



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/rec/play/tp9waxfrd4rOjOr7lDyAmSIQzP82uepDcN6x-
YM4TW3vfZyTIK95hX8vWp8BkweX3a4ITbbrzReK2MqA.UcNTDn-
nHRogEjSL?canPlayFromShare=true&from=share_recording_detail&continueMode=true
&componentName=rec-
play&originRequestUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fus06web.zoom.us%2Frec%2Fshare%2FGT2PBN
NDdI3ZU0bi0FRgnUUa3Z3E3zELZ0a4luo8Y3fsHv5t844FFtm9C22ZCyV2.wKNQWA0eYzkyU
t6Q](https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/play/tp9waxfrd4rOjOr7lDyAmSIQzP82uepDcN6x-YM4TW3vfZyTIK95hX8vWp8BkweX3a4ITbbrzReK2MqA.UcNTDn-nHRogEjSL?canPlayFromShare=true&from=share_recording_detail&continueMode=true&componentName=rec-play&originRequestUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fus06web.zoom.us%2Frec%2Fshare%2FGT2PBNNDdI3ZU0bi0FRgnUUa3Z3E3zELZ0a4luo8Y3fsHv5t844FFtm9C22ZCyV2.wKNQWA0eYzkyUt6Q)

Northwest Parking District Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)	Zoom Meeting September 18, 2024 5:00 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.
--	--

Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Daniel Anderson (At-Large)
Jeanne Harrison (NWDA)
JoZell Johnson (NWBA)
Paige Miller (At-Large)
Steve Pinger (NWDA)
Amy Spreadborough (NWBA)
Jay Ternberg (NWBA)
Todd Zarnitz (NWBA)
Alex Zimmermann (At-Large)

Members Absent

Brett Hoornaert (At-Large)
Parker McNulty (NWDA)
Greg Theisen (NWDA)

Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) Staff

Kristan Alldrin (Program Manager)
Stanley Ong (Program Manager)
Sarah Goforth (TDM Specialist)

Consultant Staff

Sarah Omlor (EnviroIssues)

Public in Attendance

Lewellyn Robison

Welcome and Introductions

Amy started the meeting at 5 p.m. and reviewed the community agreements.

Staff gave an update on Rae-Leigh who is coming back from leave but will be dedicated staff to the Boise Parking District committee and working on other potential new parking districts. Stanley will remain the dedicated staff for this committee.

Committee Discussion:

- Curious about new parking districts. Are these neighborhood initiated?
 - Yes, Neighborhood Associations etc. have asked for parking to be addressed/studied.

Meeting objective

Stanley stated today's meeting objective is to collect feedback on:

- Programmatic adjustments and the feedback process
- FY 2025/26 parking district budget

Last Meeting Recap

- Most of committee preferred implementing "No Turn on Red & Pedestrian Head Start" in FY 24/25
- Discussed plan to further refine committee-initiated projects, prioritizing projects that could be implemented in FY 25/26
- Collected feedback on FY 25/26 workplan. Committee is concerned about lack of project updates and opportunities for feedback for Northwest in Motion (NWIM) projects

Review previous feedback forms

Stanley provided decisions moving forward and some follow-up on questions from the feedback forms:

No Turn on Red & Pedestrian Head start

- Will be proceeding in FY 24/25.
- It's best practice to install these treatments together.
- Studies show there is 10% crash reduction for prohibiting turns on red.
- Each location will be assessed individually by a traffic engineer to determine if both treatments are necessary.

Committee Discussion:

- What City was the study from?
 - Washington DC was the one we heard about in the presentation, but we can ask for citation specifically and follow-up.
- Did the budget amount increase?
 - No, the amount is the same as presented two months ago.

Plan to refine commit-initiated projects

- Future committee meetings are designated to discuss implementing 1-2 committee initiated projects in FY 25/26
- Discussion about the Streetscape Plan will happen in late FY 24/25 with the understanding that the plan cannot be implemented in FY 25/26.

Committee Discussion:

- Don't believe "Initiated" is the right terminology for "community-initiated ideas" since they are just ideas being explored.
- When will community-initiated ideas be discussed? Wish for a tangible plan for that.
 - Future meetings in the schedule are more open for community-initiated ideas, these past few meetings have required necessary business to approve the workplan & budget.

FY 2025/26 Workplan

- Will proceed with the workplan as presented, except for "No Turn on Red".
- Staff will follow up with NWIM project manager for updates and the plan moving forward.
- Utilizing existing off-street parking can be discussed as a near-term action item.
- More needs to be done around TDM before this is a real consideration.

Committee Discussion:

- Is 2025 workplan posted online?
 - No, it's not posted publicly since it is not yet approved but we can aim to post in early October.
 - Note that off street parking is already in the budget, but the committee-initiated idea is to seek additional off street parking. That's a separate plan.
- Is new off street parking one of our founding goals? It doesn't seem aligned with the goal of reducing single occupancy vehicles (SOVs).
 - In earlier years it was a stated goal of the SAC.
 - PBOT views it as a toolbox, additional off street parking is one of the tools but not the only one, and not a first step.

Programmatic adjustments check-in discussion

Stanley checked in on the committee's experience since April:

- Going better than last year!
- Feel that the ground rules need to be better enforced and followed. It's hard to stay on track when people speak over others, or when we don't hold members of the public to the same rules for public comment.
- Agreement that we need the structure to keep everyone on track since we only have about an hour every month.
- Disappointed that only three committee members showed up to the TDM workshop. It feels contradictory that some people are constantly questioning the efficacy of these programs but no one showed up to actually learn about how they're going. It would be beneficial for the whole committee to hear that information, suggest to fold that into a regular meeting.

- Feel that the ground rules at the beginning of the meeting is too much and it infantilizes the committee.
 - Feel that they are helpful for new people and for members of public. Maybe not have to read them would make people feel less programmed
 - Will talk about tightening that portion up!
- The “No uninvited touching” ground rule seems unnecessary in particular.
 - Amy noted that one is there by request.
 - A committee member explained that themselves and others have been patted on the back multiple times by another committee member in a way they didn’t appreciate.
- We need to get back to Lucky Lab for non-meeting bonding time.
 - Agreed, and also the in-person/hybrid meetings are a hope to bring people together again.
- Seems like the gap between the SAC & staff is more profound. Proceedings seem more rigid.
- Want the opportunity to work together with staff to possibly find more creative solutions. Feel that we could work out a way to get pedestrian lighting on main street for less than \$40,000 a piece.
- Appreciate the feedback forms and the green/yellow/red system. It’s really helpful to go by project so decision makers have the full context per project which is how they are looking at it.

Public comment

None

FY 2025/26 budget – collect feedback

NWIM

Stanley & Kristen Met with Zef Wagner, the NWIM PM, about the program moving forward. He said that NWIM was mostly temporary pilot improvements, but the upcoming BES work in the area offers an opportunity to install permanent fixtures more cheaply than doing it on its own and saves money on continued upkeep of the temporary fixtures.

Some pilot NWIM improvements have been determined not feasible and won’t be pursued. Zef or someone from the project will attend a future meeting to discuss.

Committee Discussion:

- What is the effectiveness of the temporary measures?
 - An evaluation was started a few years ago but paused for COVID. It will be revived and we’ll know more soon.
- We need robust performance metrics in order to make any decisions about making things permanent. It’s critical to see if they work or not.
- What is PBOT looking for feedback on to proceed?

- Not how to proceed but what to proceed on. Where should permanent improvements be made and should we continue with new temporary projects from the list or work on making some existing temporary improvements permanent?
- Would be nice to see a cost benefit analysis.
- There was an understanding that all of the tier one improvements would be finished before tier two starts. Since tier one isn't complete we should readjust how to proceed from here.
- I'd like to know what happened to the tier one improvements that aren't implemented. I was waiting for the crossing to the park at Quimby & 21st & Glisan.
- What is the process for public feedback on this before the transition of paint to concrete?
- Can we get a history of this project and what its expectation are?
 - Love that idea- maybe wait until the new members start.
- What was considered not feasible?
 - Things like bus platforms that wouldn't work with drainage etc.
 - These items are all listed in the big report online:
<https://www.portland.gov/transportation/planning/northwest-motion-project-overview-and-process>

Budget

Stanley reviewed the proposed budget table. He noted the ending balance is calculated to include the "No Turn on Red" project and included a conservative estimate of Net Meter Revenue.

Note, the following year's budget is expected to have more revenue because the meters will be paid off. This year is last year of paying for those so it will no longer be deducted. There will still be maintenance/replacement costs.

Reminder these are budgeted numbers and if anything is not spent it is carried over to next year.

Committee Discussion:

- Why isn't FY 24/25 Net Meter Revenue in this budget?
 - The actual is paid out the following fiscal year, first the City calculates out the operating expenses.
 - Permit surcharge is spent in the same year though.
- Is there opportunity to come back and allocate money later?
 - Yes, since we are way under the total things can be allocated as they come up.
- Fiscal year is July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2026?
 - Correct.
- Is the facilitator cost reflected?

- Yes, under meeting & office supplies.
- The IEP funding is not just for curb extensions right?
 - Correct, curb extensions and light fixtures. We are budgeted to save for four years to get to the \$2.2 million total which includes concrete plus 22 light fixtures. Any additional placemaking or street amenities are not included as part of that estimate.
 - So \$575,000 earmarked in FY 23/24 budget. What about the FY 24/25 budget?
 - Nothing was allocated to IEP in the current FY because the project was paused until at least 2028. And we are still confirming with Brian Poole exactly what work was done in FY 23/24.
- Transportation wallet, is it achieving its goals? Performance assessment?
 - Sarah GoForth puts together a yearly report. You can review them online: <https://www.portland.gov/transportation/wallet/reports>
 - Reminder that the TDM workshop was very much about evaluating metrics of the program. And we are always working to make the program better as it is new.
- Remind me how the parking enforcement works?
 - If we don't get volunteers to take shifts, this money will not be spent and will carry over.
- Is the point of parking enforcement to collect fines for revenue?
 - No, I think we lose money overall on labor hours. It's to encourage people to pay the meter or not park where they're not allowed.
 - Is it worth it for the 10% of available parking?
 - Well there will always be a basic level of service from the City. That conversation is being had at the director level, and PBOT is actively hiring more parking enforcement officers.
- Feel that it's odd that we don't pay for our own enforcement as a parking district, and instead pay a third party (the City) who is not doing an adequate job.
 - Staff feel this is an equity issue and don't feel comfortable recommending more enforcement to one district over another because this district has more money.
 - But more revenue could also mean more reason for enforcement.
 - Is there a reason for more enforcement?
 - Is there a metric to see if we do have more issues? Wish to see some data on that to see if committee perceptions match with citywide data.
- Want better partnership with Providence Park itself, is there an opportunity to reengage with them? They could be helping subsidize or at least promoting things like taking TriMet to their season ticket holders' email list. They signed a "good neighbor agreement", but what are they doing to help?
 - Could we try surge pricing on game days?
- Could citations be paid through the Parking Kitty app? Faster turnaround could be a better deterrent for cars staying after the time they charged.

- Parking citations are handled through the Multnomah County Courts and I know they offer a discount to pay online to ease the strain on the courthouse. I don't know how easy it would be to move to the app though.
- Does the restricted event district work with less than half the targeted staff? Or are we funding something that isn't working as intended?
 - RWC is evaluates the compliance rate, will discuss next meeting.

Stanley asked for a temperature check on the budget as presented:

- Amy – Green
- Dan – Green
- Jeanne – Green
- JoZell – Yellow; Need more neighborhood input
- Paige – Green
- Steve – Red; need more from NWIM, want to see the project list
- Jay – Red
- Todd – Green

New Business

There is an opportunity for a new trash can design in the district. Staff asked if any members would want to be the one to pick the new design which involves two meetings and about two hours of art review.

- Paige volunteered.

Meeting adjourned at 6:30

PBOT Action Items

- Confirm citation for study that shows there is 10% crash reduction for prohibiting turns on red.
- Post 2025 workplan once finalized online.
- Explore data on parking issues in NW compared to other parking districts i.e. is there more reason for enforcement in NW than other parking districts or citywide?