth Pich, Keith Schwartz, Aleck Woogmaster

Welcome

Rick Michaelson calls the meeting to order at 4:10pm and invites public comment.

No comments made.

Chris introduces Kathryn Doherty-Chapman as the NW Parking District liaison. Kathryn will be working with the NW SAC and PBOT to help better manage parking in NW.

Vote on 2018-19 Permit Changes:

Rick asks if any of the SAC members would like to alter the proposed changes for next permit year or make a motion to approve the changes.

Karen makes a motion to adopt the 2018-19 permit changes as previously recommended.

Don: "What are we voting on? There's confusion in the wording. I haven't seen anything that changed the wording from last time when there seemed to be some confusion from the public. I thought we were going to clean something up, but I forget exactly what it was."

Peter also recalls hearing a comment from a member of the public but says that the proposal makes sense to him. He makes a point of clarification about permit renewals. If a current resident has 2, 3 or 4 permits, they would be able to renew "up to" what they had in 2017-18; they would not be able to obtain additional permits. He says that the first sentence in the proposal covers that.¹

Don: "That makes sense to me."

Peter says that he would like language added to the proposal that outlines the committee's research/data collection efforts for the 2019-20 permit year. The committee is collecting data for the following efforts:

- 1. Inventorying curb cuts in NW

¹ Proposed Changes for 2018-19

- 2. Incentivizing off-street parking for new construction buildings
- 3. Quantifying off-street parking options.

Don: "I think adding studying single family residential and off-street parking that already exists, and its utilization, like the Toronto plan we were talking about with Rick (from Rick Williams Consulting) so that we can get a better handle on what we have in terms of the programs."

Rick points out that that information is included in the workplan.

Karen says she's reluctant to make additional at this time because she doesn't want it to be incomplete, she says that she doesn't want people to assume it's the only thing the SAC is looking at. She says the committee needs to re-visit the workplan.

Mark agrees and encourages the members to review the meeting notes from the public meeting so that the members can start working on the concerns expresses. He doesn't think it's appropriate to modify the proposed changes.

Peter says he's fine with that but he wants there to be a general understanding that inventorying off-street spaces is the route the SAC is going.

Rick says he will work with staff to circulate a list of all discussion point and create meeting agendas to ensure issues are addressed.

Tom says that his main concern is how long it takes to collect and analyze data. He asks if there's a way of adding a timeline to the meeting notes.

Rick explains that the goal before the 2019-20 permit year is to have off-street data completed.

Nick asks about a timeline for the decision-making process for the following year.

Rick explains that any decisions made for the following permit year must be adopted by May of the previous year to ensure there is enough time to notify applicants of the changes. Ideally, a draft proposal will be ready in March, a public meeting held in April and the changes would be voted on in May. Things like format changes are not on a rigid schedule and tend to occur once a calendar year.

Nick asks if March is a realistic deadline to collect off-street data for the 2019-20 permit year.

Rick says he will work on an exact timeline with Kathryn.

Karen suggest creating a list of tasks, prioritizing the list and figuring out what needs to be done and then figuring out the exact schedule.

Don "I think what Peter was saying is looking at how to create incentives for people that actually include off-street parking as part of the multi-family project rather than, right now there is no incentive at all. In fact, there's a disincentive because they don't know what kind of permits they're going to get and there's no tie relative to the number of permits you're going to get versus are you or aren't you going to provide parking and how much will you provide? There needs to something there that incents them to do that."

Karen adds that looking at ways to incentive those who have off-street parking to utilize those spaces, rather than having them sit vacant.

Don:” I don’t know if, per code, some apartment buildings that has off-street parking can rent parking to somebody who lives blocks away.”

Chris says that renting parking spaces to tenants of other buildings is possible because of the shared parking code change that was done. She adds that she asked Rick Williams Consulting (RWC) to put together a methodology on how to collect off-street data in NW so that the SAC and PBOT can get a handle on the inventory; that process is starting soon.

Rick asks for all in favor of adopting the proposed changes as the new rules for the 2018-19 permit year.
Unanimous approval to adopt all the proposed changes for the 2018-19 permit year.

Rick mentions that there are people on the waiting list because of the current cap. He asks if the cap should remain in effect through the end of the permit year.

Jeanne recommends keeping the cap as-is for the remainder of the permit year.

A member of the public believes that the cap should be lifted because it causes an inconvenience in people’s lives.

Don: “I have to agree with that.”

Karen believes that the rules going forward should be based on the 2018-19 rules. If someone owns two cars, they should be following the new rules (being restricted to one permit).

Chris points out that current waitlisted applicants might still be on a waitlist in the new permit year, depending on the age of their building.

Mark asks how people on the waitlist assimilate to the cap.

Antonina explains that, for the most part, people don’t reach out after the temporary permit expires, apart from checking in on the status. When a permit becomes available and applicants are notified, she asks what they did for parking. Oftentimes residents park in private lots, however, they would like to get a parking permit because it’s so much cheaper.

Peter wonders what will happen when everyone learns about the new rules – will residents rush out and get additional permits? Maybe a resident wants an additional car later in the year, what if they buy a permit in advance before the restrictions?

Antonina explains that vehicle registration is required in order to apply for a permit.

Rick concludes that the cap will stay in place until the permit year expires.

Chris adds that the renewal notice will be mailed out mid-July, the changes will be applied then. She asks if the committee would like to maintain the opt-out option for the next permit year.

Rick confirms that an opt-out option will be provided for residents that choose to not renew permits.

Discuss Format Changes:

Rick directs the discussion to on-street format changes. He asks if wrap around meter-only stalls should be converted to permit stalls or change the time stay.. He adds that some of those stalls are located in residential areas and don't have the desired effect.

Karen believes that some of those stalls should be converted. Looking at what "fronts" those stalls is important. She says that she does not know how many of those stalls are out there or what the conversion would/should be.

Mark asks if the consultant has any recommendations.

Rick explains that there isn't a clear recommendation at this time.

Karen recalls RWC acknowledging the vacancy rates in those stalls being too low.

Chris explains that RWC looked at the occupancy rates for wrap-around spaces to see how many had relatively low occupancy rates. RWC can provide a proposal based on data and recommend locations where those spaces can be reformatted. Chris adds that RWC took data by for individual stalls.

Rick asks when that recommendation will be ready.

Chris explains that Rick and Owen are out of town; PBOT would look to RWC for those recommendations at the next SAC meeting.

Rick says the committee will wait on data from RWC prior to making a decision. He asks if the SAC should delay discussing reformatting the 30-minute stalls until the next meeting.

Jeanne says that the data for the 30-minute stalls will be site-specific, so it is worthwhile to wait on the data.

Rick says that good data is not available for the 30-minute stalls because 30-minutes is too short to catch users. He wonders if vehicle counter strips can be installed to survey the number of vehicles going in and out of those spots.

Rick says that it would be a sampling. If any stalls are changed to 15-minute load/unload, counters should be included there as well.

Tom asks how many 30-minute stalls are in NW.

Chris answers that there are 83 30-minute spaces and 18 15-minute spaces.

Peter asks if the SAC has the ability to fluctuate rates within the district.

Chris answers that rates are based on the meter and currently there isn't an ability to change the hourly rate.

Peter suggests playing with meter pricing to disincentives visitors from parking in residential areas by making parking more expensive on residential streets than on 21st/23rd Avenues.

Rick says that the committee will wait on the data from RWC about the wrap around and 30-minute stalls. In general, there seems to be support for increasing the "by permit" spaces as long as they are not interfering with business needs.

Tom believes that 30 minutes stalls are being used to double-park, he hardly sees anyone park in those stalls.

Rick says he would like to see more data before making a decision.

Don: "From what I heard at that public meeting, I would say 50% of the comments were about the Timbers. What concerns me is that we have heard nothing from the Timber organization or our liaison. And I think it's incredibly important that we do, given that 50% of the comments were about the Timbers. We're flying blind a little bit."

Karen mentions that the last time Ron spoke to the NWDA board, the board said they would not approve an agreement until there's a valid Comprehensive Transportation Management Plan (CTMP). The Timbers are supposed to have a CTMP that gets adopted by City Council before they can open the stadium and they're not working on it.

Jeanne explains that Ron was at the last transportation meeting and he said that the Timbers are working on a long list of options for making changes that would accommodate the 4000 new attendees so that there would be no net gain in people coming by car. Ron said the list is long and they're exploring all sorts of options for more off-street parking. They can't dwindle the list down just yet because they want to have flexibility in case an option doesn't work. They're also working with TriMet to get more trains on game days because every train is full after the game. Additionally, they're looking at things like church parking lots, shuttle opportunities and more bike parking.

Rick asks if Ron should be on the agenda for the next meeting to discuss the plan in more depth.

Karen recommends asking Ron to invite a subject matter expert on the Timber's plan.

Rick says that time will be devoted at the next meeting to talk about the Timbers.

Tom points out that the Timbers have been working with Legacy but there hasn't been any feedback. He adds that a Good Neighbor Agreement might not be sufficient for the stadium expansion, there needs to be something that resembles an actual contract.

Mark mentions that Ron has reached out to the Flanders Professional Building because it is now part of the Shared Parking Program to discuss options for Timbers parking. Additionally, Ron has reached out to TriMet (Timbers?) in an effort to set up a contract to lock in spots on a contractual basis for Timbers games.

Tom wonders how much pressure the committee should place on the Timbers.

Dan suggests attending Timbers meetings with Ron.

Karen agrees that pressure should be applied.

Rick mentions that another issue brought up at the public meeting was expanding meters in the district. He recommends creating a proposal of how that should be done. He adds that the proposal to split the district into two is a much bigger task and not something the SAC is ready for this year, but it might be something to consider next year. He asks for the committee's input.

Dan recalls that one of the messages from RWC was that metered zones are better enforced than signed zones. It's worth expanding the metered district to improve enforcement.

Jeanne points out that if the meters go up to 24th, it's only one big block. She lives on 25th where there are no meters and there's always a few spaces available. It seems to be a different situation than in other parts of the district.

Rick suggests getting the occupancy rate for the Western edge from RWC.

Mark says that he would like to get public input on the decision to expand the meter district. He asks if Jeanne would like the area near her home metered.

Jeanne answers that she doesn't have a strong opinion one way or the other. She adds that it makes sense to have the whole district metered because if there are meters everywhere the rules will be consistent for everyone. She mentions that she sometimes sees commercial vehicles (business owned vans and cars with logos) parked in the area. In that scenario, it would make sense to meter the entire area.

Karen agrees that there were concerns about enforcement. NW needs better enforcement; there is a big difference between violation rates in metered vs. non-metered areas. She is for meter expansion because consistency is better.

Rick asks if the committee should hold another public meeting to determine public interest in meter expansion. He says that there are different situations and they need to be looked at differently - the area West of 23rd Ave is 90% residential, the area East of 20th is 50% business and 50% residential. The area East of 20th may be better for 2-hour meters rather than 4-hour meters.

Tom asks about the meter-expansion process.

Chris explains that a letter would be mailed to affected residents about the meter expansion and once the exact locations are determined, a letter will be sent to inform residents of the specific locations.

Karen asks if the plan is to only meter West of 24th.

Rick says the committee should consider metering East of 20th. He asks if there should be different types of meters in different areas.

Tom asks if data is available from RWC to guide the decision.

Karen says that the members need to see the data because there are some commercial areas in the signed zone and they're not as consistent as 21st/23rd. She asks if some areas should be restricted to meter only.

Chris explains that the decision to leave time-stays was to provide for the short-term turnover in that area. It's not in the permit area because business owners called before the expansion and requested time stays to better support their business.

Mark comments that the outreach is laborious. He pictures Kathryn meeting with business owners to garner feedback.

Rick says that's a good idea and there's not that many spaces. Getting input from businesses in addition to the data is a good metric. He asks Kathryn when she will be starting.

Kathryn answers that she will start June 14th.

Peter asks about the annexation process.

Jay explains that there is a petition from the neighbors and then a ballot. 50% of ballots have to be returned and 60% must be in favor of the annexation. PBOT can annex one block face at a time.

Rick asks if there are other issues that came up at the public meeting that should be discussed.

Karen suggests having the members review the minutes from the public meeting.

Rick explains that some members of the committee have surveyed stalls in the neighborhood that are currently no parking for no known reason. He says that the members should give those maps to Kathryn and she will go over them with PBOT staff and probably walk the neighborhood with traffic engineers to see which spaces can be converted to parking stalls.

Rick concludes the meeting and asks for additional public comments, if any.

Public Comment:

A member of the public mentions that he lives between 21st and 22nd on Northrup Street and often sees vehicles parked inefficiently. Is it possible to paint hash marks on the street?

Mark explains that if spaces are painted on the streets, they must be painted to accommodate the largest vehicles. In doing so, parking spaces are greatly reduced per block.

Rick adds that some specific areas can be reviewed to see if hash marks might help.

A member of the public asks about quality of life improvements for residents of the neighborhood due to the permit surcharge.

Mark explains that the committee has received funds but has not made decisions on how to spend the funds yet. He asks for public input on how the funding should be spent; he says the committee is happy to hear feedback. Price is being used as a method to alleviate the parking problem in the neighborhood.

Rick says that funds will be used to install better lighting for pedestrians and adds that recommendations for how to spend the funds are coming in from other committees and associations.

Karen says that the funds were used to subsidize the Transportation Wallet – which has received a lot of positive feedback. She thinks the committee should start devoting time to discuss funding.

Jeanne says that there are things that are in design but not visible yet. The SAC is looking at ways to make the busiest intersections (21st/Glisan and 23rd/Glisan) safer for pedestrians. As new development comes online, the SAC asked the City to ensure they were including improvements consistent with the SAC's goals – like putting curb extensions in and pedestrian scale lighting. The outcome of the NW in Motion Project is a prioritized list that PBOT has pre-approved, the SAC can then start projects.

Rick adds that funds will be used to install better lighting for pedestrians.

New Business:

Tom asks about the status of MLC.

Don: “I want to resurrect our supply committee for next month, so I’m going to email you relevant times for you and Kathryn and give Chris or Antonina could send it out to the rest of the committee once we get a date figured out, so anyone could come in and join the supply subcommittee. Two things I’d really like to focus on at this meeting was the MLC, just like Tom was talking about. And the other is taking and running your idea about the system because we can make a lot of impact on a lot of people and quality of life.”

Karen adds that the SAC is using funds to get off-street lots up and running because it’s too expensive for a lot of people to get pay stations for private lots. She adds that she would like to see the TDM subcommittee re-started.

Meeting adjourned.