

NW Parking SAC
Tuesday, April 4, 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, Karen Karlsson, Rick Michaelson (Chair), Thomas Ranieri, Phil Selinger, Don Singer, Mark Stromme, Ron Walters

PBOT Staff

Chris Armes, Scott Cohen, Sarah Goforth, Jay Rogers, Lynda Viray, Antonina Zaytseva

Welcome & Public Comment

Rick opened the meeting by briefing the audience about the Northwest Parking District Stakeholder Advisory Committee's (SAC) objectives and clarifying the current anticipated changes for the next permit year.

- The proposed permit rate for next year will be \$180.
- The proposed \$120 surcharge from the permit rate excluding the \$60 administration fee will return to the NW neighborhood in transportation programs and projects.
- There will be an exemption for low-income residents similar to the Central Eastside Industrial District based on qualifying documents: Home Forward, HUD, Social Security Disability, SNAP
- The lottery system is a misunderstanding. Everyone who currently has a permit by August 1st, is automatically eligible to renew for the next permit year.
- There are 9,000+ permits issued and only 4,500¹ spaces available. PBOT and the SAC are working towards promoting the recently available [shared parking program](#).
- The goal of the [NW District Parking Management Plan](#) is to use the system as efficiently as possible because on-street parking is a scarce resource and needs to be used appropriately for customers to shop, employees to travel to work, and residents to own a car and live in the NW.
- The SAC is working towards implementing the plan and managing the on-street system based on best practices and data with the help of consultants and PBOT staff.

After stating the objectives, Rick opened the floor for questions from the public.

Public Questions:

Q1: Are there any plans to make developers more responsible when they build units without parking?

The SAC went to City Council last year and asked the City to require that parking be required for new buildings with an exemption for low income housing. City Council unanimously voted not to require

¹ The 2016 NW Parking Data Summary & Permit Evaluation states that total number of parking stalls in the NW parking district is 5,264 (metered and permit stalls)

parking for new buildings. The SAC encouraged the public who believe the NW District needs more parking to write to City Council as it is anticipated the problem may worsen.

Q2: You mentioned that anyone who currently holds a permit won't have it revoked. With 9,000 permits issued and only 4,500² spots, how would that happen?

Attrition and adjusting the ratio of permits to employees. The SAC is looking into the possibility of issuing permits for 0.6 of units. Also, the [shared parking program](#) is anticipated to help with the disparity.

Q3: I read that only 1 permit would be issued per address, is that true?

This was an option that has been discussed. There have been a couple of proposals: 1 permit per address, 2 permits per address, and tiered pricing. It's a challenging issue because for example you could have 3 roommates sharing a 2-bedroom apartment and they all work in different places.

Q4: Where does the other 49% of revenue go?

The parking meter program is a long established City program (since 1996) wherein 49% of meter revenue goes to the City General Fund and 51% goes back to the neighborhood. The permit program is separate from the meter program. With the permit program, 100% of the surcharge will remain in the neighborhood.

Q5: Can you define affordable housing?

An individual reliant on Home Forward, HUD, Social Security Disability, SNAP. The SAC is looking at other ways to define affordable housing.

Q6: In terms of Zone M expansion, are there plans to expand the zone west of 25th avenue without petition?

No, as this requires those in that area to petition.

Public Comment

Rick opened the floor for public comment and concerns; residents expressed the following concerns:

1. Parking enforcement is lacking in the neighborhood.
2. Parking during Timbers' game days is frustrating, as most spots are occupied by fans.
 - Ron informed all present that the Timbers plan to expand the stadium by 4,000 seats, an oversight committee has convened and there is a good neighborhood agreement in place to minimize the impact on the neighborhood.
3. If I want to be grandfathered in, but do not have a permit currently, can I get one?
 - Yes.

² The 2016 NW Parking Data Summary & Permit Evaluation states that total number of parking stalls in the NW parking district is 5,264 (metered and permit stalls)

4. What are you using as a factor to increase parking rates so significantly?
 - The pricing was discussed in detail and proposed fees varied dramatically, from \$25 to \$400. The SAC focused on \$300 because that is currently the maximum permit fee in Portland, and in the Central Eastside Industrial District.
5. A member of the public expressed frustration of single family households that have 4 cars and/or people that own cars that take up 2 parking spaces. To price fairly, this person requested the SAC would consider looking at the Kelly Blue Book value of cars and making the fee a percentage of the cars value.
6. It doesn't seem like low income people are being considered. This is a big jump and it is not incremental. By increasing the price incrementally, it would allow families and businesses to adjust and not be pushed out of the neighborhood.
7. In my building I would be forced to pay \$1,500 annually to park my car. A \$180 Zone M permit is a drop in the bucket compared to the \$1,500 annually I'd be paying otherwise. Until the permit fee is closer to market rate, I am okay with parking my car several blocks from home.
8. We are a long-established non-profit organization that serves the neighborhood. We buy 130 permits per year and the last two years we paid \$7,800. The new rate would put us at \$23,400. This is one more thing that is pushing us out of Portland.
9. I also work for a non-profit, if there was a way for us to get ½ permits or ¼ permits, that would be great. We're staffed by volunteers who come in for 4 hours shift. So even though our need seems inflated, it's not.
 - Phil commented that revenues received from the surcharge would support measures and programs to help people use alternative modes of getting around. If we want people to use their cars less, we must provide alternatives.
 - Karen commented that the neighborhood is challenged with parking as not all the permits are being used at the same time. The residential permits will require a different approach than the number of business permits.
10. I live in the neighborhood but I am not in Zone M, therefore, there is no permit needed to parking in my area and I cannot get parking. I tried to petition but people don't want to because they "want to hope they can find parking" or don't care enough to act. I want to be included in the zone. It's much harder to park in the neighborhood without a permit than with one.
11. New developments are a big part of the problem, is there any feasibility of transferring the burden unto developers?
 - Rick commented that the SAC is looking at limiting the number of permits for apartment buildings that have off-street parking but the spaces are empty. The SAC has gone to City Council requesting a requirement for developers to build parking.
 - Tavo commented that the SAC meetings are public but most people ignore what's going on until there's a hot-button issue that shows up in the NW Examiner or Facebook. Last year, the SAC went to City Council to ask them to implement parking minimums and very few people showed up other than Affordable Housing advocates. The advocates argument was that requiring developers to put in parking raised the cost of housing, thereby, creating problems with housing supply therefore, City Council was urged not to implement parking minimums because it increases the cost

of housing. The data that the SAC obtain did not support this affordable housing argument but the SAC were greatly outnumbered by the advocates. Tavo urged the public to come to the next parking minimums meeting and push back on the advocates logic.

12. Ron commented that he has been pushing to hold new developments without parking responsible. New development without parking should not receive permits. There is not only a gap between the number of permits issued and spots available, but the issuance is increasing by 300-400 permits per month. The cost should be pushed to the developers as this puts positive pressure on affordable housing because you're not forcing them to incur the cost of parking.
13. I hear a lot of people talking about businesses, but for the residents in the zone, seeing an increase from \$60 to \$300. Has anyone considered grandfathering us in? For people moving in that can afford these large apartments the \$300 wouldn't affect your income. But for some of us, it would.
 - Rick commented that he was not taking a stand for either side, but this is something worth considering. Is it fair to separate people that already live here and just charge new-comers?
 - Ron commented that he didn't view it as discriminatory. People moved into this neighborhood with an expectation to park their cars for \$60 annually. He is in favor of an increase going up a favorable amount as it's different if you're not here yet and have to make a decision to move into this neighborhood based on price.
14. How would you even go about limiting permits? Is it a lottery system? If it is a lottery system and one year I have a permit and I don't the next- how can I maintain continuity? I'm willing to fight for a spot. There's not enough off-street supply at the moment. If I need to find a parking garage, it's not going to exist. Changes to zoning laws are paramount. People that are moving into these new buildings are not low income. Unless the building provides low income housing- they shouldn't get any consideration at all.
 - Rick commented that the SAC does not anticipate a lottery system. The SAC are thinking of ways to incentivize people to turn in their permits in if they don't need them.
15. For people that have established routines that involving commuting by car, alternative modes of transportation might not be a viable option. As for visitors, what if we had a parking garage as an option?
 - Rick commented that increasing supply is our responsibility and we have looked at all of the options. Parking garages are very difficult to finance. The City is able to finance only through taxes and meter revenue. The neighborhood will need to fund and parking garages are expensive.
16. If you're going to limit the permits, maybe break it down into every 4 months, that way some permits will free up as people move out. There's a lot of minimum wage workers coming into work who would be negatively impacted by the increase. The wealthy people who live in this neighborhood are not the ones who will be serving food. I work at a restaurant on 23rd and I'm barely living paycheck to paycheck. You're going to lose a workforce as well as residents.
17. I've lived here for several years and have wondered why there hasn't been an increase to the permit fees. But why wasn't a 5% or 10% increase discussed? A 500% increase proposal is insulting and greedy.

- Rick commented that the SAC's proposal was never \$300 but \$180. The Northwest District Association (NWDA) had recommended \$300 at their last board meeting.
18. A sliding scale fee based on rent and property value would be a lot fairer than looking at SNAP or HUD. You have to earn less than \$1,200 a month to qualify for SNAP. I don't live in government-issued low income housing, but paying \$300 would be such an undue burden. Also, applying for HUD/SNAP takes so long I'm not sure that I would have the forms by August. I share a car with my husband, is there an incentive to promote sharing a vehicle? The problem will only get solved by fewer cars in the neighborhood.
 19. I have lived here for 8 years, I started a family here and my family needs two cars. The problem I have is that there's no good alternative- I can't go where I need to go easily. I think there needs to be some sort of importance to having alternatives. The closest garage to me is \$240 a month.
 - Phil commented that if you own a car and are parking on the street for \$60 annually then you're getting a benefit provided by the City that people without cars are not getting. He expressed that the SAC is trying to level the playing field so people who own cars are respecting the cost of parking. The raised cost will provide funding for alternative transportation incentives.
 20. Is there any way to automate the \$60 administration fee to make it lower?
 - Chris commented that the \$60 fee covers parking enforcement and the administration costs to issue the permits.
 21. When the zoning happened, the parking got a lot better on my street. I recommend split permit rules for residents and employees. Perhaps employees can get vouchers or discounted parking options? There's a lot of tweaks you can do to the current program without raising the fee.
 22. What are some of the incentives for discouraging people from outside of our neighborhood from taking all of our parking? For example, how can we encourage Timbers fans to take public transportation as opposed to parking? My wife and I share a car, we need to have a car and we are being penalized for it. Our building does not provide parking. Additionally, what type of say do we have in the programs that the revenue is spent on?
 - Rick commented that once the SAC knows how much funds will be available then there will be a public process in conjunction with NWDA, the Nob Hill Business Association and the community to discuss. The SAC wants to hear from the neighborhood what will be most effective in solving the parking problem.
 23. If low income housing is based off the federal benchmark, you're already homeless in this neighborhood. I moved here 4 years ago, but rent is going to go up, I had an anxiety attack, which is why I'm here. I make more than minimum wage and I can barely make more than enough to get by in a studio apartment in an old building. If \$300 snuck up on me I would have to get rid of my car. Additionally, vandalism is rampant.
 24. There are a lot of parties at fault for the parking dilemma we currently have. In an effort to be equitable, the burden should be shared by all. The burden falls on residents and employers/employees. Please consider discussing what got us to this point, who is at fault and share the burden evenly.

- Tom commented that there are 9,000 permits, but the number of permits being used at any given time is lower than the number of spaces available. The SAC went to City Council to get developers to provide parking based on a formula that's used by the entire City. He asked Chris Smith to speak about the advocates argument for parking minimums.
- Chris Smith commented that he is a 25-year resident of the neighborhood and Vice Chair of the City Planning Committee. The commission recommended against parking minimums in the City of Portland. The logic was spending resources on housing cars is not housing people. There is a problem housing people in our City right now. He added that we don't put limits on how many parking spots developers can build and if there was a demand for parking then developers would build it.

Rick closed the public comment period with the following statement:

"I am a 43-year resident of the neighborhood. I moved here because I know I could own a car. It's very important to me that people at every income level who want and need a car can have it. I'm hoping that part of our work will make it easier and easier for people to not have a car."

COMMITTEE MEETING:

- Rick asked the SAC if anyone was interested in reconsidering the \$180 permit fee for next year. 3 voted in favor to reconsider, 5 opposed. The SAC will be moving forward with the \$180 fee.
- Elizabeth expressed concern that the Nob Hill Business Association Board has not been consulted and felt uncomfortable solidifying decision before they become briefed on the proposed changes.

Other Discussion Items:

- Chris commented that we need to know what type of changes we're looking at. Employee permits are more simple. Residential permits are more challenging, which is why we developed a TDM program which encourages people not to get a permit and to turn in a permit that is not being used.
- Rick commented that we need to determine quickly the cost of the permit, limitations, and who will be required to do a survey before permits are issued. The other things are details we want done but can discuss later.
- Don commented that changing permit distribution to the apartment manager is a bad idea as most buildings are under 20 units, owner-managed, without an on-site manager. Rick commented that this proposal was for apartments with more than 30 units. Rick commented that it's important for individuals to get the permit from the City to know if their vehicles are registered or not. If they do it themselves, it's hard to tell when a building has met its cap. Perhaps we can give managers an authorization form that the applicant would take to the City when applying. The onus will be on the apartment manager to inform tenants when they don't qualify for a parking permit.
- Karen commented that we need to do more work on identifying low income qualifications for our neighborhood and opt-out incentives are a very good thing. Chris added opt-out incentives are a way to encourage people not to buy a permit.

- In terms for what the right thing is for new buildings, staff is proposing 0.6 per unit. It will be discussed at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned.

NW District Parking Management Plan
Fact Sheet April 2, 2017

The Plan

- Adopted by City Council in July 2013
- The goal is to manage the on-street system based on best practices and data
- Plan made a meter and permit district
 - Created and expanded Zone M permit parking in 2015
 - Installed 4 hour and 2 hour meters in 2016

- The NW Parking Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) formed in 2014
 - Members were appointed by Commissioner Novick
 - Currently there are 9 members (4 reps from Northwest District Association, 3 reps from Nob Hill Business Association, and 2 at large members)
 - SAC evaluates district PARKING needs and priorities and set forth priority projects and programs to support and facilitate more efficient transportation access
 - SAC's mission is to advise the City on parking issues in NW and support a full range of transportation options within the context of neighborhood livability and economic vitality with the goal of efficiently managing parking and reducing reliance on the single-occupancy automobile

- The SAC meets monthly to discuss all matters related to the plan
 - Meetings occur on third Wednesdays of the month and additional meetings if needed occur on second Tuesdays of the month
 - Receive status updates on meters and permits and review requests/exceptions
 - Develop, implement, and plan current projects list from share of future net meter revenues which includes transportation demand management (TDM) measures
 - Organize Community Input for spending meter revenue
 - Make recommendations to PBOT for permit prices and limits and for changes to the meter district
 - Increase availability of parking by
 - Implementing a shared parking program
 - Increasing supply per the NW Parking Plan

- PBOT
 - Makes final decisions and implements SAC recommendations for permits and meters
 - Provides administrative support to SAC
 - Implements capital improvements as recommended through the SAC process
 - Ongoing annual data collection and analysis
 - Consultant conducts data collection in Fall
 - Consultants prepares data analysis shortly after
 - PBOT develops reformatting based on best practices prior to permit renewal in August

- Overall summary work to date
 - Since October 2014 the SAC has met monthly and has worked with City staff on the implementation of the adopted parking management plan
 - Permit Parking was instituted in 2015
 - Meters were installed in 2016
 - Ongoing discussions have been held about adjustments to the permit system. The goal of the permit program is to manage the on-street parking system by identifying the permit eligible stalls, issuing annual parking permits and balancing the system to support area land use
 - Best practice is 85% occupancy
 - Current occupancy in NW is well over 90% at peak hours
 - The total number of parking stalls in the NW parking district is 5,264 (metered and permit stalls)
 - Regulations allowing shared parking have been adopted and SAC is working to encourage sharing.
 - In October 2016 on-street parking utilization data was collected
 - Based on the analysis, recommendations to changes of the on-street system and permit program are being developed
 - Recommendations include an expansion of the metered area as well as a reduction in permits issued to both residents and employees
 - In December 2016 Council passed ordinance 188173 that allowed NW to develop a pilot program to implement additional tools to manage on-street parking
 - The additional tools include: Permit surcharge fee, capping the total number of permits issued, limiting annual issuance of employee and residential permits and annual TDM surveys
 - The surcharges will go back in the Northwest District for TDM measures
- For more information, please go to www.nwportlandparking.com