

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, March 12, 2013

12:30 – 3:30 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Karen Gray, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Irma Valdez

**Commissioners Absent:** Andre' Baugh, Don Hanson, Lai-Lani Ovalles

**BPS Staff Present:** Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder, Matt Wickstrom, Julie Ocken

**Other City Staff Present:** Sarah Schooley, PBOT

*Vice Chair Rudd* called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. and provided an overview of the agenda.

### Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- West Quadrant Plan had its first Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting was last night. *Commissioner Schultz* is co-chairing the group, which has 33 people. There was also an opening forum last Friday, and there will be a charette this coming Friday. Housing, transportation, commercial development, river, green spaces are key issues, and this is a large, diverse area compared to the N/NE Quadrant.
- The ongoing outcome from the Airport Futures project, the PDX CAC has an annual report coming out, which Julie O will send to the PSC members. Action on the work the PSC approved. *Commissioner Gray* is on this committee, which is comprised of a broad variety of stakeholders. She noted that the Port does a good job answering questions. Annual strategy leads the topics at the meetings.
- The next PSC meeting is on 03/26 from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. with a focus on West Hayden Island floodplain and economic issues.

### Commissioners Items of Interest

*Commissioner Schultz:* added a bit about the West Quadrant SAC committee. It's diverse and a group of interested members. One of the main questions is about the designated boundary of the area.

*Commissioner Gray* mentioned the first City Budget Meeting was in East Portland last week.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from the February 26, 2013 PSC meeting

*Vice Chair Rudd* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an *aye* vote.

(Y8 – Gray, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

## Minimum Parking Requirements for Multi-Unit Buildings

Hearing / Recommendation: Joe Zehnder, Matt Wickstrom

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/5580443>

Documents:

- [Proposed Zoning Code Amendments](#)
- [Parking FAQ - February 2013](#)
- [Map: parking allowed but not required](#)
- [Permit parking problem statement issue paper](#)
- [APPP tutorial and survey results](#)
- [Shoup debrief](#)

Mayor Charlie Hales introduced the project. He appreciates the chance to hear from the community and thanks the PSC as volunteers who take on a long-term advisory role. He also thanked the commission for helping to move along urgent community problems that emerge (e.g. historic districts). Parking is a similar issue to make sure what we have in mind is what we get in terms of new development in existing neighborhoods. We want to reduce impacts on neighborhoods while preserving affordability and equity. Council is eager to take this issue quickly as well.

Joe Zehnder, Sara Schooley and Matt Wickstrom provided the staff report as shown in the **presentation**.

The project arose out of community concern because of the spike in recent large developments, especially on SE Division. A parking minimum requirement does not mean parking has not been built, as there have been almost 1 space per unit built in the recent complexes. The City policy is from the 1980s and was updated in the 1990s.

The staff proposal has 6 elements. For background, some of the variables for the commission to consider are what size buildings (40) should have a requirement; how many spaces per unit 1:4 ratio; and do substitutions make sense? The frequent transit amendment ties to TriMet's 15-minute service corridors. Each substitution option has a maximum for how many parking spaces it could buy down. Based on the proposed amendments, larger buildings could go down to about 50 percent of the minimums. Bike parking is capped at 25 percent of number of minimum spaces. Bike share is treated like car share: every 11 bike share spaces can reduce auto spaces by 3.

The proposed amendments to the current code include:

### 1. New minimum number of spaces provided

New multi-unit buildings with more than 40 units must provide 1 parking space for every 4 units in CM, CS, RX, CX, CO1 zones.

- Parking is allowed but not required for multi-unit projects with 40 or fewer units
- Plan districts with other minimum parking requirements supersede (e.g. Central City, Northwest, Gateway and East Corridor plan districts)

### 2. Minimum parking requirements - frequent transit

New multi-unit buildings with more than 40 units must provide 1 parking space for every 4 units when located within 500 feet of frequent transit.

- Parking is allowed but not required for multi-dwelling projects with 40 or fewer units

### 3. Substitutions for parking spaces

Bike parking and motorcycle parking may already substitute for some required parking.

Allow each car share space to be substituted for two required spaces (up to 25 percent of the requirement)

- An executed contract with a recognized car share organization must be provided at time of permit

#### 4. Allow off-site parking.

Joint use parking is allowed for commercial uses when the parking is located within 300 feet of site and parking demands occur at different times.

Allow joint use parking for multi-unit projects if located in an existing parking area and on a site zoned commercial or multi-dwelling residential.

This requires:

- An analysis of peak parking times for both uses
- An easement or deed restriction

#### 5. Require loading space.

Require one on-site loading space for multi-unit projects with more than 40 units.

#### 6. Clarify size/dimension of long-term bike parking.

Define size requirements for long-term (resident use) bike parking. Continue to allow location in dwelling unit.

Today's action is about the zoning code changes, but staff also wanted to provide information about the permit program as a possibility.

PBOT is looking into is a permitting system for parking. There are four permit types:

- Residential
- Commercial
- Overnight - in other cities used to deal with abandoned vehicles and/or street cleaning and plowing.
- Area Parking - currently used in Portland.

#### Area Parking Permit

- Considered in an area if there are 75 percent during peak hours and 25 percent of occupancy if from commuters. The APP is used mostly in the Central City to discourage commuters from parking then taking transit. The requirements for an APP are 40 block faces. Permits are \$60 per year and are unlimited for residents who live in the area. Employees may purchase permits, with the number available varied by zone. Visitor passes are available as well.
- APPs attempt to combine residential and commercial.
- There is a current pilot project for a mini-area parking permit program, which allows residents to ask for zones that are only 12 blocks. Restrictions on voting and petitions are more relaxed, and occupancy can be further defined by the neighborhood in the pilot.

The APP guiding principles are to

- Allow for legitimate uses
- Encourage travel demand management
- Efficient use of existing parking infrastructure
- Equitable

*Commissioner Valdez* asked which neighborhoods are in the pilot program? At this point there are none, so there is no available data to review yet.

There are two fundamental questions to answer about putting together a parking permit:

- What is a parking problem? We don't have a final answer yet. To design a permit to solve a problem, this needs to be answered clearly.

- Is the permit program equitable: The Equity Framework from the Portland Plan should be at the forefront, and design principles should not limit access to privilege. Looking at how to designate permits, there are equity implications.

Next steps for the permitting work include:

- APPP pilot program
- Formation of a new type of permit program

*Commissioner Smith* asked about paratransit access and drop-off and pick up. Do we want to think about requirements for what this should look like?

The 500' transit exemption applies to single family homes as well as multi-unit housing. No parking is required for ADUs.

The APP is about trying to preserve access to get to the land uses and not targeted at vehicle storage. Long-term vehicle storage on the street is a detriment to our centers strategies, which is something to think about in the long-term.

#### **Questions for Staff:**

*Commissioner Schultz* asked about shared parking, which in the staff proposal is limited to existing lots. If a commercial building is willing to build underground parking, why can sharing with an apartment next door not be an option?

- This is a good question. We don't want new surface lots, but in new buildings that are providing parking at 1 space per unit, there is an additional parking supply that could help other buildings. This is intriguing and a worthy amendment to consider.
- The 40 unit determination was derived in part by looking at the economics of providing parking and practice about which buildings are providing parking. Typically 10k sq foot lot. There is a module if going to put parking in, you move in general engineering modules. We ran pro formas to see about affordability in different sized buildings, and the 40-unit size got enough units and didn't force into a higher price outcome.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* In Manhattan they often rent space for a vehicle in a space farther away (far off-site).

- Part of our interest in this package was to look at options that can be implemented quickly to at least get some provisions approved. Much conversation has been with neighborhoods that have seen dramatic change in the recent past. The off-site option could come up later in a longer-term project.

*Commissioner Oxman:* There is substantial variation in the size of individual units. Is there something that characterizes the distribution of less than 40 and greater than 40 unit complexes that could have unanticipated impacts?

- We don't have unit size information; we have unit numbers only. We did look at distribution by areas of the city. East and North Portland tend to provide more parking at the newly constructed buildings.

*Commissioner Oxman:* There are disparate impacts on singles versus families. Families with kids are very different from a single person household. Are we changing the housing environment in a way that's not good for families or pushing them out to periphery?

- This is more of an economic push than a space push; this will become more true in the future. The presence of family and multi-family housing varies by area of the city. Today is about parking minimums, not for all buildings, and the market is already providing 50 percent plus all over the city. There are choices available. In the Comp Plan, growth shows significant amounts in multi-family buildings.

Staff noted eliminating the car share space would be subject to enforcement and complaint-based. Any car share spaces that reduce the number of spaces the building needs to provide needs to be maintained.

There was an idea about how to link substitutions to affordability of the unit as well – is this a worthy policy?

- We could look at this; it could be similar to the Limited Tax Exemption work the commission has seen from the Housing Bureau. There are some legal issues we are continuing to look at and can bring back a proposal linked to affordability.

*Commissioner Schultz:* Much of the issue in places like Division is people visiting commercial businesses, and we're possibly penalizing residents.

- Our centers are designed so this is shared parking. In the occupancy survey staff presented at the previous PSC meeting on the topic, we didn't see the spaces issue beyond 2 blocks from the commercial street. We are assuming residential and commercial space on the ground floor. If we build a permanent supply of parking spaces for residential, the shared use of commercial continues to work.

Susan noted that today is an initial step, and we want to get to answer that helps the problem now. We want to get something into affect soon that will help residents where new buildings are coming in for permitting.

*Vice Chair Rudd:* 50 percent of the units built since 2006 have provided parking. 2006-08 was a boom. Is there a difference from that time period to what we're seeing now?

- Permit data shows that 2012 was a return to previous levels of construction. Slightly less than 50 percent of the construction is providing parking at a .7-to-1 ratio for those providing parking.

#### **Testimony:**

- Rex Burkholder: The current policies are good. The issue of requiring parking can limit affordability and amount of use you can get out of a lot of property, making it more difficult for people to live here. We need to be thinking about larger issues and not the small inconvenience if can't park in front of their homes. Don't change the policies as they stand now.
- Mary Ann Schwab: In Sunnyside, the community has been monitoring the Comp Plan Update process, the OLCC and TriMet. I have concerns with amendment #5. If we're saving the developer \$40,000 per potential parking spot, what is the trade-off for the tenants? Bike storage on-site is a good idea. Let's make places affordable and work for the seniors and families.
- Amy Anderson: Owned her home over 30 years (near the 37<sup>th</sup> and Division developments). She is dependent on LIFT and other TriMet services. More pressure being put on the neighborhood from the new buildings creates traffic problems. Commercial buildings have extended parking availability, so shared spaces are a good idea, and the amendment should be passed.
- Brian Cefola: Parking minimums are harmful because they encourage traffic and auto use. Street parking is not an entitlement. We should propose an amendment to allow a waiver for parking minimums if the neighborhood consents to one with the developers; this would allow neighborhoods to meet their own needs.
- Linda Silver: Lives in the Sellwood neighborhood. She owns a car but uses alternate modes of transportation too. She supports the apartment taskforce revisions. The

cumulative effect of buildings without parking is of great importance. People having fewer cars but won't happen until there's something catastrophic.

- Tony Jordan: A Sunnyside resident. He is in a household with a number of small kids and no automobile. Denser and less car-centric is improved from 10 years ago, so this minimum requirement would be a step back. Market-rate parking is a solution. He supports the proposed amendments reluctantly without increasing minimums, but a greater emphasis needs to be put on policies and permitting in the future.
- Terry Parker: Lives in Rose City Park. New residents are not less-likely to own a car. SEE WRITTEN. We should require .75 parking spaces for new multi-units, which is comparable to NYC (requires .7).
- Allen Field: Lives in Richmond. The current proposal is a good start. A review of developers and cumulative effect is the difficulty. The ratio should be .35 per unit or lower the unit threshold to 30 units. There needs to be more robust formula to take into account the cumulative impacts in an area. An option would be to incentivize developers to attract people who don't own a car with rent rebates and TriMet passes. The City's parking strategy should not be based on TriMet since service has been continually cut.
- Michael Robinson, SK Hoff Construction: The process is going too quickly. There's been lots of testimony, and the commissioner should take more time to deliberate. If they can't meet parking requirements, builders likely to build fewer units. But this affects property rights because the change will impact residents instead of builders. The commission should consider the changes as outlined in written testimony submitted.
- Gary Davenport, ONRG: Overlook neighborhood. He provided a report that shows the number of units in N/NE Portland that don't have parking. There are 20 buildings within last 18 months that are currently in the permit process or have completed construction. 11 of these have been done by one developer, 51.6 units on average for 568 total units; other developers' total is 217. The code needs to be stronger and less easily exploited. BPS has not acknowledged parking and minimum problems or that a developer has exploited the code. There should be a 20 unit maximum for parking.
- Ellen Burr: Provided a context about the neighborhoods that are most impacted by large apartments. The proposed 40 unit minimum should be dropped to 20 units. She supports the parking taskforce amendments. PSC members should look at TriMet service and become familiar with neighborhoods. Most apartments being built are studios, not suitable for families. Affordability is a question. Developers are looking to exploit the code.
- Philip Selinger, NW District Association: Parking has been an active debate in the NW District. They are pleased to see an on-street management plan. The association has not reached consensus, but parking minimum changes are not a substitution for a long-range strategy. In a plan district, other amendments will be needed. NWUDA supports the proposed revisions as part of a way to start to look at a long-term plan. Graduated minimums could be an option as could fee payments and credits. A transit and parking impact review could be a requirement for developers before building.
- Linda Nettekoven: Thanks to BPS (Matt Wickstrom) for the work on this project. The highest priority concern is regardless of a ratio, strategies are not effective for long-term if we can't address cumulative impacts. We need to account for customer, residential and employee impacts within a corridor. Transportation and parking management associations would be optimal for corridors to monitor and manage in a

comprehensive and holistic manner. Affordability needs to be included in the process.

- Bonny Brae: Richmond neighborhood. Welcomes a more pedestrian-friendly development overall, but there are problems resulting from amount of new construction. Developers are using CS zoning (no residential limits on density), but all other zoning has a residential limit. This has allowed developers a loophole. Design review and density standards, which directly effect quality of life, should be another consideration to include in the minimum parking standards.
- Angala Ehelebe: Lives in Woodlawn. Diversity of transportation choices is important; it should not be one-size-fits-all. A cumulative impact study for development is important. Permanent handicap-accessible parking spots should be included. Narrow streets are a concern when on-street parking is over-utilized.
- Bob Richardson: Rose City Park resident. The city's vibrant, walkable corridors have a variety of housing, many without parking. Zoning changes are a fair compromise. Ratios should take into account current stock within neighborhood. We should also look at market-based solutions including a residential permit system.
- Michael Harrison: Previous City planner. Proceeding quickly with the amendments would be a mistake. Parking is an issue that can solve itself. If you own a car, you likely want to house it somewhere off-street. If you can't afford that, you may have to park on street. If you impose new requirements, you are pricing lots of people out of the market. Don't adopt the current proposal.
- Sheryl Oldham: Richmond neighborhood. Adopt the recommendations and get them passed at City Council as soon as possible. Vibrancy is nice, but parking is a continuing problem.
- Jeff Mandel: Kerns resident. The City should reconsider any requirements for new developments. Being open to concerns that are founded is good, but not those that are unfounded. The staff presentation spoke the facts. Are you basing your recommendation on facts or hearsay and opinion without numbers to support? We are seeing a mode change, which is something we want and is also required because of climate change. There is a dividend payment – we can validate dollars returned to the community based on fewer miles being driven. Make decisions based on the data.
- Tamara DeRidder, Rose City Park NA: Thanks for moving the proposal ahead quickly. RCPNA's recommendation is to lower the impact area so the .25 parking ratio will apply for 20-40 units then .5 would be for 41 and greater units. 70 percent of apartment renters have at least one auto. If parking is not provided somehow, there will be more pollution because people will have to drive around to find a parking place. Apartment garages don't necessarily have to be on-site, but they do have to be provided. Decoupling will help prices stay low and creates an asset for the local community. We should also reduce car share ratio in the proposed amendments to 10 percent instead of 25 since it is a new option. The Apartment Parking Taskforce wants a .5 parking ratio for 20+ units and wants to put a limit of 25 percent of all required parking that can be eliminated by exemptions.
- George Wolters: Sellwood-West Mooreland resident. Thankful to see staff's willingness to address issues. A quick-fix approach is positive, and he supports the recommendations from Apartment Parking Taskforce. There should be limit on required spaces that can be reduced and a way to measure the cumulative impacts of development.

- Barbara Ross: Residents are frustrated. She urges the City to do some short-term fixes. Work with property owners and managers to make sure prospective tenants know about limited parking. We need everyone to cooperate with parking enforcement division to enforce existing regulations. Shared parking for residents and commercial would be a good step.
- Doug Klotz, Portland Neighbors for Sustainable Development: Supports the direction of the proposed zoning amendments and agrees with the rationale for exemptions for 40 units and below. Concerned about increase in number of sites that will need to have parking and about changing transit definition from 20 minutes to 15 minutes. Without an exemption, density will be difficult. This proposal is a good compromise and a good first start.
- Ted Labbe, Depave: Supports efforts to harmonize buildings into their new areas. A higher building size threshold or simply count units about 40 for determination of on-site parking (60 or 80 units) should be considered. We should retain the 20 minute corridors because 15 minute would strip on-site parking exemption for too many buildings. Considering City's shortfall of funds to maintain the street network, the permit system could help with providing a revenue stream.
- Kathy Lambert, Division Hardware: Encouraged by LUBA's decision to reverse the permit for construction across the street. Parking minimums need to be put into place, and a traffic study for where buildings are being constructed should be next. Congestion will increase with more people and autos they bring.
- Dr Scott Forbes: Not against high-density development, but 70 percent of the units will have cars, so there is still a need for spaces for 56 cars in a large multi-unit building. This is bad for all neighbors. Don't delay the passage of the minimum parking requirements.
- Richard Lishner: Without minimums, we are duplicating NW Portland in SE Portland. The City should create a SmartPark, and developers who don't provide parking on-site at new apartments should have to pay into the SmartPark garage. Developers are taking advantage of a loophole. He agrees with the 25 percent ratio – it's a good compromise. Cumulative effects need to be taken into account. Regulations are wrong in the 40 unit minimum and should be brought down to 20 or 25. Buy-backs should reduce required spaces only as much as 25 percent, which should be the minimum.
- Judah Gold-Markel, RNRG: lives two blocks from 37<sup>th</sup> and Division. Density, design and parking have been issues as large apartment complexes are being permitted in/on Division. Today's recommendations are a first step. We continue to advocate for short- and long-term changes. Quick and efficient measures should be put into place. Advocate for a resolution that is quickly passed on to Council.
- Margaret E Davis, Beaumont-Wilshire Neighbors for Responsible Growth: The parking requirement should apply to buildings of 20+ units with .5 car spots per unit. There should be no exception to parking requirements based on any level of expected TriMet service. Required parking must be on-site and should require loading spaces for buildings of 20+ units.
- Heather Flint Chatto: Richmond resident. Are we getting the type of density we want? Residents think not – parking is only one issue. Design is another critical issue, which is largely left unaddressed. She supports the current proposed amendments as a good start and encourages the PSC to look at 2012 Design Commission State of the City

report to address design standards.

- Donna Ernst: Long-time Richmond neighborhood resident. 1999 was the start of the increase in traffic on the Division corridor. Development without required parking is a large concern. Also, TriMet needs to increase service levels.
- Jeff Sakamoto, Foot Print NW: The development company has not built in Portland but is studying the market. He has done properties with and without parking in other cities. He is opposed to the amendments because it is the wrong tool; it's a knee-jerk reaction. Permits are a good option to look at. The market has to dictate the need to provide parking. The residents are the ones who will be hurt by requiring parking – not the developers – because they pass on to the increased costs to residents. Permitting is flexible and can capture value.
- Aaron Brown: Against the proposed amendments. Policy should help manage the parking issues but not require building new parking spots. The City shouldn't enact regulations that require an auto that some people don't own. We need to rethink how to better manage parking to meet current and future needs.
- Ben Schonberger, Housing Land Advocates: Opposes the current proposal because it doesn't account for all issues that are overlaid. Minimum parking requirements increase rental costs and reduce the number of units that get built. The proposal will block some potential units from being created and will incentivize driving. The current policy provides opportunities for all and is more equitable. Current parking capacity is still available.

**Written Testimony Received:**

- Joseph Bradford
- Marj Cannon and Hugh Moore
- Depave
- Tony Jordan
- Ryan Schenk
- Housing Land Advocates
- Steve Gutmann, Portland Neighbors for Sustainable Development
- Doug Klotz
- Metro
- Apartment Parking Task Force, CWLUG
- Brian Cefola
- Rose City Park NA
- Executive Committee of the AIA/APA/ASLA Urban Design Panel
- Portland Neighbors for Sustainable Development
- Joe Recker
- Mary Ann Schwab
- Margaret Herrington
- Christine Heycke
- Richard Mackin
- Gary Davenport, Neighbors for Responsible Growth
- Douglas Brown
- Peter Cowan
- Caroline Zavitkovski
- Mike Warwick
- Judy Arielle Fiestal
- Esther Harlow
- Nancy Matela

- Pamela Quinlan
- B Donovan
- Kerstin Juerges
- Timothy Dragila
- Eli Spevak
- Alexis Grant
- Portland Commission on Disability
- Michael Hayes
- Sara Wright
- Kirk McEwen
- Sean Barnett
- Jeff Deiss
- Rex Burkholder
- Mick O'Connell
- Perkins Coie on behalf of SK Hoff Construction
- Alexis Grant
- Don Vallaster
- Bob Richardson
- Terry Parker
- Gary Davenport, ONRG
- David Aulwes
- Linda Nettekoven
- Bonnie Brae
- Kathy Lambert
- Barbara Ross and Joe Omelchuck
- Margaret E Davis

**Discussion:**

There was a request from a member of the public for the testimony to remain open, and the commission discussed this option.

*Commissioner Smith* wants to continue this conversation as a work session to include a discussion about bikes; if off-site parking works; and para-transit access loading. The proposal is not quite ready to be forwarded. *Commissioner Schultz* noted she would be interested in putting a decision off to a work session as well. *Commissioner Houck* as well so the commission can take a holistic approach. *Commissioner Shapiro* would like to vote today.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about reducing the unit minimum to 20 instead of 40.

- The smaller the building, the more the parking distorts the economics. Lots of complexes in the recent period have been built in the 20-40 unit range. On Division, the average size of projects is about 33. Regarding parking for 20-30 units, the neighborhoods have historically been able to absorb. Staff would be comfortable with 30 as the threshold.
- *City Commissioner Fritz* noted the sense of urgency for this project too.

*Commissioner Houck* updated his response and thinks it's fine to vote today if we can revisit and rethink options in a broader context. We don't want to lock in a bad decision today just to take a vote quickly.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about spaces for bike share. My understanding is the unit is 10 slots for 10 bikes. What are the 11 and 19 numbers?

- In terms of the construction, there need to be more vaults for bike parking than actual spaces. 11 bikes and 19 slots is the desired minimum.

*Commissioner Smith* mentioned that off-site parking is skeptical. *Commissioner Schultz* noted this is actually something developers are interested in and should remain.

*Commissioner Smith* proposed amendments:

- The phrase “light rail” should be changed to “high-capacity transit”.
- For high-capacity transit the distance phrasing should be 500’ from the station area, not the alignment.

*Vice Chair Rudd* closed testimony for the hearing.

**Motion:**

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to:

- Accept the transit and bike-share amendments provided by *Commissioner Smith*.
- Clarify that the off-site option is not limited to existing parking. Also change the distance to be within 500’ instead of 300’ to align it with the transit distance.

*Commissioner Valdez* seconded.

*Vice Chair Rudd* restated the motion, and the motion passed.  
(Y8 – Gray, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to forward the PSC’s recommendation of

- Staff’s 6 proposed amendments.
- Plus today’s amendments.

*Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y7 – Gray, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez; N1 – Schultz,)

The commission will continue this discussion; parking permits may be part of the ultimate solution. The commission’s letter to Council should direct PBOT to continue work on permitting options and note this is an interim, first step, but that a larger process and review needs to continue.

**Adjourn**

*Vice Chair Rudd* adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator