



PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION

1120 SW Fifth Ave., Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503-823-5185  
Fax 503-823-7576 TTY 503-823-6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Chloe Eudaly Commissioner Chris Warner Director

<b>Northwest Parking District Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)</b>	Zoom Meeting Portland, Oregon May 19, 2021 4:30 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
--	---

**Northwest Parking District Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)  
Meetings Notes**

**Members in Attendance**

- Rick Michaelson (Chair, At-large)
- Nick Fenster (Vice Chair, Northwest Business Association, NWBA)
- Daniel Anderson (At-Large)
- Peter Rose (At-Large)
- Alexandra Zimmerman (At-Large)
- Mark Stromme (At-Large)
- Karen Karlsson (Northwest District Association, NWDA)
- Ron Walters (Northwest District Association, NWDA)
- Jeanne Harrison (Northwest District Association, NWDA)
- Amy Spreadborough (Northwest Business Association, NWBA)
- Don Singer (Northwest Business Association, NWBA)

**Members Absent**

- Thomas Ranieri (Northwest Business Association, NWBA)
- Parker McNulty (Northwest District Association, NWDA)

**Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) Staff**

- Rae-Leigh Stark (Northwest Parking District Liaison)
- Zena Rockowitz (Parking Program Specialist)
- Kristan Alldrin (Program Manager)

**Public in Attendance**

Joleen Classen  
Steve Pinger  
Lewellyn Robinson  
Larry Kojaku  
Vicki Skryha

## **Northwest Streetscape Plan**

### **Scope**

Rae-Leigh received comments from the SAC on Northwest Streetscape Plan scope. Three goals: develop streetscape needs, prioritize list of projects, identify partnerships and other funding sources to leverage funds.

### **Task 1: Committee Engagement and Outreach**

Committee engagement guided by Capital Projects Subcommittee. But adoption or decision making going to full body. Outreach will include public survey for businesses and residents to get broader community engagement, neighborhood entities.

Jeanne sent a prototype. Jeanne wants to see people face to face, for this project it's really important.

Alex wants to engage folks who might have different mobility needs, seniors, equity area identified in Northwest in Motion (NWIM). Could Friendly House act as CBO for this? Want scope to be more expansive in terms of outreach.

Ron wants to know if we have asked people if this is a priority. What if feedback is focused on wrong stuff? Says he is a naysayer for the approach. Not supporting with leading with major investment without someone else. Might be willing to support with funds with someone else who is the lead, as opposed to being on hook for leading it and others may not pile on.

Jeanne says they want to know what we are spending money on but also hearing that there is nothing about this project that is a no go.

### **Take 2: Visioning**

Kick off project will have visioning exercises with Capital Projects Subcommittee. Get a feel for streetscape needs and aesthetics. First touch point with the public.

### **Task 3: Project List**

They will build off what was heard in visioning. Will get a project list and implementation plan. Outline different types of projects, type, benefits, location, quantity, cost. Alternative options for cost effective, quicker, temporary, projects (this was a suggestion at last meeting)

#### **Task 4: Implementation Plan**

Create plan of how to get project list off the ground. Go into detail with timeline, when to start, how long each project will take, look at the costs. Based on annual parking funds on hand and what is projected. Look at ideas for funding matches (not all need to be funded by SAC). Guidebook to share with developers to encourage them to implement what is recommended from plan. Creates opportunity to leverage SAC funds, by potentially finding a funding match with developers to encourage implementation. Lastly, would include interviews and focus groups with developers and city staff to make sure it can be implemented. Second touch point happens here with reaching out to the public.

Karen says significant amount of northwest is historic district. How does that add to and not detract? How to integrate that? Second piece is outreach in the city. If we are wanting new development to respond, is this going to be official or a suggestion? In many places there are street standards and this is part of what developer actually needs to do. This can't just be feel good document. Wants this to be adopted guidelines used in development review process like they in Slabtown.

Alex agrees there needs to be teeth to this and need to be sensitive to historic context but there is an opportunity to link styles northwest is known for.

Rick says this is two different projects and confused about how they work. One is areas where development is not taking place (south of Lovejoy St.). North of Lovejoy St., 50% is going to be redeveloped. Not sure how to structure to accomplish both.

#### **Public Input**

Steve is confused about what the deliverable is. Has relationship with this exercise from NWIM 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue corridor improvements. This is at some point an urban design exercise, wants to become development standards to a point, wants to be encapsulated as right-of-way standards but having trouble grasping what is being proposed . What are we asking them to do? Thinks they should look for consultant with a strong design background rather than transportation background. Gets nervous around temporary, quicker, cheaper ideas, not necessarily what he wants.

Lewellyn: PBOT hasn't always wanted to get public input. Is there a better way for the SAC to get its money? Assisting developers with providing off-street or on-street parking?

Vicki: since this is specific to NW 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, should reach out to property owners and businesses with information that was more specific than what was in NWIM. This could come as a surprise to a lot of people and they are in a position to know some important information. Rick responds, absolutely. Rick says NW 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue is a focus too.

Don: "Glad you made the point about NW 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue, each has its own character, and in a sense this whole exercise from what I've been listening to seems a bit muddled still. Steven pointed that out and Rick made some good points. It is engineering or is it design? North of Lovejoy has total distinct character than south. NW 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue has its own deal. Any design guidelines that come out of this have to be flexible enough that they let each area have its own unique identity. Worried about too much homogeneity like you have in Slabtown.

Amy says, as plan is being developed for outreach, maybe there are multiple junctures in which residents, business, and other stakeholders can weigh in. The NWIM plan went out for open house and comment. Was hefty document and if you hadn't been following along, that was a lot to relay to members to get them engaged, commenting. Will figure out the best way to reach out to businesses.

Peter notes he has seen PBOT come by and throw book at owners and doesn't want to see that happening in the neighborhood. He is for improving areas identified in report but doesn't want to see stick being thrown at owners.

## **Budget Adoption Process**

### **Budget Adoption Overview**

Rae-Leigh talks about budget timeline. During May and June look at budgets at each subcommittee for recommendations.

At June SAC meeting will have discussion about both budgets. Different than last year because discussion in June around both budgets together. In July meeting, if all is okay adopt the budget.

### **Revenue Allocation**

Shows reminder of how funds can be used. Net meter revenue is spent the fiscal year after it's collected and permit surcharge is collected and spent the fiscal year it's collected. Clarifies it is "available to use" versus "spent". Rick says big balance carrying forward. Doesn't need to be spent that year.

Shows buckets of expenses between net meter and permit surcharge revenue. Gives project examples. Capital projects fold into two buckets (come from both revenue sources).

Rick asks which money can only be spent on things only in Transportation System Plan? Rae-Leigh responds, permit surcharge.

### **Permit Surcharge and Revenue Budget**

On track to spend 55% of the budget. Will be getting budget updates on what is being carried over. Rick says they are spending less Transportation Demand Management (TDM) money they have available so can do something different with it in the future.

Nick asks is that difference between budgeted and billed or will that be under billed also because of activity? Rae-Leigh says they wont hit what they budgeted.

Rae-Leigh says Transportation Wallet distribution was lower than past years, mostly because of people not opting out of their parking permit. May not be as high as it always has been because less permits are in distribution right now. Only budgeting for people to redeem 100%. But that is not what happens. It's typically only 60%, so you will see a more realistic Transportation Wallet this year.

Karen says we need to factor in COVID in 2020 and early 2021 into people's activities. Weren't wanting to buy as many wallets. This year is an awkward anomaly. There will be less people opting-out because who have opted-out have opted-out. Not worried they only spent 55%.

### **Net Meter Revenue Budget**

On track to spend about 70% of the budget this year. Some of the spending is going into set asides.

Nick says get pretty heavy into carry over from previous year. Rae-Leigh responds, this year hurt the net meter revenue budget. We will have to cut things proportionally compared to what we have coming in from net meter revenue. There will be some changes for the next budget item.

Parker sees on the budgets consistently funded, is that an account with funds? Rae-Leigh says any line items that aren't set asides just go back int to the budget, nothing is lost. Comes back the following year. That is the reason looking for streetscape improvements. They revert to SAC funds, not to city general fund.

Tom says his understanding of net meter revenue was historically there was to be money set aside for increasing off street parking should that ever come to fruition, but doesn't see it here. Question about shared parking definition. Rick clarifies the money is for new parking and shared parking. Will come up with definitive term.

Nick asks about cumulative balance of set asides, Rae-Leigh says at the start of next year will have \$1.2 million in set asides.

### **5 year budget**

Have laid out the next 5 years budget based on exercise done in the past with Kathryn in the past and will continue to add to this.

### **NWDA NWIM Implementation Committee**

Parker introduces the NWDA NWIM Implementation Committee. Explains that strong opinions were thrown back and forth between Planning Committee and Transportation Committee in NWDA. There was a difference of opinion and wound up with committee to help NWIM that represents the groups. He thought it would be a good idea for them to communicate with SAC because SAC is paying for relatively substantial portion of NWIM.

Vicki explains, the idea is to have better communication, ongoing observation, and provide feedback. PBOT doesn't want to hear too much from us until the fall. Had specifically asked that internal diverters in the neighborhood be postponed until there is more outreach and evaluation of their needs. One thing in particular they thought was important and they do not seem to comply with the northwest district plan and urban design. Wants to see if there are any members of this committee that would like to communicate with one another, share perspectives, and have a way we can follow up with the city. Troubled by what the broader community thinks about some things and how do we tap into that? Feedback through outreach doesn't seem represented to community as a whole.

Larry would like to propose that SAC funds related activities as data collection and possibly mitigation for the traffic diverters that are actually installed. PBOT isn't particularly interested in funding the effects of diverted traffic for pedestrian and bicyclists, for example gridlock and adjacent intersections.

Rick asks if they are making decisions for NWDA or are decisions being made by the board or they are trying to coordinate? Vicki says they are an advisory committee and provide updates to Planning and Transportation committees. Want to get more communication going because seemed like there was fractured sense of what people really wanted during the process.

Alex asks them what the evaluation of diverters in NWIM could look like? Would be good idea for SAC to think more broadly. There was a conversation about not wanting to pick and choose funding specific projects, that is why there was a decision to fund a particular amount. If we are going to play that role, we are looking at everything across the board, not just specific projects.

Ron says as an NWDA representative, they need to figure out how it's going to interact with the SAC. Not sure how he would take direction from the NWDA board. How are SAC reps supposed to engage with NWDA and take their guidance?

Parker: everyone is doing a good job representing your opinions as a neighbor, not worth getting into right now but important to put SAC together with implementation group to make sure there is proper implementation.

Nick says he is wrapping his head around it. When he hears NWIM implementation committee, thinks it's a body keeping NWDA apprised. If its primary function is NWDA then it does feel like SAC is getting involved in the innerworkings. Will this be the convening place for those who have interest and concern about NWIM? If its just the mechanism in which NWDA is keeping itself up to speed, seems awkward.

Rick says would this fund additional data collection or mitigation preparation? That is within the scope of what the SAC does and perhaps we need to look at what we are collecting in terms of data. Thinks it's a discussion worth having.

Jeanne says PBOT is doing a significant amount of data collection this fall and will include what Larry is talking about, such as diversion on adjacent streets. Who would you hire that would be better than the City? The SAC said we didn't want to fund greenways so why would we go mucking about on decisions we aren't funding?

Alex states that since NWDA represents the entire neighborhood by default, may be worth NWDA's time to engage with those in the community who haven't been heard rather than this group taking an active role in that.

Vicki says committee got formed because didn't think there was enough time for the Transportation Committee only meeting once a month to engage enough on this issue. Not necessarily a closed group. The invitation is open to anyone who wants to meet with them, they are new. When we talk about mitigation and evaluation, we did make progress working with PBOT on number of streets, to expand, so some streets aren't missed. There are some things that would benefit us looking at more closely.

Nick says no one from the SAC is actively involved in the committee. Keeping in touch okay. More directly involved seems complicated.

Parker states implementation committee is for the NWDA of which the SAC has 4 members from the NWDA. If the SAC wants to give feedback to the implementation group, fine. SAC doesn't necessarily have to partake in all of the dialogues and opinions. Theoretically the implementation group is there for the neighborhood.

**New Business**

Jeanne learned the Flanders bridge will be open June 4 at 11 am.

*Meeting Adjourns.*