

Moving to Our Future:

Pricing Options for *Equitable Mobility*

PBOT
PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION



Community Task Force Meeting #3 – Meeting Summary

March 9, 2020 | 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Portland Building, 1120 SW 5th Ave, First Floor, Room 108

Relevant Materials

Please find links to relevant materials below:

- [Meeting Agenda](#)
- [Presentation Slides](#)
- [Draft Equitable Mobility Framework indicator list](#)
- [Revised Task Force Charter and By-laws](#)

Attendance:

Present:

Task Force Members	City Staff	Bureau
Brian Cooley	Tony Jordan	Transportation
Andy Cotugno	Ady Leverette	Transportation
Taren Evans	Elizabeth Liedel Turnbull	Planning & Sustainability
Monique Gaskins	Tammy Lundervold	Transportation
Aaron Grimmer	Esme Miller	Transportation
Hau Hagedorn	Sherifa Roach	Transportation
Shani Harris-Bagwell	Vivian Satterfield	Transportation
Jonathan Hutchison	Ashton Simpson	Transportation
Justin Jackson	Sara Wright	Planning & Sustainability

Absent:

Task Force Members

Violeta Alvarez
Baofeng “Bao” Dong
Stephenie Frederick
PK Mandel
Nicole Phillips
Richa Poudyal

Agenda

TIME	AGENDA ITEM
5:30 p.m.	<i>Dinner for Task Force Members and refreshments available</i>
6:00 p.m.	Welcome & Opening Remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize Task Force Meeting #2 summary • Parking lot responses • Charter finalization • Information sharing
6:15 p.m.	Public Comment
6:25 p.m.	Debrief from Meeting #2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key takeaways from small group discussions
6:35 p.m.	Equitable Mobility Workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visioning exercise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>What does equitable mobility look like in Portland?</i> ○ <i>Who should we prioritize?</i> • Sticky wall exercise • Equitable mobility framework and indicators (rotating small-group discussions) • Full-group report out and next steps
7:55 p.m.	Wrap-up & Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action items

Welcome & Opening Remarks

Facilitator Emma Sagor welcomed Task Force members and previewed the meeting agenda.

Next, the group reviewed parking lot items from Meeting #2.

- Parking lot items are issues that the group doesn't have time to fully discuss during the limited time in a Task Force meeting and are recorded for staff to follow-up on at the next meeting.
- Parking Lot Items from Meeting #2:

PARKING LOT ITEM	STRATEGY TEAM RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the Task Force timeline intersect with ongoing work/decisions being made that might impact pricing? • Is there a protocol for Task Force members to provide comments on existing processes? • Are we going to consider the entire universe of pricing options and non-pricing complementary strategies? 	<p>There are many ongoing conversations that intersect with this work or could potentially be related. The charge of this group is to advise on if and how new pricing strategies might help advance equitable mobility and there is not time to discuss every possible complementary strategy or topic within the project timeline.</p> <p>Staff will report back in April with more clarity on how the Task Force's work intersects with other ongoing efforts and how, when and on what the group may forward recommendations.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can we get a list of pricing decisions that have been made in Portland historically? 	<p>Staff will report back in April with more information on this question.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the process for developing, voting on and forwarding recommendations? 	<p>Per the charter, the Task Force will vote to forward recommendations. A quorum of members must be present and majority and minority opinions will be recorded.</p> <p>Staff will also report back in April with more clarity on the process for identifying topics for recommendations.</p>

Charter Finalization

Staff presented a revised version of the Task Force Charter, reflecting edits requested by Task Force members at Meeting #2. Edits included:

- Spelling out “VMT” and other acronyms
- Requested updates to background section to clarify the group’s charge and connection between VMT, congestion and climate impacts.

Task Force members requested one additional edit to the Charter:

- Add “(VMT)” in parentheses after the spelled-out statement so people know moving forward what it refers to

The Task Force agreed to consider the Charter final with that edit.

Information Sharing

Project staff provided updates and shared information on topics relevant to the Task Force’s work:

- Staff are adding citations and references to the talking points from the slides related to the presentation “History of Transportation in Portland: Why Centering Racial Equity Matters.” These talking points will be made available when finalized.
- All City of Portland advisory body volunteers must complete mandatory trainings as part of the onboarding process. Task Force members are required to take the following trainings:
 - **Discrimination and retaliation Prohibited (Human Resources Rule 2.02)**
 - This training provides a foundation for the expectations for professional conduct that advisory body members are held to when volunteering to advise the city. The video for Task Force members to complete this training is still in development. Staff will share the link to the training video with the Task Force as soon as it becomes available.
 - **Equity Training**
 - This training is conducted through a self-guided PowerPoint presentation. Staff will provide the link to the training materials in April.
- OPAL, who is a partner with the City on this project, is working with other organizations to hold a community focus group this spring around the topics of pricing and equitable mobility. This spring focus group and additional focus groups later in the process will allow for the involvement of

additional community expertise and insight. The outcomes of these focus groups will be shared with the Task Force as they occur. *[Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, the spring focus group is postponed. More information will be shared as it is available.]*

- Resources and articles shared by Task Force members are posted by staff on the project website. Task Force members are invited to send resources/links related to this topic so they can be distributed to the group in this way.

Public Comment

The City will be collecting public comment throughout the entire 18-month Task Force process via email, regular mail, phone, and written and verbal comments at public events. At each meeting, Task Force members will be provided a written report of public comments received since the last meeting. No written comments had been submitted prior to this meeting.

At the meeting, one member of the public provided the following verbal comments:

"I want to pass along some thoughts for you to consider as you visualize what equitable mobility looks like.

One part of equitable mobility is providing an appropriate level of transit service, and for the past two decades, this region has been under-investing in bus service and spending significant funds on capital projects that have placed a big burden on TriMet's payroll tax revenues in the form of continuing bond payments. Transit has not been meeting past regional goals, and does not appear on track to meeting the goals of our current Regional Transportation Plan.

Looking back to the year 2000, our Regional Transportation Plan¹ had a "preferred system" goal of 551,757 originating transit trips per weekday by the year 2020. Starting from 207,400 originating fixed route weekday transit trips in the year 2000, this would have required a compounded growth rate of 5 %.

Unfortunately, TriMet's ridership reports² show, for FY 2019, 237,563 average weekday originating riders, less than half of the goal this region had two decades ago.

Why did this happen?

Bus service was cut by 5% in 2005, and again in 2010 by about 12%. Rides per capita peaked in about 2004. This region failed to make the investment we knew we needed to make, and the result could have been predicted. Bus service hours are up only 16% total over the past 20 years, and bus ridership is now down about 10% over 20 years.

Of course some productive bus service was replaced by MAX service, but it wasn't only bus service that failed to increase. The MAX Blue Line to Gresham has roughly the same level of service today that it did in 1990.

The whole MAX system has limited ability to increase service on existing routes due to lack of capacity through the Rose Quarter and Steel Bridge bottleneck, and MAX ridership has also stagnated in recent years. Because of the bottleneck, the MAX Green Line opened with less

frequency than promised, and has not improved over opening day. The Yellow Line actually had service cut when the Green Line opened, in order to provide capacity over the Steel Bridge.

If you want more transit riders, you need to provide the service, and you need to have a well-designed system that facilitates connections: bus to bus, bus to rail, and rail to rail.”

Doug Allen

March 9, 2020

1. https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_metro/6/
2. <https://trimet.org/about/pdf/trimetridership.pdf>

Debrief from Meeting #2

Shoshana Cohen, Project Manager, thanked Task Force members for participation in meaningful discussions during Meeting #2, recognizing that time constraints limited opportunities for debriefing small-group discussions. Shoshana summarized key themes identified by staff facilitators from Meeting #2 (see [presentation slides](#)), then invited additional reflections and comments from the group.

- Some Task Force members shared concerns that saying “racism created the system we have today” may be too strong and cause disengagement with the overall message.
 - Some Task Force members felt this wording implies most transportation decisions were made due to overt, intentional racism and disregards the influence of subconscious bias, which can lead to unintentionally racist outcomes. Task Force members discussed the distinctions between individual and structural racism, as well as the relevance of intent.
 - Others shared that “racism” can be defined as prejudice and power. Using that definition, even if a decisionmaker is not overtly racist, they can still make racist decisions if the systemic structures in which they operate and have power are built on prejudice.
- Some Task Force members noted the power of the language we use to talk about transportation spending. They noted that we call infrastructure spending, including on freeways, an “investment,” while we call spending on services, like transit, a “subsidy.”
- Some Task Force members noted being surprised by the information shared and said they were unaware of the power race and wealth had in the history of transportation evolution in Portland. They spoke about this process being an effort to counteract that history—not just give “subsidies” or a leg up, but to rebalance historically inequitable power structures.
- A Task Force member asked for more information on the health impacts of transportation projects and policies. This was added to the parking lot for further follow-up from staff.
- A Task Force member requested more information on the City’s adopted policies around leading with racial equity. This was added to the parking lot for further follow-up from staff.
- Task Force members in general discussed the importance of being clear in the language we use.

Equitable Mobility Workshop

Michael Espinoza, Project Strategy Team Member, provided instructions for the Equitable Mobility Workshop portion of the agenda. Task Force member were randomly assigned four different groups.

Step 1: Visioning Exercise

In small groups, Task Force members generated responses to the following two visioning questions:

- What would “equitable mobility” look like in Portland?
- What barriers do people (particularly thinking of Black, Indigenous, People of Color communities) face in reaching equitable mobility?

Task Force members recorded responses to these questions on sticky notes and discussed their reflections with their small groups.

Step 2: Sticky wall exercise

The Task Force reconvened as a large group and placed their individual sticky note responses from the visioning exercise on a “sticky wall.” The sticky wall included a list of pre-populated categories and individual indicators generated before the meeting by staff, as well as an “other” category for comments that did not fall into one of the pre-populated categories. The [draft indicator list](#) was based off the Greenlining Institute’s [Mobility Equity Framework](#). Michael shared that staff have spent the last few months refining and vetting the draft indicator list with the internal project Technical Advisory Committee and PBOT Transportation Justice Steering Committee. This indicator list is draft and subject to further iteration in this workshop and beyond.

Step 3: Rotating small-group discussions

Task Force members dispersed again into four small groups. Each group rotated through a series of stations to discuss how the Task Force’s “vision” of equitable mobility aligns with the draft indicator list and whether refinements were needed to fully capture the Task Force’s vision.

Notes from the visioning exercise and small group discussions are summarized in the following tables:

Moving People & Goods

Visioning Exercise: What would Equitable Mobility Look Like	Visioning Exercise: What barriers do people (particularly thinking of Black, Indigenous, People of Color communities) face in reaching equitable mobility?	Small group discussion notes: Does the draft indicator list reflect the Task Force’s vision?
<p><i>Efficiency:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travel time and cost for non-car trips would be competitive with car trips (<i>this competitiveness is very important in order to shift users</i>) <p><i>Transportation Affordability:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historically advantaged communities “pay” (\$, time, etc.) and historically disadvantaged communities benefit more than they pay. Free transit access for those who need it. Balanced housing/transportation costs <p><i>Availability:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Everyone in Portland has a reasonable way to get to where they need to go – no matter what they are paying for housing. A functional degree of parity (Frequency, condition of infrastructure throughout Portland) A transit stop within ¼ mile of all residences. An abundance of choice in everyone’s mobility options in every neighborhood. Ability to drive to desired destinations 	<p><i>Efficiency:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technology Travel times that serve as a barrier or result in few choice uses. Efficiency of the allocation of the right of way. Time: door to door commute time, inflexibility of timing (transit, job hours) Distance: displacement, housing costs, job/shopping/destinations Economic efficiency Travel time competitiveness <p><i>Transportation Affordability:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of transit as a % of household income Lack of wealth and income Money: transit fees, parking fees, vehicle maintenance, fuel (liquid, dry, food), tickets, gas tax, car reg fees, vehicle (car, bike, shoes), sunk cost of each mode. Low level of transit – enabled independence (ex. At the mercy of transit malfunction and frequency) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transit service is not available for shift jobs. Transit Reliability: inflexibility of timing, predictability of travel All modes of transportation are respected equally (more equitable resource allocation). Gas should be more expensive. Busses + MAX should be free- not concerned about wealthy people not paying.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability of commercial operations to access their destinations to provide needed products and services. • Close by access to frequent and fast transit • Access close by to safe bike routes that provide continuity along the route. <p><i>Reliability:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People who are in a big rush should have a reliable option to get where they need to go on time. • Transit reliability • Not waiting more than 10 minutes for a bus <p><i>Connectivity:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully realized networks that create connectivity for all modes • The convenience of the comfortable no longer takes precedence over others' basic needs. • Everyone should be able to reach key destinations reasonably, conveniently (including access, affordability, safety etc.), and speedily <p><i>Accessibility:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wheelchair users should never have to wait because the bus is too crowded • Depressed curbs + crosswalk lines on every corner • Affordable housing close to jobs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation cost burden (relative to income) compounded by only one reliable mode (cars). • Time spent commuting. • Low level of car access/ ownership <p><i>Availability:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure: Bike lanes, Bus lanes, Avail. of parking • Limited options (modes) for transit/mobility • People that need public transportation shouldn't have to choose between food + Transit. It should be a right to be able to get where you need to go. <i>(group discussion of why this supports the need for free transit)</i> • Comfort + Quality <i>(just as important as availability and reliability)</i> • High variation in access to "good" transportation options • Lack of service during non-peak hours. (I.e. weekend afterhours) • Frequency of transit options (quality, access, options, reliability) <p><i>Reliability:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public spaces (transit) can actually be more safe sometimes than private spaces for people who face domestic abuse or other personal safety concerns sometimes in their own private spaces. <p><i>Connectivity:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing affordability • Distance from city center 	
---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Infrastructure gaps, like sidewalks and bike right of way. <p><i>Accessibility:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Travel time to public transit• ADA• Longer commutes and wait time for BIPOC and East Portland residents<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lack of options in in transportation• Ability to drive,• Distance to jobs, services, stores (Relative to housing)• Access to information	
--	--	--

Sustainability & Health

Visioning Exercise: What would Equitable Mobility Look Like	Visioning Exercise: What barriers do people (particularly thinking of Black, Indigenous, People of Color communities) face in reaching equitable mobility?	Small group discussion notes: Does the draft indicator list reflect the Task Force’s vision?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equitable access to “good” transportation options. “good” defined as low-cost, low impact, good for health. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disparate land use in neighborhoods (e.g. large, wide corridors so transit is far away from neighborhoods in East Portland) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Averages hide differences between smaller geographies (e.g. census tracts, corridors) and demographics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E.g. some neighborhoods have street trees and green spaces, while others have wide corridors that lack trees and parks • In Portland, increasing growth and wealth does not lead to health and sustainability. Need to invest in a way that facilitates growth and wealth while maintaining/prioritizing health and sustainability • Low-income people shouldn’t be the ones required to take on the burden of climate action—high income people who have access to cars need to act too. In addition, low-income people are disparately burdened by climate impacts. • Need to start considering externalities as part of cost/benefit analysis • Many of the people contributing least are being burdened by negative impacts/outcomes • Impacts of transportation mode on health (e.g. if a bus commute takes two hours, what is the impact of that commute on

		<p>one's health? What do you do with that time? Do you have access to technology during that time? What kind of job do you have? How does one's commute/way they travel impact one's health?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs need to reflect the true cost (of externalities) (e.g. cost of gas needs to reflect all of the negative climate and health impacts that it causes) • Must decouple VMT from growth/wealth. Currently growth and increasing wealth are associated with increasing VMT. However, improving health/sustainability requires reducing VMT • Need to change how we define "healthy economy" • Portland should incentivize companies that aren't contributing to increasing VMT • Current system prioritizes car use (e.g. two car garages, suburban development). Cars are a self-fulfilling prophecy/cyclical, when people buy them, they drive them because they've already made the investment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land use is important • The US is deeply embedded in car culture. • Tie outcomes to social determinants of health • Sustainability- health has to be key to system design • Kids & elderly—what is driving the need for cars? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Very difficult to take kids on the bus ○ Unrealistic
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Transit stops may be inaccessible for elderly○ Time tradeoffs● There are legitimate reasons to drive● Taking the bus can be really inconvenient, especially when our system prioritizes cars (cheap (subsidized) gas, cars fairly cheap)
--	--	---

Safety

Visioning Exercise: What would Equitable Mobility Look Like	Visioning Exercise: What barriers do people (particularly thinking of Black, Indigenous, People of Color communities) face in reaching equitable mobility?	Small group discussion notes: Does the draft indicator list reflect the Task Force’s vision?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streets and street crossings that are safe to walk along and across • No more than 2 blocks walk without a safe place to cross • All kids should feel safe walking to school. • All people are able to get to where they need to go throughout the city safely • Fewer elderly people involved in car crashes • Being able to bus home from anywhere after 10pm • Rules for bikes = safety for pedestrians • Broader awareness of the kinds of safety to be found in being in public and in community.(re: partners abuse, LGBTQ+ existence etc.) - More of a critique of the promises of interpersonal safety that are assumed to go along with private auto travel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freeways cause physical barriers and divide neighborhoods. • Fast moving traffic makes walking unsafe. • Safety: Road safety, transit center safety, sidewalks, lighting • Infrastructure: sidewalks, bike lanes, street lights, • Personal Safety concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure that prioritizes high-speed auto travel over pedestrian and bike safety is concentrated in neighborhoods that BIPOC communities have been displaced to. • Experience of public life is impacted by how safe people feel

Economic Opportunity

Visioning Exercise: What would Equitable Mobility Look Like	Visioning Exercise: What barriers do people (particularly thinking of Black, Indigenous, People of Color communities) face in reaching equitable mobility?	Small group discussion notes: Does the draft indicator list reflect the Task Force’s vision?
<p><i>Transportation-related job opportunities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No one (or far fewer) people feel that they “have to own a car” • Transportation system affordable to all <p><i>Fair labor practices and living wages</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equal access to quality jobs, no matter geographical location in Portland Metro Area • Public transit that is frequent, connected, and is free. <p><i>Inclusive local business + economic activity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everyone is able to move throughout the city with similar relative costs, on their time + wallets. 	<p><i>Transportation-related job opportunities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to affordable transit prevents access to jobs + housing options • Affordability • Inability to live and work co-located <p><i>Fair Labor practices + Living Wages</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility of employer <p><i>Inclusive local business + Economic Activity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being unfit to drive, or too poor to afford a driver 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving freight and economics are often a counter to equity, but it doesn't have to be, think differently • #1 job in Oregon is truck driver, but is this an equitable, healthy job opportunity? (concerns around gender representation, health of drivers) – Let's make bus driver, train operator attractive green jobs. • Apprenticeship programs – diesel transition, just transition • Gig economy jobs – no fair labor practices- It's based on “user” benefits. • Think more about costs than benefits, but still very important • Concerned this could justify inequitable/unsustainable projects + investments: one-time vs. Ongoing impacts • Access to jobs vs. Transportation jobs specifically • The purpose of an equitable mobility system isn't job creation, but jobs created should be equitable.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation is a circulatory system – feeds economy, opportunity to all parts of city. • E-Scooter companies created jobs for folks who may not have many options • Some benefits of a gig model: short term, bridge, but right now not sustainable • Failure in freight world to be nimble and innovate: death march: more VMT= more economy. • Tabulate cost of SOV trips so it can be internalized • False conflict between freight and sustainability • Part of the “benefits case” <p><i>How should we prioritize racial equity through this process?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize jobs for BIPOC individuals- access matters • Contracting- need more focus on equity • Centering transportation jobs on BIPOC communities- perpetuating service v. professional career path disparities • Prioritize right to organize • Affordability integral to job access – fare free for communities of color, - free is more than \$- time, accessibility, reliability • 15-min cities – Paris Example. Community benefit agreement. • What is available in proximity to transit oriented development, but more intentional
--	--	---

Process Equity

Visioning Exercise: What would Equitable Mobility Look Like	Visioning Exercise: What barriers do people (particularly thinking of Black, Indigenous, People of Color communities) face in reaching equitable mobility?	Small group discussion notes: Does the draft indicator list reflect the Task Force’s vision?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car-centric culture • Cultural stigma (e.g. assumptions of economic status because of transit usage) • Access to storage for cars/bikes • Lack of funding for all alternative modes of transportation • Drivers from outside the city are a significant contribution to the problem • Access to drivers license as a proxy for other mobility options • Assumptions regarding access/familiarity with technology • Expanding transit in expensive • Close in neighborhoods are most accessible by all modes resulting in low income displacement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobility tools that by their nature do not reinforce unequal access • Access to amenities not just “shopping” or work • Get where we’re going in the same amount of time with the same quality of experience without impacting our livelihoods 	<p><i>Do these topics of things we care about capture your vision?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whose needs are being met at the end of the decision-making process? • What decision-making processes? It’s unclear • When planning for the City, we are always thinking of those who are there in that moment and not about who is being or will be displaced • Equitable outcome vs process – which one is it? • The process often takes so long (plans take so many years, we spend more time talking about them than working to execute them) • The description doesn’t capture the topic • What do we mean by “diversity of perspectives- whose perspectives? (not everyone’s opinions are weighed the same way) • Process equity? What does that mean? Is this referring to what we are doing now or what we are about to roll out?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make sure the engagement, outreach and roll out is inclusive and multilingual- tools -e.g. cultural-specific and non-English language newspapers in Portland • “diversity of perspectives” is too vague. What does that mean? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agencies don’t know what to do with those diverse perspectives. • Make sure your “what we care about topic” and its description language is consistent. - e.g.:" Process equity-inclusive, and diversity of perspectives” • Process equity is too ambiguous • Language is too vague • Call out mobility outcomes • What does consultation mean? How does it look like? <p><i>How should we prioritize racial equity through this process?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Youth civic engagement ○ How do we center “who we are prioritizing”? ○ Call out CBOS (serving non-English speakers, immigrants and refugees) ○ How are we coming/reaching out to low-income, houseless individuals in a strategic way? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Conduct focus group
--	--	---

Wrap-up & Next Steps

Emma Sagor thanked participants for their participation and gave an overview of the next phase of Task Force work. *[This look ahead is subject to change due to the COVID-19 pandemic]*. She reviewed next steps and parking lot items before the meeting was adjourned.

Action Items

- Staff will compile feedback gathered on the draft Equitable Mobility Framework and share compiled notes with the Task Force; time will be saved on the next meeting agenda to debrief the exercise.
- Staff will follow up on parking lot items.