

# 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](http://Portland.gov/Transportation)

**Jo Ann Hardesty** Commissioner **Chris Warner** Director

<b>Northwest Parking District Supply Subcommittee</b>	Zoom Meeting September 15, 2022 1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.
---	---

**To watch meeting recording go to:**

[https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/QFjJ5jimsOqxkvRbzwRwVquZSSwmjGt26wrfTqxiBNYYr6AlJKwa5tp65aITbN2k.Ru\\_2O3I5CZHmorw4](https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/QFjJ5jimsOqxkvRbzwRwVquZSSwmjGt26wrfTqxiBNYYr6AlJKwa5tp65aITbN2k.Ru_2O3I5CZHmorw4)

## Meeting Summary

### **Members in Attendance**

Rick Michaelson  
Jeanne Harrison  
Karen Karlsson  
Tom Ranieri  
Amy Spreadborough

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

Rae-Leigh Stark (Northwest Parking District Liaison)  
Stanley Ong (Parking Program Specialist)

### **Consultant Staff**

Tyler Bump (EcoNW)  
Guenevere (Gwen) Millius (Parachute)  
William Reynolds (RBT)  
Owen Ronchelli (RWC)  
Rick Williams (RWC)

### **Public in Attendance**

Libby Bakke (Timbers)  
Mujtaba Ali (SP+)  
Todd Zarnitz

### **Introduction and Updates**

Rae-Leigh started the meeting at 1:03 pm.

Rick Williams shared an update on the NW off-street parking demand & feasibility study. They will collect feedback on the draft recommendations from the subcommittee and the committee and incorporate them into a draft to be shared at the end of September or early October. Final report should be ready by January 2023.

### **Public Outreach Notes**

Gwen shared an update on the public outreach process for the study to understand people's views and habits about parking and transportation. Participated in the district open house, administered a transportation survey with 487 responses, and held focus groups. Survey respondents and focus group participants had high amounts of resident participation.

William reviewed the high-level survey findings.

- 487 respondents – 61% drive alone 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
  - 35 visitors
- 28% of weekday “trips” were not taken due to remote work
  - About 1/3 of residents 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. Large employers were done as 1:1 interviews.

Employee/Employer focus group findings:

- Employers feel constraint in parking
  - Healthy Business permits and apartments without parking are putting constraint on on-street system.
- Monthly rates in existing off-street parking feels too expensive
- Safety for employees and guests is an on-going issue
  - Most didn't want to walk more than a couple of blocks
- Transit is inadequate for swing/graveyard shifts
- Signs and wayfinding need to be clear that someone is welcome to park there

- Most businesses may not reserve parking, but off-street parking for visitors would be helpful
- Temporary visitor permits can be confusing/hard to use
  - Some additional follow-up on how to update plate numbers in permit system may be helpful

#### Resident focus group findings

- Most did not know about Transportation Wallet
- Most saw car ownership as a net benefit to life
  - Having a car meant economic opportunity – better paying jobs are out of the district
- Timber/Thorns games add to constraint to parking
- Some residents report circling for 30 minutes to find parking
- Most residents would not consider parking off-street more than 1-2 blocks away
  - Exceptions: secure garage, guaranteed space, ability to charge EVs.
- Most said that they would not pay for off-street parking
  - Of those who said they would pay, willing to pay between \$30-\$100 per month.
  - From the survey \$50-\$75 a month was what respondents said they are willing to pay

#### Discussion

Rick M clarified the work from home trips are not actual trips into the district.

Karen asked to clarify if the that 46 residents park on the street have available parking and choose not to purchase it, or if their residence offers parking but is not available. She thought residents cannot buy Zone M permits if they have off-street parking available. Rae-Leigh said that category A buildings can purchase permits even if there is off-street parking available. Rae-Leigh also said that residents that are eligible for the income-based permit can purchase a Zone M permit regardless of the availability of off-street parking. Karen would like this question to be more specific about the availability of off-street parking in the future.

Rick M suggested that inadequate transit service needs a paragraph or two. It may be outside of the scope, but its an issue that has been identified. Gwen also said that transit is a barrier to encourage less driving or to giving up their cars. Karen said that they used to have more transit service but was cut years ago.

Karen asked if Gwen could share the 4 large employers that participated in the interviews. Gwen said that it was Zapproved, Tillamook, DoveLewis, and On Running.

#### **Review and Discuss Study Recommendations**

Rick went over the study recommendations. Each study has an action statement, description, and order of implementation.

- Parking Capacity and New Supply
  - First step is to determine the initial target of additional parking supply needed
  - Need to establish protocol to use funds
  - Pursue and establish private partnerships
- Parking Management
  - Reaffirm goal for allocating on-street parking permits, based on occupancy and constraints to visitor parking
  - Initiate new pricing and permit allocation process
    - Permit pricing needs to increase. Can be phased in.
    - Use additional revenue to support new supply
  - Continue data collection on and off-street.
- TDM
  - Discuss and develop enhanced incentives within NW TDM program
  - Establish performance goals for mode choice behavior, particularly in non-resident employees
  - Continue TDM incentive enhancements as revenue allows
- Improved Supporting Infrastructure
  - Explore fast stop-like spaces in residential areas
  - Explore remote parking opportunities along streetcar or bus lines with direct service to NW
    - Can be paired with Transportation Wallet
  - Need to improve collaboration with TriMet to improve service to district
- Education and Awareness
  - There are misconceptions in program offerings. Consider doing an annual NW Parking District 101 open to PBOT staff, committee members, and the public
  - Initiate tracking of performance success measures
  - Establish base system of public outreach for annual implementation

## Discussion

Rick M asked if there is utilization data on existing off-street lots. Rick said that we have data on 107 facilities (including residential buildings), but many off-street lots in the district are 15 stalls or less.

Karen said that there is a challenge in increasing on-street parking rates when employees and residents say that transit is not good enough. It will be challenging to link increasing on-street permit price and TDM programs. Rick W said that they now know that they have

flexibility in how funds are used. Gwen asked if the business association would be willing to act as a group or large employer to organize/sponsor vanpool amongst employees working for smaller employers/businesses.

Rick M said that the committee has been asking for short-term loading zones in residential areas for about two years already.

Jeanne said that regarding off-site lots, this may just push commuters to other neighborhoods. Rick W said that they were neutral on the policy, but it is an option that is allowed.

Rick M said that this is supposed to be an off-street parking report, but 4 of the 5 recommendations are not about off-street parking. He suggests doing separate report for the 4 items, or to make them less of a focus so that they don't have the same emphasis. He thinks they can make better recommendations about shared parking. Rick W said that the consultant team believes that there is a direct connection between TDM and the success of the off-street program. There are areas, like in area b where there are 400 on-street permits parked and it would be a challenge to move them off the street.

Rick M said that doing more TDM does not increase the likelihood of creating off-street parking but reduces the need for off-street parking. Raising on-street parking rates is more directly related, but he does not think most people will understand it. The report needs to focus on what it takes to produce off-street parking. He also suggests including a statement that the current on-street parking rates do not justify off-street parking yet. Rick W said that they can lead with everything related to parking, and then go to another section for other actions and programs.

### **Next Steps**

Rick W said in future rounds of data collection (surveys), he suggests including geocodes to be able to identify where people live in relation to transit infrastructure.

### **Discussion**

Karen has some concerns about some of the introductory data that needs to be corrected. Part of it is that there is a misconception of what NW Portland is like. Statistics like median income doesn't reflect lower income residents. Rick M said that there are still a similar number of lower income residents, but many more higher income residents have now moved into the district. Karen said that tract 47 is not included in the data and is really part of the neighborhood. Tyler said that he will look back at the census data. He also said that including the income distribution may be a better representation than median household income.

Karen said that the amount of people who make less than 25,000 in figure 3 doesn't include everyone in the neighborhood who have that level of income.

Rick M said that the other demographic info of concern is the increase of 3,000 housing units, but only an increase of 1,900 residents.

Tyler asked the subcommittee for suggested ways to better communicate the demographic information.

Rae-Leigh suggested to use the PBOT equity matrix since it includes tract 47.

Karen said that the Civic Life published neighborhood-specific info but doesn't think it includes the 2020 census data.

### **Timbers Update**

Libby Bakke is here from Barney and Worth, and supports the Timbers Organization with the Stadium Oversight Committee. She also helped with the transportation planning work during the expansion. During the expansion, she helped with the transportation planning work. One of the main strategies that came out of that planning effort was to find more off-street parking.

Rae-Leigh asked if the additional off-street parking is specifically in the NW District or in other areas. Libby said that measure C.1 from the Comprehensive Transportation Management Plan Update is to promote and secure underutilized parking facilities, to incentivize off-street parking. The first thing specified is to maximize the use of SmartPark garages.

Libby asked what discussion has been taken to date about parking at Legacy. Rick said that there has been discussion about what the master plan allows. The general feeling is that they are OK with using Legacy parking for Timbers if it doesn't increase the number of drivers in the neighborhood. One of the key policies is to not encourage driving into the neighborhood.

Jeanne said that it's been several months since she's briefed the NWDA board. In the past it was a firm "no", but they are now a little more open to listening to the options.

Karen said that the neighborhood already feels that there is already a large impact from Timbers and Thorns games. If the spaces at Legacy were available, there is concern that it will bring more people into the neighborhood. There are management tools that can help address that, such as pre-sold parking.

Rick said that one of the realities is that even if Timbers/Thorns fans are intending to park at Legacy, if they see a closer on-street space they will want to park there instead. Karen added, unless they prepay. Rick said that the Restricted Event District may need to be expanded.

Tom said that Timbers fans are already driving into the neighborhood. He would like to see if off-street supply can help. If it were cheaper to park off-street than on-street, that may encourage fans to park off-street.

Rick said that it would be nice if a resident who lives near Legacy were able to park at Legacy during the game if they cannot find a space on the street. He wants to make sure that residents and retail customers can find a space to park.

Rick asked if there is a proposal of how the Timbers would like to use Legacy parking. Libby said that the Stadium Oversight Committee wants to make sure what they do with parking at Legacy is supported by the NW SAC and the NWDA. Rick asked if there is a specific proposal being considered.

Ali said that prior to 2020, many Timbers fans were parking at 10<sup>th</sup> and Yamhill SmartPark garage half mile away, and would completely fill the 800-space garage. The Legacy Good Samaritan lots are a little further away (0.7 miles 15 minutes walking) but is still a nearby resource. Some lots are already open for public parking after 5 p.m. in the two lots closest to Providence Park – parking structure 1 (177 spaces) and an adjacent surface lot (83 spaces). Fee is \$1 per hour, which is cheaper than on-street parking. Overall campus has 2500+ spaces. The question is if there is demand for it and how to facilitate it.

Karen said that if they can get half of the Timbers fans who currently park on the street into the garage, it would be appreciated. She works further north than the Legacy campus, and Timbers fans walk from there.

Rick said that the subcommittee should draft goals, such as Karen's (reduce on-street demand, but not overall demand). If the Timbers have any ideas about how they would like to use parking and address these issues, they can compare the two to see if there is something worth bringing to the full committee.

Rae-Leigh asked if there are Timbers fans currently parking at Legacy and if it is advertised. Karen thinks that there is a general lack of awareness, and doesn't think many people are using it in general. Ali said that there probably is some, but not many. It is not specifically advertised for Timbers parking. SmartPark is utilized a lot since it is on the organization's website.

Jeanne asked if Ali knows if Legacy has any conditions about which lots they would open up since there is some usage at nights and weekends for hospital business. Ali said that

parking structures 2 and 3 already have equipment in place. Parking structure 2 is more heavily used in the evening though. Amy asked how many parking spaces are in those structures. Ali said parking structure 2 has 575 spaces and parking structure 3 has about 500 spaces.

Amy asked if it is also \$1/ hour at parking structures 2 and 3. Ali said that although the equipment is in place, public parking is not offered currently at parking structure 2 or 3 but he imagines that it would use the same rate.

Tom asked if what is the current Timbers perspective and sense of urgency on advancing the discussion with Legacy and SP+? Libby said that the Stadium Oversight Committee wants to make sure that the NWDA and NW Parking SAC are on board first. Rick's idea about drafting conditions or concerns will be useful for the Stadium Oversight Committee. Tom asked if there has been discussion internally. Libby said that they had lots of discussion in 2019 when the Comprehensive Transportation Masterplan was being developed.

Ali said that the Timbers have a parking resource map online with lots as far east as the waterfront. In NW they show lots as far north as Irving.

Rick M said that some private property owners are charging \$5-6 per hour for Timbers parking.

*Meeting Adjourned at 2:37 pm*