

# PBOT

PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION

1120 SW Fifth Ave, Suite 1331, Portland OR 97204

Phone: 503-823-4000 Portland.gov/Transportation

Mingus Mapps Commissioner Tara Wasiak Interim Director

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/91234567890>

**Northwest Parking District  
Stakeholder Advisory  
Committee (SAC)** | Zoom Meeting  
November 20, 2024  
5:00 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.

## Meeting Summary

### **Members in Attendance**

Amy Spreadborough (NWBA)  
Greg Theisen (NWDA)  
Jay Ternberg (NWBA)  
Jeanne Harrison (NWDA)  
JoZell Johnson (NWBA)  
Parker McNulty (NWDA)  
Steve Pinger (NWDA)  
Todd Zarnitz (NWBA)

### **Members Absent**

Brett Hoornaert (at-large)  
Paige Miller (at-large)

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

Stanley Ong (Parking Program Specialist)  
Erika Nebel (Group Manager)  
Colleen Mossor (Analyst)

### **Consultant Staff**

Christine Moses (EnviroIssues)  
Sarah Omlor (EnviroIssues)  
William Reynolds (RBT Consultants)

### **Public in Attendance**

Tom Ranieri  
Juliet Hyams  
Allan Classen

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Christine started the meeting and reviewed the SAC's mission statement and community agreements.

### **Meeting objective**

- Discuss hierarchy of access to on-street parking in residentially zoned parts of the neighborhood.

### **Last Meeting Recap**

Stanley gave updates on:

- Safety concerns for certain intersections where the SAC has requested all-way stops: Stanley passed on the request to Traffic Operations, but they said that all-way stops aren't meant to be used for traffic calming and intersections have to meet a certain threshold of traffic volume to warrant them, otherwise they can cause more harm than good. Traffic Operations requested that specific safety issues be submitted through the hotline 823-SAFE.
- Preliminary results from the Restricted Event District assessment: Peak Occupancy is at 95.3%

Committee Discussion:

- The neighborhood and business associations already submitted comments about specific intersections of concern. Feels like those comments aren't being heard.
- Disagreement with the threshold required for all way stops - how do we know those studies aren't out of date or not relevant to these intersections?
- Interest by the committee to try this as a pilot project against PBOT standards.
  - Studies have shown it put people at risk, PBOT is not going to do that for a test.
  - Committee members wish to push harder on this issue.
  - Staff assured the issue has been pushed and Traffic Operations aren't going to budge.
  - Committee members want a decision maker to come to the meeting to explain why it can't be done.
  - Staff will ask Rick Nyes and their team when they are available.
- Suggestion to press the safety issue, but don't assume that an all-way stop is the best solution. Traffic engineers may have other suggestions for the specific issue.

**Budget Feedback Form**

Stanley shared that PBOT will be moving forward with the FY 25/26 Budget as it was presented two months ago. There were concerns raised about updates to Northwest in Motion and follow up assessment. Stanley anticipates staff attending the January Committee meeting to provide that update for the committee.

**User Prioritization - Case Studies**

William Reynolds presented case studies of parking prioritization in different cities/neighborhoods of similar size and use case to the NW Parking district.

**1) Columbus, OH - Short North Arts District**

- a. Performance based rates that are modified every 6 months

**2) Seattle, WA - First Hill**

- a. Prioritizes hourly parkers
- b. No cap on permits
- c. Recalculate hourly rate every 4 months

### 3) Toronto, ON – Yorkville

- a. Maintain database of residents with off-street parking and prioritize residents without.

#### Committee Discussion:

- Do these cities have the same amount of parkers as this district?
  - Don't have the numbers ready but yes they are comparable.
- Is there data for off street parking in Portland?
  - Yes, this is tracked through development permits.

#### **Public Comment**

- Tom Ranieri made multiple comments:
  - He requested a way for there to be public comment that takes longer than 5 minutes.
  - He shared concerns about public comments never being answered.
  - He asked about an update on how the committee is going since the pause and restructuring.

The committee chairs noted that the meetings are the committee's time to work and not hear public comments so only a short time is allocated. In the future public comment may be moved to the beginning or end of the agenda as to not interrupt the flow of discussion.

Public comments are recorded in the meeting notes, along with committee member comments, and posted on the City website for the public record. If the committee chooses, they could elevate a public comment to be added to the meeting agenda for further consideration.

#### **User Prioritization – Options**

William noted that Performance-Based Parking Management (PBPM) will be implemented with the goal of an average peak occupancy rate of 85% meaning there are 1-2 parking spots available at any given time. PBPM must be implemented as first step to address the current parking supply before adding new parking is considered.

William gave some history on what prioritization has been used in the past starting with a city-wide policy in 1996 which prioritized 'short term parking, then carpools, and then long-term use' and in 2012, the NW Parking Management Plan prioritized 'customers and visitors'.

The potential user groups that we can prioritize are:

- Customers/short term
- Residents
  - With off street – *This would require gathering this data*

- Without off street
- Residential guests
- Employees
  - Swing shift – *Folks arriving/departing when there isn't transit*
  - Daytime – *Folks arriving during transit service/daylight*
- Visitors staying 4+ hours

<b>Option 1: Shared customer/Residential Access</b>	
User Prioritization	Process
1) Residents Residential Guests Short-Term Visitors Swing Shift Employees 2) Daytime Employees 3) Long-Term Visitors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Phase out daytime employee permits</li> <li>● Increase hourly rates based on constraints measured on commercial streets</li> </ul>
<b>Option 2: Residential Priority</b>	
User Prioritization	Process
1) Residents Residential Guests 2) Short-Term Visitors Swing Shift Employees 3) Daytime Employees 4) Long-Term Visitors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Phase out daytime employee permits</li> <li>● Increase hourly rates in residential areas based on measured constraints</li> </ul>
<b>Option 3: Tiered Residential Priority</b>	
User Prioritization	Process
1) Residents w/o Parking Residential Guests 2) Residents w/ Parking 3) Short-Term Visitors Swing Shift Employees 4) Daytime Employees 5) Long-Term Visitors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Introduce tiered residential permit pricing</li> <li>● Phase out daytime employee permits</li> <li>● Increase hourly rates in residential areas based on measured constraints</li> </ul>
<b>Option 4: Residential Priority Based on Access to Parking</b>	
User Prioritization	Process
1) Residents w/o Parking Residential Guests 2) Short-Term Visitors Swing Shift Employees 3) Residents w/ Parking 4) Daytime Employees 5) Long-Term Visitors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Phase out daytime employee permits</li> <li>● Phase out residential permits if off-street parking available</li> <li>● Increase hourly rates in residential areas based on measured constraints</li> </ul>

#### Committee Discussion:

- Don't we already have some data differentiating residents with or without off-street parking?
  - Yes, this districts' permits do have a distinction for that. Prioritization would mean those with off-street parking may not get a permit if demand is high.
- Removing parking permits for businesses with daytime employees would be a big change- we should ask the business association about that.
- Existing commercial (businesses) cannot change. Can we make more challenging for new commercial to get Zone M permits?
- Wish to alleviate parking constraints by working harder to get Legacy to cooperate on shared short-term parking or by adding a hop on / hop off trolley rather than taking away permits.
  - Agree on a free local circulator- similar to the one in Washington Park.
  - Stanley has visited their three garages and confirmed that they have signs and equipment to offer public parking on nights and weekends, however Legacy officially denies that parking is available for the public.
- Concern for residential visitor access to neighborhood.
- Want to prioritize residents regardless of if they can take transit.
- 'Short term visitors' are the same as customers, right?
  - Yes
- Southern portion of neighborhood is more constrained, it's not the whole district.
- Why are maps showing only some parking and not 23<sup>rd</sup> or 21<sup>st</sup> streets?
  - We are currently only talking about residential permit parking and you can't park on those commercial streets with your Zone M permit. We will look at user prioritization options for commercial parking in the future.
- Are we forcing apartment buildings with parking to use their parking?
  - Yes, if an apartment resident has parking available to them (for free or at a cost) they would not be eligible to get a parking permit.
- Want to respect the commercial and residential balance- if the businesses aren't there no one would want to live here. We are intertwined.
- Concern that the cost of parking will deter people from coming.
  - That's the point of parking management. You can't even find parking right now so that's already the case.
- Four years ago we got rid of 2,000 permits and raised rates. Some people had 5 permits to have junker cars parked indefinitely. We've already been working to prioritize to get to that 85% occupancy goal.
- Feel we should prioritize customers because we need them for the businesses. And if the businesses aren't busy the residential parking isn't a problem, so that's the need.
- Sounds like we don't need to pick one of these options but could choose how to prioritize for ourselves. But we have to either change demand or change supply.
- Concern for making a complex parking system more complex.

- None of these options mention event parking which is a huge issue for the district.
- Without enforcement, permits don't matter.
- The business parking permits aren't a one for one comparison to residential parking because employees or volunteers like at Rose Haven don't come everyday and park-sometimes it's more like once a week and not all permits are active at once. And the transportation wallet isn't being incentivized enough for workers.
- Landlords can't find tenants if there is no parking. That's another residential need to account for.

### **Next Steps**

William and the consultant team will revise these options taking into account today's feedback and come back to the committee around January/February. This process will continue for 2-3 more meetings to define this plan and then work on implementation.

- It was noted that today's presentation took up too much of the meeting with not enough discussion time.
- Request for the meeting presentation and materials be given one week in advance to leave more time for discussion.

*Meeting adjourned at 6:40*

### **PBOT Action Items**

- PBOT will ask Rick Nyes and staff for availability to talk about all-way stops.