

NW Parking SAC
Wednesday, May 17, 2017
3:30 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, Lynda Viray, Antonina Zaytseva

Public in Attendance

Allan Classen (NW Examiner), Douglas Johns, Walt McMonies, Christine Warden

Welcome & Public Comment

Rick Michaelson called the meeting to order at 3:40 pm and invited public comment. Attendees expressed the following concerns:

1. I'm a sole proprietor, can I get a business permit next term year? The business owners in my area are concerned that some of their employees won't get permits.
 - a. Sole proprietors will be eligible for a business permit. The changes to .8 FTE will only affect business with 5 or more employees.
2. I'm a resident in the neighborhood and I would like clarification on the Timber's Good Neighbor Agreement program. Specifically, why are scheduled Timber's games metered separately?
 - a. Timber's games are considered major events because their expected attendance is 12,500 fans per game. The Timbers Committee is looking to see if 12,500 is the right number. Additionally, the Committee is looking at ways to ensure that the additional 4,000 seats being added to the stadium won't increase parking demand on the neighborhood.
3. Would the SAC look into limiting parking for Thorns games as well? They're becoming more popular.
 - a. Currently Thorns games are non-major events because they have less than 12,500 fans and don't have amplified music. We could encourage them to use Good Neighbor procedures.
4. What's the plan to reduce the 30-minute metered spots? They are not permit friendly.
 - a. The SAC established a subcommittee to review meter use. The 30-minute spots were created as a short-term space for residents looking to get in and out of the space quickly (dropping off groceries, etc.). The subcommittee will review the efficacy of these spaces.
5. How does raising the permit fee to \$180 resolve the parking demand problem in the neighborhood? Where does the money go?

- a. The rate increase is a small first step. There is no expectation for residents to give up their cars, we're trying to change the demand for on-street parking. The surcharge goes back to the neighborhood to increase Transportation Demand Management (TDM) options.
6. What about the empty parking lots?
 - a. There is a new shared parking program to allow the use of surface lots. The SAC will work with businesses with empty parking lots to discuss options.
7. Why did the SAC choose to place permit limits on buildings with more than 30 units?
 - a. The 30-unit cap was an arbitrary number. Scott will work with buildings with 30 or more units to discuss their TDM needs.
8. Can the generated revenue be used to build a garage?
 - a. This is the beginning of the program; the SAC will discuss which projects the generated revenue will be allocated to.

Discounted Zone M Permits

- Chris proposes that the surcharge not be charged for people with award letters from an assistance program, such as: SNAP, HUD, HomeForward, etc.
- Chris shares a document from the Housing Bureau that lists income levels that the Bureau looks at for individuals who are not as low income as SNAP, HUD, or HomeForward but fall somewhere on that scale. The low income provision available is if a resident meets 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI) identified by the Portland Housing Bureau [here](#) then they are eligible for a \$60 Zone M permit. Chris suggests that the SAC look at potentially having people self-certify based on their income level and to have an interim cost for the permits (between \$60 and \$180). It would be possible to create a three-tiered pricing structure: \$60 for low-income, \$120 for people who meet the income threshold outlined by the Housing Bureau, and \$180 for everyone else.
- Karen asks about the requirements to be eligible for an assistance program.
- Chris explains that it depends on the building types- There are 6 HomeForward buildings in this neighborhood- to qualify for HomeForward, residents must fall between 30-50% of the median income level.
- Rick asks for clarification: if an applicant has an income that qualifies them for SNAP but they're not on SNAP would they qualify for the \$120 rate?
- Chris clarifies that they would pay \$60 if they had an award letter from any assistance program. If an application does not have an award letter, they would self-certify their income and pay a rate somewhere between \$60 - \$180.
- Rick notes that if an applicant met the income level requirements, they would be eligible for a \$120 permit and wouldn't have to file any paperwork, they would just self-certify. Rick requests comments/opinions from the members.
- Ron commented that he would rather make self-selection too easy and have some abuse than to make it too challenging /paperwork-heavy and have hardly anyone use it.

- Karen shared that based on the census data- a large portion of the neighborhood would qualify for a discounted permit.
- Tom adds that if a person is struggling financially, charging them \$120 wouldn't be a break. Anyone that earns less than \$40,000 annually should get the discounted rate of \$60.
- Phil expresses his concerns about the possibility of abuse and urges the committee to differentiate between gross and net income.
- Karen thinks that the SAC will discover quickly that there will be a lot of abuse or that there are a lot of people that are low income in the neighborhood. Karen expresses concern about self-certification because it's an easy solution and adds that \$120 a year is only \$10 per month.
- Rick explains that he hears support for keeping the low-income fee at \$60 and \$180 for everyone else, forgoing the option of a sliding scale.
- Karen expresses concerns that the SAC won't have enough revenue for TDM services.
- Tom asks how businesses would be affected.
- Rick states that businesses will not qualify for a discounted rate.
- Rick urges members to make a motion.
- Tavo makes a motion to set a flat-rate of \$60 for anyone who hits the low income threshold on the Housing Bureau form and forgo the sliding scale altogether.
 - 4 in favor
 - 3 opposed
- Committee supports the recommendation that there will be two annual permit fees for residents, 1) standard rate of \$180 and 2) \$60 for low-income residents based on the provision a resident meets 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI) identified by the Portland Housing Bureau [here](#).
- Rick expresses hesitations about the motion – stating that he'd be uncomfortable next year if it turns out that there is a lot of abuse. The SAC may need to rethink/adjust this motion next year.
- Karen points out that once the City is able to process monthly or quarterly payments for parking permits it will be easier on applicants to pay \$10-\$15 per month, as opposed to one large sum once per year. A smaller monthly rate might seem more reasonable for residents.
- Phil asks if it's possible to do a semi-annual fee for residents.
- Chris explains that, at this time, it is not possible to do so.

Public Communications & Outreach

- Lynda explains that PBOT submitted a May ad in the Examiner and another one for June to inform residents of the new Zone M changes. There will be another ad in July to notify residents about the TDM program and available incentives. In addition to the ads, a letter will be mailed to residents at the end of this week, and a modified letter for residential building managers and employers will be mailed next week.

- All letters are posted on the website (www.nwportlandparking.com) and a new webpage has been created- the Zone M Pilot Program webpage gives background and discusses current permit changes. Additionally, there is a live required survey available for applicants and renewal notices will be mailed in July.
- Rick asks if the next ad in the Examiner will talk about the .8 FTE.
- Lynda confirms that the ad will reflect the change to .8 FTE, changes to price, and a notice that existing permit holders will be able to renew their permits and that there will be some changes to the larger buildings for new residents.
- Don mentioned that many people were unaware of the recent changes and adds that relying solely on the letters and the advertisement in the Examiner will get the same response. Don recommends that there be a more aggressive outreach effort using different mediums (such as the Oregonian, the radio and TV), otherwise, the SAC will be in the same situation as last time.
- Rick suggests notifying everyone on the mailing list as well.

Permit Week: 07/25, 07/26, and 07/29

Chris explains that PBOT will be going into the neighborhood to process permits on-site. The events will be held at The Lucky Lab on the following dates and times:

- Tuesday, 07/25 from 4 – 7 PM
- Wednesday, 07/26 from 4 – 7 PM
- Saturday, 07/29 from 11 – 2 PM
- Staff will be on hand to sell permits, answer questions, talk about TDM programs and BIKETOWN. The event will be an opportunity to talk to applicants about what they want to see the surcharge used for and to get ideas for projects.
- Karen mentions that Susan is willing to help share the event with the business association. Karen suggests that PBOT advertise the event on NextDoor as well.
- Rick points out the importance of establishing a good mechanism for getting public input for the expenditures.

TDM Subcommittee Report

Phil updates the SAC on the TDM subcommittee.

- The subcommittee is looking at alternative transportation mode options- such as, transit (bus/streetcar), Biketown, car sharing and car rental companies. The subcommittee is brainstorming ways to incentivize these alternative options to address the barriers of giving up a car. The incentives are conceptual at this time, but an option could be a transit pass subsidy program where the SAC puts 25% towards a TriMet annual pass and the funds are matched by the apartment management firm.
- The subcommittee started a conversation with TriMet to leverage transportation demand in the neighborhood to get more service to the area. Karen and Phil met with Neil McFarlane and Tom Mills (Senior Planner for TriMet who is assigned to the NW district). Neil concluded that an

intergovernmental agreement was needed between TriMet and PBOT with the FCC named as part of the deal.

- Neil recognizes that TriMet’s service improvements and the SAC’s TDM program will need to roll out in phases and in a coordinated fashion to ensure that both TriMet and PBOT benefit from the partnership.
- Karen adds that there was a willingness from TriMet to test a few pilot projects in NW that TriMet is not offering anywhere else (ex: the pass program). Karen mentions that Phil volunteered to pull together the language to get the agreement started and that Tom Mills will be the contact person. Additionally, TriMet will assign a marketing person to work on the pass subsidy program.
- At the meeting Neil mentioned a proposal to extend the Line 24 bus (NE-Fremont) that services Emanuel Hospital across the Fremont Bridge, which goes through Northwest and terminates at Collins Circle has received diverse community support to bring the line to NW. It would give the NW a direct connection to NE – connecting a lot of dots along the way. It could be rolled out as soon as September 2018. Also, line 10 will be extended to Willamette Heights via Union Station and the North Pearl and line 77 will have frequency improvements.
- Karen informs the SAC that the Line 24 bus would be valuable to Legacy Hospital as a connection between their facilities. It would be good to get Legacy involved in reviving the line.
- Phil explains that the Pearl neighborhood has been present at the neighborhood Transportation Committee meetings on a regular basis and would be interested in working along step with the SAC to improve TriMet service.
- Rick mentions that the subcommittee is looking to expand membership by adding a TDM specialist from Legacy and someone from Nob Hill.
- Karen mentions that Susan Thomas, the President of the Nob Hill Business Association would like to add another member from the Nob Hill Committee to the SAC.
- Don inquires about data for some of the TriMet lines to use as a baseline to understand the effectiveness/impacts of the proposed changes.
- Phil explains that TriMet has detailed stop-by-stop information regarding “ons and offs.” However, they don’t have origin-destination data. Metro has surveyed such information but not sure the last time it was conducted. It is hard to get origin-to-destination data.
- Tom asks for estimated costs for TriMet line extensions.
- Phil shares the following estimates: extending the line 24 with the most modest service (30-minute service intervals with no service on the weekends) would cost \$751k annually. However, weekend service would be needed for the neighborhood, to extend the line 24 with better service (20-minute service during peak times, 30-minute service all other times and 30-minute service on the weekends) would cost \$1.7 million annually.
- Scott asks if TriMet is expecting funds to come from the SAC.

Phil clarifies that TriMet does not expect the SAC to fund the added services. TriMet has a new revenue stream, but they have to allocate the funds region-wide and the money is in high demand.

- Scotts suggests that instead of funding the added services, the SAC can incentivize people to use transit and increase the demand for ridership by using the permit surcharge. Scott believes that the committee's part of the equation is to get more people riding buses, TriMet's part of the equation is to provide the buses.
- Karen explains that there was never any concept that the SAC would be funding actual service improvements for TriMet.
- Phil clarifies that TriMet is looking for help from the SAC in funding some capital improvements (such as bus stop amenities).
- Rick asks how TriMet would get buses across the Fremont bridge during rush hour.
- Karen explains that TriMet is talking with ODOT about using the shoulder lane for buses during rush hour. Such practice has been done in other areas and there is some receptiveness to the idea.
- Tom asks for clarification about the car rental remark Phil made earlier.
- Phil clarifies that he wouldn't use Zipcar for a full day trip (to go to the beach) because it's much cheaper to rent a car for the day than to use Zipcar. However, there is no convenient rental car business location in the neighborhood. If a rental car service was more convenient, people would be more apt to use that option.
- Rick adds that at some point the SAC might have a transit pass/parking pass option that, for example, could be eligible for 40 car-rental hours per year.

Supply Subcommittee Report

Don updated the SAC that the subcommittee is focusing on the following areas:

- Looking into strategically located valet parking to make it easier for residents/visitors to get in and out of their cars without circling the neighborhood.
- Dividing the neighborhood into smaller sections to evaluate the current on-street parking time limits to see if more on-street supply is a possibility and to rationalize spaces with their current surroundings, for example, short-term spaces that used to service businesses that are no longer present.
- Looking at the placement of BIKETOWN stations to determine if they can be placed elsewhere without taking valuable parking resources.
- Looking at options to create new off-street inventory, whether it be approaching Good Sam, creating a new supply of smaller lots throughout the neighborhood, partnering with MLC, etc. Don adds that the subcommittee will determine what could be done about current zoning and developing standards to get new on-street supply.
- Potentially servicing a shuttle over the holiday season to see how it works. A PSU study conducted in 2003 studied the efficacy of shuttle service and deemed it too expensive. TriMet experimented with a shuttle before but it didn't work efficiently, whereas Washington Square's

shuttle worked well. However, at this time, it may be putting the cart before the horse- we will want to have shared parking lots in place beforehand.

- Don informs the SAC that there is a new code that enables the committee to open unused lots. Don and Tom conducted an inventory of potential shared parking one year ago on 21st/23rd Aves in commercial zones to find available parking and found that there were very few parking spots available during the day. Most businesses won't share their parking lots during the day but might be open to sharing their lots after business hours.
- Karen adds that there are a lot of "no parking" spaces in Zone M for unknown reasons. A lot of the spaces are on corners, maybe the City can look into these spaces to see if they can be changed to parking spots.
- Karen informs the SAC that Metropolitan Learning Center (MLC) is hiring a new principal. The principal will have the ability to help facilitate using the parking lot behind the school for parking. Once the new principal is hired, Karen and Susan, from the Nob Hill Association, will invite him/her out to talk about the neighborhood and discuss the parking lot.
- Don adds that the last time the SAC was able to use the MLC parking lot, they worked with the principal and it's a great suggestion to work with the new principal as well. Additionally, Don informed the group that Doug Capps has deep connections with the school system and is working with stakeholders in the neighborhood regarding off-street parking spaces. Don adds that working with Doug would help the SAC affect MLC, which in turn will improve parking along the 21st corridor.
- Ron points out that most of the Timbers game needs occur on the weekends and in the evenings. The SAC could look into partnering with businesses to offer shared parking for fans. The fans would pay for parking and the Timbers could offer incentives such as a shuttle service, discount on food/drinks, etc. Shared parking might be a way to solve some of the Timbers' parking problems. Ron asks if the members are supportive of looking at a Timbers/business shared parking lot partnership before further discussion.
- Rick comments that a lot of the details will need to be worked out. There will be a real problem if there are no assigned spaces as people will be circling the neighborhood if they can't find an available spot. Additionally, we want to ensure that the shared parking option is reducing parking demand and not incentivizing people who didn't plan to drive beforehand. Finally, we wouldn't want fans circling the neighborhood once the parking lot fills up.
- Don agrees that on busy weekends in the summer the fans will be competing with other visitors to the neighborhood for parking. However, Don expresses interest in the idea.
- Rick informs the group that at the next subcommittee meeting two people will join: someone who deals with parking management/shared parking and someone from Legacy to discuss parking options at their location.
- Rick adds that in the long-term, Good Sam is going to have some sort of parking option and the SAC will want to have influence on that decision. It would be good to establish a relationship with Good Sam.

- Elizabeth asks if striping parking spots could be an option because cars are often parked inefficiently.
- Karen explains that in order to stripe a parking spot, space must be allocated for people to maneuver in and out. As such, less spaces become available with striping.
- Rick adds that it would be possible to experiment with striping in some areas.
- Ron suggest that there are spaces where 2 and/or possibly 3 vehicles could fit but because of inefficient parking, only 1 car will utilize the space.

Shared Parking Program Outreach

- Lynda shares that PBOT hired a consultant to do outreach for the Shared Parking Program named Bill Weismann.
- PBOT identified 44 large-surface parking lots and tasked Bill with doing the outreach to each business from May to August. Bill will mail an information sheet and follow up with a phone call to each of the identified businesses. At the end of the study, he will encourage the businesses to apply to the program or refer them to Lynda with any specific questions about shared parking.
- In September, Bill will finalize his report and provide a detailed record of the outreach results, common questions received, lessons learned and recommended next steps.
- Bill will have an update by the first week of June and Lynda will share the results with Rick and the Supply subcommittee.

New Business

Current Permit Issuance-

- Ron asks how many permits were issued for Zone M in the past week.
- Chris explains that there is not an exact number available for the meeting, but it can be pulled.
- Ron asks if it would be possible to start tracking Zone M permit issuance monthly to measure increase and/or decline.
- Chris informs the SAC that there is a report that is generated every week that outlines permit issuance per zone.
- Karen asks if the report shows cancelled permits, adding that a new permit that cancels out a previous applicant's permit should not count as a new permit to the system.
- Chris clarifies that the report accounts for cancelled permits.
- Don points out that some people don't cancel permits when they move out of the neighborhood, as such, there isn't a way to know exactly how many issued permits are in use.
- Chris explains that the \$50 incentive was created to encourage people that move to return their permit.

Streetcar Extension-

- Phil informs the SAC that the NWDA has been conversing with Streetcar and TriMet. Streetcar is looking to add an extension to Montgomery Park. One possible option is running the Streetcar through the Conway Development. At all costs, running the Streetcar through 23rd and Vaughn should be avoided completely. But, because the streets are too narrow to allow two-way Streetcar traffic, the block west of 23rd and Raleigh St. would need to be used. However, at the last

neighborhood meeting, approximately 20 neighbors from Raleigh St. came to protest any Streetcar presence on the street.

- Dan Bower, from Portland Streetcar is considering talking to the major property owners about the possibility of stair-stepping over to Wilson St. and then running up Wilson St. to Montgomery Park- which would fall just outside of the boundaries of Zone M. The notion being that that area of the neighborhood has seen some development pressure. However, this is conceptual at this point, and the expected timeline is 4-5 years, using local funding- no federal money is planned at this time.

Meeting adjourned.