

## **Parking Management Manual SAC**

Monday, July 17, 2017

4 p.m. – 6 p.m.

Portland Building

1120 SW 5<sup>th</sup> Ave, Suite 800

Portland, OR 97204

### **Meeting Notes**

#### **Members in Attendance**

Reza Farhoodi (Pearl District N.A.), Lisa Frisch (Portland Business Alliance), Heather Hoell (Venture Portland), Deborah Howe (OCOM), Tony Jordan (Portlanders for Parking Reform), Juliana Lukasik (CEIC), Rick Michaelson (NW Parking SAC), Owen Ronchelli (Go Lloyd), Felicia Williams (DNA)

#### **Project Team in Attendance**

PBOT: Chris Armes, Malisa McCreedy, Nicole Powell; Kimley-Horn: William Reynolds; Rick Williams: Rick Williams; Spencer: Joseph Spencer

#### **Additional Attendees**

Michael Jacobs (PBOT)

#### **Workshop Outline**

- Reminder to stay focused due to limited time.
- Agenda: Revisit changes to documents based on feedback.
- Performance based process of adjusting meter rates and time limits.
- Project Schedule
  - 1) Meter Districts/APPPs, 2) Pricing & Time Limits, 3) Loading Zones, 4) Enforcement
  - 5/15: Manual Intro, 6/19-7/17: Meter Districts/Revenue Allocation, 7/17-9/18: Price/Time Limits, 9/18-10/16: Exceptions/Event Districts, 10/16: Loading Zones/Enforcement, 11/13 or 11/27 Draft Manual
  - Meeting scheduled for August is cancelled due to eclipse, schedule shifts back one month, determining if November meeting will be 11/13 or 11/27.
- Logistics
  - There are two topic focus areas for the meeting: meter rate adjustment process and time limits.
  - Use name card to request floor, need to hear from everyone.

#### **SAC #2 Recap**

1. Document Updates Based on Discussion

- Focus on performance based process, data driven, and trimmed documents to focus in on those aspects.
- Parking management district process: Focused last time on establishing new meter districts, revised the documentation to broaden that based on recommendations from last meeting. This is meant to be a process for establishing new parking management districts in commercial areas. The commercial areas will drive the process, make requests to PBOT, form an advisory committee to make recommendations on changes to the meter area based on the data collection and analysis. This is about new meter districts and new parking management districts in commercial zones that currently has no guidance. If they start to experience parking issues they can form a committee, make a request to PBOT, and then enter this parking management district process to guide how changes will take place moving forward. If an area already has time limits they can go through this process to potentially establish a meter district. The document lays out all the guidelines for establishing a new meter district. Setting up framework, make sure it is a data driven process, serves as a guideline for any new areas.
- Defined relationship between commercial areas & surrounding neighborhoods. There was confusion around whether the makeup of the advisory committee will be made up of representatives from that commercial area, it can be business representatives or residents of the area. It is a separate process from the area parking permit program, that is an established process and our parking management manual will not make changes to that. They are separate, but we recommend that they coordinate together.
  - Rick M - I disagree because I don't think you can functionally separate these, having a narrow commercial district with a residential district around it.
    - William – We want them to coordinate, but not necessarily force the process. The goal was to leave it up to the local decision making process and not have any guidebook to say this is how it must be done. There is some flexibility at the local level to set up the advisory committee in whatever way makes sense for that area.
  - Heather – Would you be having the APPP be only residential with no business representatives?
    - Malisa – We have an existing APPP for commuter parking issues. What we proposed to Council has business and residential representatives on stakeholder committee, which we would like to fold into this process, but that is not what's in place now. We need a process because we don't have one now, there could be a companion APPP, but at this point we have no mechanism to do that. We want to establish a process that we can take to Council to establish new parking meter districts. Example: Mississippi has made many requests, but we have nothing to offer them. We want to address the commercial corridors and get the APPP process over the finish line, we could have complementary processes.
  - Rick M – We should keep it simple and pull a lot of the details out of the documents.

- Juliana – I have a lot of questions around structure and formation of new parking districts.
  - Malisa – Discussed this at the last session and sent revised documents.
  - Juliana – If I still don't agree with that, what is my process? Concerns about the TMA and TPMA.
  - Malisa – We aren't saying that you can't form a TMA, but you must start with the default stakeholder group, you aren't going to start with at TMA. There is nothing that says it can't be a TMA eventually. We are establishing that it is an advisory committee, these are City funds, the committee is advising how those funds get spent in that district. A TMA has other funds that can be spent based on their mission.
  - Juliana – Did we change the language about who gets to decide who is on the SAC? Trying to avoid the ability for any bureau to be able to decide who is on the committee.
  - Malisa – We took all that language out. Tried to make it simple as a framework to start with.
- William – Additions to the documents are in red text, deletions are gone. Added minimum number of representatives for SAC as 5 as a starting point, no maximum.
- Heather – Does it have to be a newly formed advisory group or can it be an existing group?
  - Yes, it can be some recognized entity if that has all interests represented
- Clarified that recommendations or modifications to parking management are based on local data.
  - Provided general starting guidance (ex: hours of enforcement), will be further focused on local data. These are just starting points to help new parking management get off the ground.
  - Rick M – Would suggest that the base guidelines are all that must be done to establish a district, that step two is to collect data and refine.
- Net meter revenue allocation are city funds.
  - Rick M – 51% net meter revenue policy is staying.
  - Heather – Requirements for use of City funds are already established?
    - Yes

### **Focus Area #1: Meter Rate Adjustment Process**

#### 1. Background and Goals

- What are issues? Set by Council, led to slow adjustments, no formal guidance, no data collection schedule.

- Establish performance based process – minimum & maximum hourly rates, demand thresholds, schedule & process for rate adjustments.
  - Inform data collection.
- Why adjust rates? When rates are too low it leads to parking congestion in high demand areas, want close to 85% threshold, which leads to 1-2 open spaces per block. Want to manage in a way to balance demand in meter district.
  - Rick M – What do you do if meter districts are small or narrow? A commercial strip with residential surrounding it? A lot of districts are commercial strips with residential on either side and they don't have parking garage options, so we must recognize that is the system we are dealing with.
    - William – You could raise the meter rates and people can follow time limits.
  - Heather – Is there a correlation of bad behavior with 85%+?
    - Rick W – Not a lot of literature, but in our experience with data collection we have seen this, ex: parking over yellow lines, traffic safety with circling while looking for parking.
- Want to manage demand with range of rates, provide parking options. The goals are not to increase revenue or not to encourage users to avoid travelling to the district.
  - Heather – If access is being managed, it can be more manageable to get there.
    - Reza – Do business associations agree?
  - Heather – Yes, they understand because they want customers to have easy access to their stores. Frame it as not taking it away, but making it easier.
  - Lisa – 30% of customers don't like paying for parking in downtown because there are plenty of places where you don't have to pay to park. Receive negative feedback about Sunday parking in the Pearl.
    - Malisa introduced Michael Jacobs, program manager for SmartPark Garages.
  - Rick W – The number of transactions at a meter can now be tracked. Want to create turnover, raise the rate and see where the numbers are. Ex: If we had 100,000 transactions in an area in year one, the goal would be 100,001 in year two, want to encourage users to still park in the district. Want to create turnover at a reasonable time stay. If you raise rate and transactions fall you want to reconsider that rate.
  - Heather – The lack of information for non-downtown businesses feels scary, having better information and more data will help folks understand.
  - Juliana – The Central Eastside must balance employee parking too. Data management convinced employers that management was a good idea. Businesses and big employers were convinced about meters through data management.
  - Heather – Important to emphasize local data, ex: business traffic on specific streets.

- Juliana – Enforcement is critical, when parking is not enforced it is abused.
- Malisa – Many challenges are due to lack of enforcement, but enforcement is staffing up to have more enforcement support.
- Rick M – Enforcement should be part of the data collection too: number of tickets, frequency of patrol, etc.
  - Malisa – With switch to going to more license plate based systems, that will help with enforcement and tracking.
- Felicia – I understand that current meter rates are set by City Council. On a parking committee, a few years ago, they recommended that there would be flexibility in place. The whole goal of this is to set upper and lower limits. Who would make the decision to change the price?
  - Malisa – The PBOT Director would be able to adjust the rates (with SAC recommendation) until they hit the cap and then they would have to go back to Council to adjust the range. It would be like how SmartPark garage rates are set.
  - Rick M – Do you envision raising the cap?
    - That would be determined through a similar process to this or can come up through the SAC. It would take 5 years to reach \$5 from the \$2 starting point.
- Key metrics: occupancy, turnover, violation rates, on street meter and SmartPark pay station transactions – revenue is not a metric we are tracking. Revenue is a side benefit, changing rate is a parking management tool.
- Heather – Revenue businesses will get matters (not meter revenue).
- Owen – Could make “not to encourage users to avoid traveling to the district” into a positive instead of a negative statement in the manual. It is for economic development, we want to encourage the economic engine of the neighborhood.
- Deborah – Some businesses don’t make revenue, price increases hurt capacity to bring in patients. There aren’t metrics to look at equity issues. There is not much parking capacity in Old Town China Town. It is a transit rich area, but people are getting priced out.
  - William – Goal is to provide ranges and options.
- Juliana – Will there be any ability for SAC to counter price hike if they feel there is a case in their district (like Deborah’s example)?
  - Malisa – This goes back to part of our challenge, we are talking about being data driven. If on street is parked up over 85% we aren’t serving anybody. The increases we are talking about would be minimal, keeping in mind there is a SmartPark in the district and those rates are lower than on street, so that would be an option for folks that can’t afford the on-street rates. We are talking about parking management, it comes down to basic economics, supply and demand and how we price it. We created

SmartPark reduced rate pass and are looking at other options or subsidies. We need to have this conversation about changing rates and responding to demand we see on street.

- Rick M – Does SAC make recommendation to raise rates and PBOT approves or disapproves?
  - Malisa – This process provides range, thresholds, and data collection to make those decisions without having an SAC. This is giving the authority to the PBOT director to raise rates, like with the SmartPark garages. The SAC has the role of making recommendations on reinvesting the funds in the district.
- Juliana – In the Central Eastside the data is a tool, not an automatic process. Ex: there are places in the district that are at 85%+, but we didn't feel it was a fit for meters yet and had the choice not to put them in. Will it be an automatic process without SAC input?
  - Malisa – There will be an approved range set by Council and the authority is given to the PBOT Director.
- Lisa – There was a SmartPark garage that was under capacity (data showed), the City was going to move forward with lowering the all-day rate by \$1, but retailers didn't want it lowered due to events and development happening in the nearby area that would soon push occupancy upward, and that wasn't listened to. I am not comfortable with automatic raising.
- Tony – Access is the goal, automobile is one mode of access, some people could take other modes. Some people aren't included in the surveys because they don't have access (didn't arrive in an automobile). Maybe people that arrived in a car could take other modes, some can't, but some can use other modes.
- Rick M – Automatic price takes away citizen participation.
- Malisa – We are trying to model after what we've seen as best practices in other places, we are trying to have an informed discussion based on data.
- Heather – It is our job is to set recommendations around how these price increases could happen, but the point of having the price increases is to manage the parking.
- Owen – It is important to provide authority for adjustments as a tool to adjust pricing to help manage the supply. There are instances where it might not make sense to adjust prices, despite what data says. Rather than making it automatic, there could be some language that says if there is an SAC in place the PBOT Director could consider recommendations from the SAC prior to raising prices.
- Juliana – Maybe there could be a way to apply for a variance, ex: if there is a construction project happening nearby that has impact on parking. In our district, it is not the price of the parking, it is the meter itself that is the problem, the meters are what the community get upset about. When I was talking about the 85% trigger, I was talking about putting the meter in, not the price.
- Chris – The process for establishing areas and management was discussed at last month's meeting. We would continue with incremental management as discussed at the last meeting.

- Reza – How fine grained would the analysis zones be?
  - William – There won't be analysis zones, it will be entirely data driven, where the highest demands are.
- Reza – Would you change rates all at once in a single parking district? Would you see rates changing in different parts of downtown or would the entire district change?
  - Rick W – Some districts collect data district wide, most need a statistically valid sample, ex: Central Eastside collects data once a year, then expanded collection area and refreshed to make sure highest occupancy areas weren't always being used. In larger districts, you would collect a statistically valid sample area, in smaller districts it can be possible to collect data for complete area.
  - Malisa – This is something we will look at, have an option for different rates in high demand vs. lower demand areas. Possibly tie the price increases to time stays. For this to work we would need to adjust meter rates within the district.
  - William – It is not about setting boundaries in the areas, but letting the data dictate.
  - Rick W – The whole purpose of performance based pricing (having lower and higher priced areas), ex: San Francisco had just as many price increases and decreases.
- Felicia - I recall a data collection zone map.
  - Malisa - That was done in the past, but we could change collection areas based on current land use.
- Rick M – From a management side I think we must decide what is the smallest size area you would want to use.
  - Malisa – We've established a data collection process that we are using in the Central Eastside and Northwest. We've done some spot data collection in downtown.
  - Rick W – We used to collect data in the same zones to be methodologically consistent, but we found out we needed to flex those because the districts are bigger. So, the next time around we took pieces of the old zone and expanded.
- Technology and implementation: We need to be ready to implement, but remain flexible. Current limits: prepay at midnight, payments are allowed in 15 min increments (\$0.20 increments), use posted signs showing time limits, not rates (rates are on meter or Parking Kitty app).
- Currently hourly rates: Downtown is \$2, NW is \$1.60, Marquam is \$1.60, CEID is \$1.20, Lloyd is \$1, and event rate is \$3.50

2. Case Studies

	<b>Boston</b>	<b>Seattle</b>	<b>SF Park</b>
<b>Price Range</b>	\$1.00 - 4.00	\$0.50 - 5.00	\$0.25 - \$6.00

<b>Adjustment</b>	\$0.50	\$0.50	\$0.25
<b>Guidance</b>	> 80%: Increase < 60%: Decrease	> 90%: Increase* > 85%: Watch for 1 Year < 70%: Watch for 1 Year < 65%: Decrease**	> 80%: Increase < 60%: Decrease < 30%: Decrease (\$0.50)
<b>Rate Adjustment Period</b>	2 months	12 months	2 months
<b>Time Limits</b>	2 Hours 4 Hours	2 Hours 3 Hours (after 5pm) 4 Hours 10 Hours	4 Hours No Limit

- Boston’s program is new and focuses on a small area.
- Seattle plays a little bit with time limits with their performance based process.
- SF used to have sensors installed, but those are now turned off.
  - Heather – Did you say Boston is changing their rates every 2 months?
    - Yes, but they are trying it out in a very small area.
    - San Francisco is at 2 months as well.
- Rick M -How long does it take for customers to realize and respond to rate change?
  - Rick W – They are still working on that. In the beginning in San Francisco the people were blind to the rate changes (just saw price on the meter). Seattle had more communication with routine announcements in newspapers and website, announce rates and keep them for a year. Annual adjustment time allows Seattle to gear up communication and update maps.
  - Malisa – Assistant Program Specialists were hired to help with outreach and communication for future projects.
  - Chris – It is finding the right way to communicate, whether it is mail, email, news – every way we can think of to get information out.
- Owen – Thinking about equity issues and technology if it is possible, you could have some sort of validation for certain types of businesses within a zone through Parking Kitty. Having a validation coupon for people that park within certain distances of businesses and have a rotation with the coupon code.



- Rick W – There was an app called Parkt that Seattle used where a retailer would load value back to be used for parking or shopping.
- Malisa – The parking app vendor can validate. We are working through some issues with the new technologies. SmartPark has a robust validation program, so we would want to work with them, but we aren't capable of that yet.
- Heather – More wayfinding for enforcement hours and meter rates would be helpful.
  - Malisa – We are working on how to clean the signs up and make it more informational.

### 3. Draft Meter Rate Adjustment Process

- Proposed guidance
  - Target occupancy: 70% - 85%
  - Rate adjustment: +/- \$0.20 or +/- \$0.40 or +/- \$0.60 (more granular price elasticity)
  - Hourly rate range: \$1.00 - \$5.00
  - Data collected: Every 12 months
- Tony – If this is a proposal to set occupancy targets and adjust them based on data, it seems better to aim with more flexibility. If you are behind, is there a quicker way to calibrate to get areas to 85%? Ex: raise \$0.60 and check after 6 months to adjust instead of a year.
  - Malisa – I understand, but want to make sure the proposal is something Council will understand and pass.
- Reza – I can't, with a straight face, go to my neighborhood and support this without getting PBOT to commit to another process to get local control for our neighborhoods, retroactively. I would like to see PBOT make that commitment to us. I am in favor of increasing rates if necessary to meet the 85%. I don't know what to tell them what they are getting out of it.
  - Malisa – They get better parking access. We aren't able to revisit that conversation, as we've already talked about. The way downtown is set up is a different code and not something we can change.
- Heather – If a management area starts in January, is data measures again in January a year later?
  - Rick W – Data is collected during typical robust occupancy periods. This can be different in different districts.
  - Malisa – Want data collection to happen around a year based on needs of the area, but if an area was established in January the data could be collected that November if that makes sense.
  - Heather – The first year could be rocky implementation, but then levels out. Would data be looked at annually or seasonally?

- Malisa – This is based on resources and needs of area, but the goal is at least annual data collection.
  - Heather – I don't remember a discussion about the 70-85% range, just the 85%.
  - Rick W – 70% is the low range where you consider reducing the rate. 70-85% is where you want to be.
- Rick M - \$0.20 seems like it would have little impact, I would suggest just \$0.60. It is important how quickly data can be collected and process, then implement. You don't really have time to collect data and implement more than once a year, but would like this to be a faster process.
  - Malisa – This comes down to resources. We are putting out an RFP to have more consultants available for data collection.
  - Rick W – Depends on the size of the district. If it is small you could collect data more than once a year, ex: Mississippi could be done quarterly.
- Lisa – Would like more information about spot data collection. I was under the impression that it was 100% data collection in downtown. The 15% differential is too narrow, maybe 20% would be better (like the other case study examples). Would like to see a new number.
- Rick M – Would like to see 85%, as best practice.
- Other thoughts about rate changes? One rate or multiple rates?
  - Felicia – One rate, either \$0.40 or \$0.60.
  - Lisa – I don't understand why it must be \$0.20. In other cities, it is a quarter. \$0.60 seems too high, I would suggest \$0.50, but that is not possible.
    - It must be divisible by 4. Meter technology allows to purchase time in 15 min increments.
  - William – It is a \$0.05 adjustment every 15 minutes.
  - Malisa – The meters can't be programmed differently.
- Owen – I think that price elasticity is very responsive to market, it allows you to make larger adjustments and incremental adjustments. If you have an area that is at 90% and you increase it \$0.20/hr you won't see a change, \$0.40 might have some influence, and \$0.60 will see the most change. I like the ability to be flexible, it might create some confusion, but it allows you to be more flexible with the market.
- Reza – \$0.20 is not worth it for the political pain, but \$0.40 or \$0.60 would be fine, probably \$0.40.
- Tony – I think the 70-85% adjustment time seems fine and I agree that having options of \$0.40 or \$0.60 would be best.

- Rick M – Each of these adjustment numbers is a different percent of price in the different districts (different base starting prices).
- William explains Recommended Rate Change Guidance slide. The benefit of having the smaller options is for the districts with lower starting price points.
  - Rick W – Ex: if we are at 86%, do we want to take it to 80% or even lower? \$0.20 might work well in the lower rate areas.
- Deborah – Would prefer having \$0.20 as an option, 10% isn't trivial.
- Heather – Should have rate increases be proportional to current meter rates.
- William – If you look at the graph, at the lower range of \$1 with 95% occupancy rate, you would need a \$0.40 adjustment. At the upper end of \$2-3, if you have 88% occupancy (close to 85%) you would also want a \$0.40 increase. At higher ranges, you would very rarely use that \$0.20 adjustment to have an impact. This is based on data that was collected nationally.
- Rick M – Where do those cars go? Do they not come to neighborhood? This might work well in the Central city, but on streets like Hawthorne there are no choices. One of three things happen: they don't come (don't want), they park in the neighborhood, or they use alternative transportation (we want).
  - William – The idea is that they are using off street or lower priced facilities.
  - Rick W – Hawthorne is a great example, they have no priced parking and people are parking in the neighborhood. Those three things you mentioned will happen. The net 51% revenue invests in neighborhoods and we have the APPPs to help residents living in those neighborhoods. If Hawthorne were to meter, would more people park in the neighborhood? Hard to say because so many people are already parking in the neighborhood. If Hawthorne metered, it might compel them to have an APPP. When we've transitioned from free parking to paid parking we've never had anyone go back and say that was the wrong decision, but these programs needed to be in place (APPPs, SACs, parking management districts, net meter revenue). Cities that are sharing the revenue are most successful, revenue for TDM.
- Tony – I think there is a compelling argument on the lower end to keep \$0.20 in the range. Council like might options and \$0.60 might be too blunt, have it be smartly flexible.
- Malisa – We talked ourselves back to \$0.20/\$0.40/\$0.60. We have five meter districts, with five price points, want to provide flexibility.
- Rick M – Different districts have different rates and we need flexibility.
- William – The last downtown adjustment process considered elasticity and \$0.20/\$0.40/\$0.60, went back and forth, and ultimately the decision in downtown was to go from \$1.60 to \$2. They observed 90% occupancy and wanted to get to 85%, which is why that \$2 rate was selected.
  - Deborah – Sees the chart as helpful with the explanation.

- Group decides to keep increments of \$0.20/\$0.40/\$0.60, set the range to 65%-85%, annual data collection is default, and minimum to maximum range is \$1-5.
  - Deborah – Supports the approach, but wouldn't put a time frame on it, and would like to provide a subsidy with equity.
- Lisa – It might help control the message if you list how many years it would take to get to \$5. Provide an example phrase.
  - Malisa – It would take 5 years to reach \$5 in downtown, with the starting rate of \$2 and adding \$0.60 each year.
- Lisa - I would like to see that the advice of the SAC means something because there have been several instances where there is a SAC and their recommendations have not been listened to.
  - Malisa – The SAC is an advisory committee and it is up to the director to make the final decision. The director and commissioner have the final authority.
  - Rick W – If SAC is in place, the director will consider recommendations.
  - Juliana – This is why a district should have the ability to form a TPMA.
    - Malisa – There is nothing that stops that. These are City funds, they are advisory committees to spend City funds in the district.
  - Heather – (referencing the documents) The tool we are talking about is helping the local commercial areas to encourage parking, so putting some more language in here around positive economic development impacts could be helpful. Add positive language to the document, focus on economic vitality, so local folks help drive this.
  - Rick M – This is Citywide, so try not to have the document so focused on the Central City.

**Focus Area #2: Time Limits Discussion** – ran out of time, all topics to be discussed at the next meeting

1. Background
2. Proposed Guidance
3. Metrics to Consider

**Wrap-Up**

1. Project Schedule
  - We will discuss time limits at the next meeting. Please share your thoughts by email about shorter than 2 hour time stays (15 & 30 minutes) before the next meeting. The goal is to get 2 hours as a baseline. Want to consider land use characteristics and other metrics to consider for 4 hour time limits. We want this process to be tied to clear metrics.
2. SAC #4 Overview
  - We will discuss time stays and event districts. The next meeting is in September.

Meeting adjourned.