

PBOT

PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION

1120 SW Fifth Ave, Suite 1331, Portland OR 97204

Main: 503-823-5185 TTY: 503-823-6868 Fax: 503-823-7576 Portland.gov/Transportation

Jo Ann Hardesty Commissioner **Chris Warner** Director

Northwest Parking District Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)	Zoom Meeting September 21, 2022 4:30 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
--	---

To watch meeting recording go to:

https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/qwjdu_0a_PsqN1XvVA5J9OPWRjH867HSjpnM-id_JN1s1G8ltmsEaOFVebCX-3G1.fE3SdwD5gGtAh9nH

Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Rick Michaelson, Chair (At-Large)
Amy Spreadborough, Vice Chair (NWBA)
Dan Anderson (At-Large)
Jeanne Harrison (NWDA)
Karen Karlsson (NWDA)
Parker McNulty (NWDA)
Tom Ranieri (NWBA)
Peter Rose (At-Large)
Don Singer (NWBA)
Mark Stromme (At-Large)
Ron Walters (NWDA)
Alex Zimmermann (At-Large)

Members Absent

None

Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) Staff

Rae-Leigh Stark, NW Parking District Liaison
Stanley Ong, Parking Program Specialist
Kristan Alldrin, Program Manager
Dave Benson, Parking and Regulatory Group Director
Wendy Serrano, Equity and Inclusion Manager
Sarah Goforth, Transportation Wallet Manager
Judge Kemp, Transportation Wallet Coordinator
Lisa Strader, ADA Coordinator

Office of Community and Civic Life (Civic Life) Staff

Ocean Eale, Advisory Bodies Analyst

Consultant Staff

Peter Collins, RWC

Guenevere Millius, Parachute

William Reynolds, RBT

Owen Ronchelli, RWC

Tracy Smith, Inhance

Rick Williams, RWC

Public in Attendance

Allan Classen

Lewellyn Robison

Steve Pinger

Todd Zarnitz

Kathy Sharp

Welcome & Announcements

Amy started the meeting at 4:35 pm

Code of Ethics

Ocean Eale from Office of Community of Civic Life reviewed the Advisory Bodies Program. Advisory Bodies Program was created in 2017 to standardize how advisory bodies work. The NW SAC's bylaws will be reviewed again for compliance to the bylaws template.

"Public official" in Oregon state law can refer to all levels of government, from city and county up to the state level. The term "City official" works in the same way but focuses on the jurisdiction of cities.

Portland City Code 1.03 Code of Ethics governs city officials on areas of trust, objectivity, accountability, and leadership. City officials, employees, contractors, and volunteers are HRAR 2.02 prohibits workplace harassment, discrimination, racism, and retaliation based on protected status. All advisory board members serve at the pleasure of the commissioner.

Amy asked if what Ocean is going over is more appropriate for next month's meeting with the new committee members. The primary reason the committee wanted this on the agenda was to confirm the aspect of confidentiality portion of HRAR 2.02. They also have questions about the chain of authority – for the NW SAC, who is the manager that HRAR

2.02 refers to? Ocean said that the initial email was sent to everyone on the committee, so the response was also sent to everyone on the committee. The manager that HRAR 2.02 refers to is the staff liaison. He also clarified that after reviewing the email thread, that there was not an official accusation but a warning/suggestion that behavior can be construed or misconstrued potentially as bullying or discriminatory behavior.

Rick M said that there seems to be confusion between public officials and city officials. They are public officials, but are not city officials since the SAC does not make decisions nor speak on behalf of the City. Therefore, the code that is being applied is not relevant. He thinks that it should be clarified that they are included though. Rick M is surprised and shocked by the City's short-term memory about the agreement made between the council-appointed SAC and the City when negotiating the bylaws about the continuation of the chair as a non-voting member. It was a long considered and heavily negotiated deal. He also asks why this went public if there is a process that calls for confidentiality and escalation. It should have been addressed through the chair or vice chair first. He also said that there is nothing that Don had said in the email that he did not say at the previous meeting, so why was he accused and not him? Rick also said that "and with that, thank you very much and I am done being chair of the SAC, and I'm signing off now for the evening".

Tom said that if you look at the email conversation, it began with a general statement about zoom meetings and how they don't seem to work for the SAC. Don had responded in the email conversation that it's the same for him. Tom still does not understand what was wrong. Tom would like to know what called for PBOT's response in the first place - where exactly did Don violate the rules or code of ethics.

Wendy Serrano said that the perception of targeting or bullying is due to the targeting or calling out of an individual's ability to serve in a specific role. She would like to highlight four of PBOT's values - Equitable, Respectful, Open, and Inclusive. This is important to be addressed because the committee is about to welcome in new members, and wants to ensure that civility is valued and maintained. PBOT is committed to providing training and resources of best practices on how to foster the inclusive and equitable culture that they want to see.

Amy wanted to come back to one statement - what happened that resulted in PBOT's action. What she hears is that it's one thing to discuss ideas, and another to attach another individual directly to it.

Ron asked how we resolve the fact that the majority of the committee doesn't see any violation of the city code or standards in what Don did, and that they see numerous violations in how the City responded. Wendy said that at the end of the day, we want to uphold the values and culture of PBOT.

Ron asked how can he call out someone's behavior as inappropriate in a meeting, or say someone has better credentials or qualifications? Can he not say that? Wendy said that PBOT wants to uphold civility. The way it was perceived was disrespectful.

Dan said that in the email, it was stated "it is ridiculous to say" that the committee member "has 'expertise' in commercial parking – she does not. However, she has excellent knowledge of TDM and how parking relates to the overall picture, but not how parking operates, the economics, etc." When this was mentioned in the meeting, this point was not acknowledged. He does not see anything objectional about this case?

Wendy said that what we are trying to get at is to have individuals acknowledge their privilege and power they possess in the dynamic. This won't be something that's going to be accomplished in this meeting, but something that needs to be worked on together.

Amy said that there is a sense of feeling from PBOT that there is underlying environment that veers towards problematic behavior, and that further training is needed to improve the general vibe and goodwill of the committee. Wendy said that this will need to be addressed systematically to make sure that we foster the behavior we want to see in the bureau and in various advisory bodies. Its not that just the NW SAC will have new trainings, but this will be something that benefits the bureau and all its advisory bodies.

Dan made motion to accept the resolution that was circulated with the meeting materials for today's meeting. Ron seconded motion.

Dan said that as the maker of the resolution, it speaks for itself. Amy asked to add that "confidentiality should be made in communications per HRAR 2.02". Dan accepts the amendment. Tom seconded.

Tracy asked what the process or protocol for introducing and voting on resolutions if it is not on the agenda. Rae-Leigh said that it was on the agenda as discussion and not a vote. She will need to defer to other PBOT staff if they should move forward with the resolution since the role of the SAC is to provide input on parking and transportation demand management in the district, not conduct.

Rick M said that he and the Vice-Chair Amy requested this to be a vote when they had met with PBOT to set the agenda. So, it is appropriate for the SAC members to add to the agenda for a vote.

Tracy asked Dave for clarify the resolution. In terms of the meeting process, its not on the agenda since it was noted as discussion only.

Rick M said that if this does not come to a vote, he will file an ethics violation against PBOT staff for not following procedures for the SAC.

Dave said that we are not going to vote on this today. He suggests formatting it to a letter, and it would have the same effect. Rick M said that according to Robert's Rules of Order, any member may propose a resolution at a time of meeting, and if there is a majority willing to consider it then it is on the agenda and considered.

Ron said that he along with five other committee members, drafted the resolution and sent it to Rae-Leigh and Rick M more than a week in advance to be included on the agenda. Rick M talked to Amy and Rae-Leigh never said that this will not be voted upon. If need be, he can make a motion to include it on the agenda and that a majority of the SAC members will force it on the agenda to be immediately voted upon. However, he agrees with Rick M that this should not be necessary; that PBOT and any rule of order should welcome the will of the committee. The motion is moved, and if its not going to be entertained, it can be withdrawn or tabled, and his next motion would be to put the resolution on the agenda and immediately voted upon.

Dave asked what Ron thinks the net effect will be? Ron is looking for clarity since he respectfully disagrees that the initial email is problematic. The committee is objecting on the substance and tone of the email from Rae-Leigh. He believes PBOT has violated ethics and confidentiality rules. He sees greater concerns with PBOT staff than from any member of the committee.

Dave said that this does not change the rules of conduct of advisory bodies. Some of the issues raised in the resolution won't result in any action. If you believe that any misconduct has occurred... *(Dave lost his connection to the meeting)*.

Amy said that the intention of the committee members who are bringing this as a resolution, bringing it up in writing and discussed at this meeting is that it is very important to this group to have a conversation with good dialog and respect for each other. Its not about where this gets filed; but the understanding that there's a greater dialog that needs to go forward and a better way of going through the process of calling out committee members by all. They are going to vote on the resolution since it is the what the committee members desire and will use this to start future conversations about how to create a respectful environment for everyone at the table.

Vote:

Yes

Dan Anderson
Karen Karlsson
Rick Michaelson
Tom Ranieri
Peter Rose
Don Singer

Amy Spreadborough
Mark Stromme
Ron Walters

No
Jeanne Harrison
Alex Zimmermann

Abstain
Parker McNulty

Motion passes

Off-Street Demand and Feasibility Study Recommendations

Amy said that three members of the supply subcommittee have drafted a memorandum that they would like to include with the acceptance of the report from Rick Williams Consulting. The memorandum will be sent out after this meeting. Off-street parking is part of the committee's mandate and bylaws, and one of their top goals is to preserve and manage parking in the district.

Amy asked if they send out the memorandum to the committee members, can this be something be voted upon? Rae-Leigh said that it cannot be voted on since there has not been discussion about the memorandum at the subcommittee. Rae-Leigh said that they will talk about that after since they need to discuss the Rick Williams recommendations still. Amy agreed.

Rick W said that they have been keeping a record of comments from the supply subcommittee and will incorporate SAC comments before sending out an updated draft final report.

Gwen reviewed the public outreach work done as part of the study. They participated in the NW District Open House to encourage survey and focus group participation. Transportation and Parking Survey closed in August. Focus groups were held for employers, employees, and residents.

William provided a high-level overview of survey findings

- 487 respondents – 61% drive alone to work overall. Was about 50% in 2018.
 - 358 residents
 - 98 also work in the district – 40% drive alone to work
 - 260 do not work in the district – 66% drive alone drive alone to work
 - 94 non-resident employees – 71% drive alone to work
 - Over 50% of non-resident employees park on the street

- 35 visitors
- 28% of weekday “trips” were not taken due to remote work
 - About 30% of those who work from home anticipate having to go into the workplace more frequently in the future
- \$175/month median resident cost to park off street
 - 29 residents (9% of those with a car) park on-street without a Zone M permit
 - 46 residents (14% of those with a car) have residential off-street parking and choose to park on-street
- Less than 10% of respondents have the Transportation Wallet
 - Residents were more familiar with Transportation Wallet program than employees

Gwen reviewed the focus group findings.

Employees/Employer findings

- Parking is constrained
- Monthly rates feel too steep in garages
- Participants were concerned about safety for guests and employees and wanted short walking distance to off-street parking
- Transit is inadequate for swing and graveyard shift workers
- Healthy Business Permits and apartments without parking is adding further constraint
- Wayfinding signage in shared-use lots needs to be clear and welcoming
- Most business would not want to pay for reserved parking, but though visitors could benefit from access to paid off-street parking
- Online system is difficult to use for temporary or daily visitor permits

Residential findings

- Most did not know about the Transportation Wallet
- Most view car ownership as a benefit to their life
 - Having a car meant access to economic opportunities
- Most do not move cars during Timbers and Thorns games
- Residents report circling for parking for up to 30 minutes between 4 and 8 p.m.
- Most are not willing to walk more than 1-2 blocks from their home due to loading/unloading and safety
 - Some would consider walking further if off-street parking is secure, reliably available, or availability of EV charging spaces
- Most are not willing to pay for off-street parking
 - Of those who said they would pay said it is worth \$30-\$100 a month
 - All agreed \$200 a month is too much

Rick W reviewed the draft recommendations. Each recommendation is outlined with an action statement, strategy description, and phased order of implementation.

- Parking Capacity & New Supply
 - Critical to develop draft set of financial packages
 - Policy and code review shows that we can do this
 - Need to establish protocols for engaging funds from the NW Parking District for use in partnerships
 - About 50% of constraint in on-street parking is due to vehicles with Zone M permits.
- Parking Management
 - More aggressively price parking to match demand for both visitor and permit parking.
 - Performance-based pricing is typically considered for visitor parking, but needs to be applied to permits too
- TDM
 - Recommending using additional net parking revenues to incentives the use of other transportation options
 - The out- pocket of- costs to use other modes of transportation should be less than the cost of parking
- Supporting Infrastructure
 - Need to improve access to transit and amount of service
 - Explore fast-stop like spaces in residential areas for loading/unloading
- Education and Awareness
 - Lack of awareness of programs
 - Recommending doing a NW Parking District 101 program annually
 - Continue doing parking and transportation survey on a regular basis
 - Create and track performance measures year over year

Next Steps

- October 2022 – incorporate NW SAC feedback into draft recommendations report
- November/December – meetings as necessary to refine final published report
- January 2023 – Present findings and recommendations final report to NW SAC

Tom asked for clarification about the 10% figure about the Transportation Wallet. William clarified that 10% of residents have a Transportation Wallet. Most resident survey respondents are aware of it.

Tom asked what Rick W meant by increase the use of net meter revenues for TDM? Rick W said that as the committee looks at using revenue to pursue partnerships for off-street parking, they should also look into increasing the subsidy or value of incentives offered in the Transportation Wallet or other TDM programs.

Amy asked to clarify what the next steps are. Rick W said that the original scope called for the report to be completed in December. However, they committed to provide a 95% final document before many committee members reached their term limits in September. They

will take any input or comments received in the next week and incorporate into the report. The final report will be ready for the new committee by January 2023. Amy asked if committee members can have until the end of the month to submit feedback. Rick W agreed to take feedback, directed through Rae-Leigh through the end of September.

Public Input

None

Appreciation of Members Leaving

Steve Pinger thanked the members that are leaving on behalf of the NWDA and said that the NWDA intends to keep the leaving members engaged.

Amy asked Rae-Leigh to comment on the process for the new committee members. Rae-Leigh said that their first meeting will be on October 19 and that they are completing the training right now. We will discuss with Amy next week about the new agenda to get the new members up to speed.

New Business

None

Meeting adjourned at 6:02 pm.

PBOT Action Items

- Collect feedback from committee members about draft Off-Street Demand and Feasibility Recommendations