

University Transportation Committee
January 14, 2004

Present: Ken Anderson, School of Public Health
Paul Brown, HFS
Peter Dewey, Transportation Services
Kerry Kahl, Purchasing and Stores
Danny Kraus, HR – Labor Relations
Jerri McCray, Facilities Services
Diana Perey, Transportation Services
Carl Root, Parking Services
Paul Roybal, Transportation Office
Scott Rutherford, CEE
John Schaufelberger, Construction Management
Helen Shawcroft, UW Medical Center
Kathryn Wilham, Social Work
Ken Winstead, ICA
Matt Weatherford, Arts and Sciences

Guests Ray Wittmier, UWPB, (for Vicky Peltzer)
Aaron Hoard, Office of Regional Affairs
Brittany Goodnight, ASUW
Christine Lee, ASUW

Absent: Jeanette Henderson, Real Estate Office
Vicky Peltzer, UWPB
Ali Tarhouni, Finance and Business Econ

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Kraus moved to approve the minutes from the December 18, 2003 meeting. Mr. Anderson seconded. The motion carried.

Payroll Deduction for ICTs

Mr. Root indicated that he had previously expressed reluctance to add additional services available through payroll deduction because of on-going difficulties that Parking Services has experienced in transferring data to/from HEPPS. Mr. Root stated that these difficulties are resolvable. Parking Services will initiate these services once programming is complete, likely in July.

Estimated Trips with Complimentary U-PASSes

Mr. Roybal reported that the discussion at the last meeting about eliminating complimentary U-PASSes for SOV holders prompted questions regarding the cost of this benefit. He provided the following information: 10% of the 3700 U-PASSes issued to SOV holders use the pass an average of 2.87 trips per week. Overall the average for all complimentary U-PASSes is 0.3 rides per week. This averages out to \$12.00 per person per month for those who use it and \$1.27 per person per month overall. Mr. Roybal proposed a charge for employee SOV permit holders of an additional \$4.50 (25% of the cost of the fee) for a U-PASS, which is in between the \$1.27 and the \$12.00 costs. Ms. Shawcroft questioned how much money the University would actually be gaining by charging the SOV permit holders for U-PASSes. Mr. Roybal responded that the amount had not been estimated. Ms. Shawcroft stated that since the income projections would not represent a big dollar amount, she questioned the wisdom of taking away yet another benefit.

There was a discussion about the improved opportunities for pricing with the advent of the Smart Card. Ms. Wilham inquired if there might be usage charges per trip which would allow us to charge differently for U-PASSes. Mr. Dewey explained that there was no relationship between what we pay Metro and the cost of the U-PASS. Mr. Rutherford suggested that we use the smart card to expand the services available to U-PASS holders, see what the ridership on these new services turns out to be and then make decisions about whether the cost of services is worth the benefits. Mr. Dewey reminded the committee that the earliest estimates for the timetable for Smart Card use was fall 2006. It has not yet been determined how we will be billed for individual trips. There is plenty of time to plan.

Differential Pricing for Transit

Mr. Dewey reviewed some of the points discussed at the last meeting. Transit costs of the different agencies vary, some cost significantly more, e.g. Community Transit. Because of this, the idea of charging more for those people who use Community Transit was suggested. Mr. Dewey explained that such a change would represent a fundamental shift in the U-PASS program. The purchase a U-PASS has always provided the user access to any transit of the agencies with which the University contracts. How would we implement a different fare media system – it would have to look different. Having uniform fare media facilitates distribution to students. The U-PASS is sent to 100% of UW students; 85% of the students keep them. We can't send different fare media to students we think would use Community Transit because we can't differentiate geographically; some people in King County use Community Transit who you would think would use Metro. Can we risk asking students to declare up front what transit service they will be using? That is a risky proposition because it may increase the number of students who just decide not to use a U-PASS at all. Smart Card will enable us to have more options. A voucher system has been considered. For example, the University might agree to pay the agencies for a maximum value of transit, say \$80.00 for each U-PASS each month. Mr. Dewey has mentioned this option to the transit agencies and they were concerned but he stated that now is the time to talk about it. Mr. Dewey suggested that the Transportation Office would continue to explore this. Mr. Rutherford asked about the possibility of having an \$80 voucher for rent for a residence within walking distance to the campus.

Ms. Wilham asked about the possibility of U-PASS benefits for ferry riders. Mr. Dewey explained that the Transportation Office has been looking at whether to expand the services available with U-PASS. One concern with having ferry use a part of the U-PASS program has been the possibility that people may use it for recreation rather than for commuting and that the University would have to pay for these. Ms. Wilham suggested that the Transportation Office investigate how Swedish Hospital and the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center manage their programs which include ferry use. Ms. Wilham reminded the committee that before U-PASS, University employees could use their Metro pass on Community Transit and that it was worth part of the cost of the Community Transit trip,

the employee paying the difference. This model is similar to the voucher option discussed above in connection with the Smart Card.

This discussion was deferred to a future meeting.

Review of Proposed Fee Schedule

Mr. Root referred the committee members to the copy of the Proposed Fee Schedule which outlines proposed changes in the parking fee schedule which are proposed to begin 7/1/04. He reminded the committee that there are presently three major capital projects about to begin that will require funds from Parking Services for replacement parking. They are the expansion of the West Campus Garage, construction of Research Technology Building parking and the purchasing the 4545 Garage. Mr. Root began a review of the proposed increases outlined in the attachment. One of the changes he noted was the implementation of an additional \$15.00 fee per month per vehicle for permit carpools. Mr. Rutherford wondered if the proposed fee included the cost of a U-PASS; Mr. Root explained that it did not and that the proposal would continue to require that carpool members each buy a U-PASS. Mr. Anderson noted that the fee schedule should then state that the cost is in addition to that of a U-PASS.

Mr. Winstead asked about how carpooling was enforced. There was a general discussion about the possible abuse of carpool permits. Mr. Anderson wondered if permit carpools could be required to stop at the gatehouse. Mr. Root explained that Parking Services was always looking at ways to prevent queuing at gatehouses, and having carpools stop at gatehouses would definitely increase the queues. Mr. Dewey explained that there are certain steps in place to discourage abusers, such as assessing where they live and having them sign an agreement statement. An additional step will be to require that users individually pay the proposed carpool fee. It is thought that this will decrease the likelihood of phantom carpool riders. Mr. Anderson asked about having designated carpool lots like we used to e.g. having to have three riders to park in S1. Mr. Rutherford

queried about how many carpoolers have the same address. Mr. Dewey replied that it used to be one half but is likely to be less now.

Ms. Shawcroft wanted to know who buys the Sales and Service Designators. Mr. Kahl provided the example that copy machine service people come in on a regular basis and would use them but sales people would need to pay the daily rate.

Ms. McCray wondered why we would propose that debits cards be essential to carpool in E1 and whether people would be allowed to use the Husky debit card at the gatehouse. Mr. Root replied that the fee proposal would increase the incentive to use the Husky card, both by increasing the cash SOV rate and by requiring that transient carpools have a Husky card. This will cut down on cash handling. When questioned about Husky debit card use by other than resident students, Mr. Brown stated that there are currently 30,000 active accounts and there are only 5,000 student residents and that all students are eligible to use the Husky card account. He explained that there has been a dramatic increase in the use of Husky debit cards and he hopes it will continue.

When Ms. McCray questioned the 2005 start date of the early withdrawal fee, Mr. Dewey explained that the stickers had already been printed through December 2004 that state the current fee. Mr. Dewey explained that the transit pass is worth a lot of money and \$75 early withdrawal fee is designed to discourage students from signing up for class, dropping the class and then keeping the U-PASS.

Mr. Winstead asked about the parking rates in E1 during events. He stated that since we want people to use E1 perhaps a price break should be considered. Mr. Root and Ms. Perey both explained that if the lot is staffed during an event there are increased costs and so a price break is not possible.

Mr. Rutherford asked Mr. Root what he thought the next step in the process would be concerning the proposed fee schedule. Mr. Root stated that he would incorporate the committee's comments, make the necessary changes and bring the revised document to

the next meeting. Mr. Dewey stated that they hoped to get the schedule approved at the next meeting on Feb 3rd. Ms. Wilham asked about obtaining a copy of the approval process timetable. Ms. Perey stated that one was given at the last meeting but it will be resent.

Results of the Windshield Survey

Mr. Root reported that the purpose of the windshield survey was to determine how effective enforcement was in the fall quarter. He reported that the survey results indicated that enforcement is very effective (97%) in the a.m. hours but that enforcement effectiveness drops off in the p.m. hours. He is working with Assistant Police Chief Wittmier to determine the causes.

Mr. Dewey wanted to have a word about the fines. They are defined by the WACs and there is an established approval process for recommended changes. Ms. Perey informed the group that she and the Parking Enforcement Group met recently to discuss proposed changes to the WACs on parking fine amounts. She explained that of the twenty three fines listed, they had recommended changes to half. Mr. Rutherford wondered if we coordinated our fines with the City of Seattle. Ms. Perey stated that the City's fines were considered. The proposed WAC changes will be reviewed at the next meeting.

There was then a brief discussion about the areas around campus in which there is free parking. Mr. Dewey noted the city's requirement that the University not increase traffic to U District yet they provide thousands of free parking spaces within 1.5 miles of campus.

Review of Financial Projections

A "pro forma" showing financial projections was distributed. Mr. Dewey reminded the committee that as discussed at the prior meeting, the given set of assumptions about revenues, expenses and fund transfers left the projected financial position in the red. Mr.

Dewey explained what is driving the costs increases - increases in transit contract costs and capital expenditures. As a way to pay for these expenditures, staff has revised the projected operating expenses to hold the line on other operating expenses. If this is done, the proposed fee schedule will provide enough revenue for the Transportation System to remain solvent. Mr. Schaufelberger questioned the possibility of having no increases in expenses from 2004 until 2007. Mr. Brown questioned the possibility of utility costs not increasing during that time period. He also wondered how Parking Services will be able to justify the SOV price going up 12% and then cutting services. Ms. McCray explained that the desire is to focus on operating efficiencies and minimize any cuts in service visible to the consumer. Mr. Schaufelberger questioned the \$50,000 listed for surface lot construction on the Research Tech Building replacement parking. Mr. Dewey stated that 120 stalls are going to be needed for Research and an additional number for Publication Services and the Northlake building for a total of 160 – 170 stalls. He explained that rather than having to supply all of the building parking needs with underground parking, Transportation Services is looking at nearby surface lots. Residence hall students in W39 are going to be displaced. Ms. Perey explained that the costs will be determined when the spaces are identified, e.g. W39 would not be costly.

There was a general discussion about whether transportation fees were bargainable by the unions. Mr. Kraus confirmed that these kinds of issues were bargainable under the new law. Bargainable issues include wages, hours and working conditions. Mr. Kraus suggested that labor contracts might contain language like that of Local 925 which states in effect that the union waives bargaining of transportation fees as long as they are fair and equal and equally available to all staff. Ms. Perey asked whether these are negotiable even if they have been approved by the Board of Regents and Mr. Kraus indicated they were. Mr. Anderson suggested that something in writing should be created about this issue so that it is on the radar screen. Mr. Kraus stated that everyone is aware of the need to address this as precedent shows that an issue does not disappear if you are silent about it.

Sound Transit

Mr. Dewey provided an update on Sound Transit light rail planning. The original Sound Transit plan outlined a route under Portage Bay and up 15th. Sound Transit determined it was not feasible due to cost. Sound Transit then identified alternatives under Portage Bay and up Brooklyn, with stations at Pacific and 47th Street, and also under the Montlake Cut and up Rainier Vista with a station in E11 and another on Brooklyn. The University told Sound Transit that because of the potential impact on research, the Rainier Vista alignment was unacceptable. A nearby alternative with a station at Husky Stadium is currently being evaluated.

Mr. Dewey reported that Sound Transit will be doing further analysis and reminded the committee that Sound Transit will not start this project for at least five years.

Mr. Winstead thanked Mr. Root and Assistant Police Chief Wittmier for the excellent parking services provided at the weeknight basketball games.