

## **University Transportation Committee Minutes February 3, 2004**

### **In Attendance:**

Ken Anderson, School of Public Health and Community Medicine  
Paul Brown, Housing and Food Services  
Peter Dewey, Transportation Services  
Mae Diligencia, ASUW Student Representative  
Jeanette Henderson, Real Estate Office  
Daniel Kraus, Personnel Services  
Rebecca Lehman, GPSS Representative  
Jeraldine McCray, Facilities Services  
Diana Perey, Transportation Services  
Carl Root, Parking Services  
Paul Roybal, Transportation Office  
Professor Scott Rutherford (Chair), Civil and Environmental Engineering  
Helen Shawcroft, Medical Center Administration  
Ali Tarhouni, Finance and Business Economics  
Matt Weatherford, Arts and Sciences  
Kathryn Wilham, PhD Program in Social Welfare  
Ken Winstead, Intercollegiate Athletics  
Ray Wittmier, UW Police (attending for Vicky Peltzer, UW Police)

### **Guests:**

Pat Galloway, Parking Services  
Celeste Gilman, Transportation Office  
Julie Golding, Parking Services  
Aaron Harris, GPSS  
Brian Ho, UW Police Parking Enforcement  
Ryan Mattson, ASUW Student  
Karen Mooseker, Parking Services  
Amy Rolph, The Daily  
Mariann Woodland, Parking Services

### **Absent:**

Kerry Kahl, Purchasing and Stores  
John Schaufelberger, Construction Management

### **Action Items**

- Mr. Root will change “lease” to “rent” in WAC 478-116-131.
- Communicate to campus community about proposed fee schedule changes. Report to UTC on communication.

## **Approval of Minutes**

In regard to the January 14, 2004, UTC minutes Mr. Root requested that the end of the paragraph on page one in the section on Payroll Deduction for ICTs be changed to “Mr. Root stated that these difficulties are resolvable. Parking Services will initiate these services once programming is complete, likely July 1, 2004.”

Mr. Anderson moved to approve the minutes from the January 14, 2004 meeting, with the change requested by Mr. Root. Mr. Kraus seconded. The motion carried.

## **Carpool Pricing**

Mr. Dewey gave an overview of the considerations that had been taken into account in the proposed carpool fees. One concern raised is that a carpool fee might have an adverse affect on carpool mode share. The price of permit carpools was proposed to be \$15 per month per vehicle at the December meeting because this was thought to be low enough to avoid decreases in carpool mode share. Following the last meeting, staff reconsidered E1, gatehouse and West Campus Garage carpool pricing, to make them more congruent with the permit carpools and to reflect the lower cost of parking in E1. The proposed carpool fee for E-1 was lowered to \$0.50 per car per entry and the proposed Pay-Per-Use-Parking and gatehouse fees for carpools were changed to a cost of \$0.75 per entry, which would be \$15 a month for a carpool that came to campus 20 days in a month. Instituting the new fee would mean that the West Campus Garage could be used by transient carpools for the first time. Mr. Root added that this would mean that all PPUP users would be eligible to make a carpool.

In response to a question, Mr. Dewey reiterated that the three issues being addressed by the proposed carpool fee are: carpool *mode share* has been price insensitive (though carpool permit sales have increased the proportion of employees who say that they carpool has not increased), there have been concerns over carpool fraud, and carpools still occupy parking spaces so should pay something for the use of parking resources.

Mr. Dewey stated that the reductions in the proposed fees cut the carpool revenue roughly in half. The new carpool revenue figures are incorporated into the proposed fee schedule dated 2/3/2004 (attachment 2).

Ms. Diligencia raised the issue of students not understanding why they had to pay to carpool when they were already paying for the U-PASS. Mr. Dewey pointed out that Ms. Diligencia’s concern is one example of a larger issue, namely communicating the changes to University of Washington students, staff, and faculty. Mr. Mattson added that students will be upset, want to know what is happening to their money, and will avoid carpooling to campus and instead walk, take the bus or park off campus.

Mr. Dewey explained that the fee increases were due to rising transit costs (\$5 million more) and capital projects to replace parking spaces that will be displaced by construction (\$1.3 million). He also opined that if students choose to walk or take the bus instead of carpooling that would be a positive outcome. Further, he noted that there is not a large untapped area of free unrestricted parking in the neighborhoods so that significant increases in off campus parking seemed unlikely.

Ms. McCray noted that costs for parking are less for students than anyone else. The proposed increases are also less for students. When costs go up everyone in the system has to contribute.

Mr. Mattson proposed that there be a charge for parking on the weekend rather than a carpool fee. The main points of the discussion that followed were that there was less need to manage demand on the weekends and that charging for parking on the weekends would not generate much revenue. It was also noted that fees are charged for parking during events on weekends.

Ms. Wilham stated that prior to being on the UTC committee she had not even been aware of the U-PASS carpool parking privileges. This reiterated the need to improve communication with students and employees about alternatives to driving alone and the multiple benefits of the U-PASS.

### **Proposal to Provide Employees with Free Parking Privileges**

The proposal to allow employees free 30 minute parking privileges at load zones (as commercial vehicles currently have) was initiated by Brian Geppert and brought to the UTC by Mr. Dewey. It was decided that the issue of providing free parking 30 minute parking privileges came too late to be given due consideration three year fee schedule, and will be tabled until next fee schedule. It was noted that 30 minute free parking used to be allowed, but it was abolished because of abuses. Also, currently employees with parking permits can park in load zones. Mr. Rutherford added that there are parking products departments can purchase to allow drop off parking.

### **Review of Proposed Fee Schedule**

Mr. Root began by explaining the proposal for a 12% fee increase each year for the three years 2004, 2005, and 2006.

Ms. Diligencia questioned the E-1 cash fee increase from \$2.75 to \$4.00, rather than to \$3.00. Mr. Root explained that the purpose of this was to make the difference between paying the Husky Card debit rate and the cash rate significant. When people use Husky Card debit payment, transactions are faster, queues are shorter, and less cash has to be processed. All of these things cut Parking Services costs. Mr. Rutherford added that the higher cash fee makes visitors pay more and students, who have Husky Cards, pay less. Discussion followed about how money can be added and removed from a Husky Card account, with the ASUW and GPSS representatives both expressing their lack of familiarity with the options. Mr. Brown clarified that it is possible for the account holder to withdraw the money on his/her account; and that it is possible to add money online, at the HUB, at various libraries, at Schmitz Hall, or by sending a check. All UW faculty, staff, and students have active accounts, whether or not their account has money on it or has ever been used.

Mr. Mattson asked how students will be able to give their input to the proposed fee changes. Mr. Dewey responded that the proposal will be brought to the ASUW, GPSS various other University committees, and there will be a public hearing before the proposal is brought to the Board of Regents for approval.

Mr. Harris questioned the fee increases in light of the overhead savings gained by using Husky Card accounts in parking transactions. He suggested that the savings be passed on to students.

Mr. Root and Ms. McCray explained that the proposed fees were based on the assumption that Parking Services will hold its expense level over the next three years. This is difficult considering increases in utility costs, employee salaries, and other unanticipated expenses. The increase in fees is less than it would have been without cost saving measures.

Mr. Tarhouni emphasized the need for good communication with the campus community, especially in relation to revenue increases.

Mr. Tarhouni noted that SOV permits are a major revenue generator. He cautioned that consideration be given to the reduced sales that would occur with the increased fees, and the effect that might have on revenues overall.

Mr. Dewey responded that there has been a steady decrease in the sale of SOV permits since the start of the U-PASS program. However, the proposed carpool fee is likely to cause a transfer of people who use carpool permit without actually carpooling back to SOV permits. This would not increase the number of cars coming to campus, just the number of permits sold, and the corresponding revenues. Mr. Root and Mr. Rutherford noted that many more people are expected to be added to the Seattle campus in the next decade, and that no more vehicle trips are allowed.

Mr. Dewey began the discussion of the fee for U-PASSes for SOV permit holders. Currently 3,700 U-PASSes are given free to SOV permit holders. If 2,000 were sold at the proposed price of \$4.50 per month the annual revenue would be \$108,000. If 370 were sold the revenue would be approximately \$20,000. Mr. Brown and Ms. Shawcroft discussed the reasoning behind giving the U-PASS for free—to encourage SOV permit holders to try the U-PASS. Ms. Perey said that though the free U-PASSes may have reduced SOV trips during the day, they likely had little effect on the number of SOV commute trips.

Ms. Henderson suggested giving free transit script instead of a free U-PASS as a means of encouraging SOV permit holders to try taking the bus. Ms. Lehman suggested sending the U-PASS sticker to SOV permit holders the way U-PASS stickers are sent to students, namely that the SOV permit holder will be charged a fee unless they send the U-PASS back. Mr. Rutherford explained that this option had been explored for all employees at the start of the U-PASS program, but that it was then considered not possible (to send them unsolicited to all employees). Ms. McCray suggested that SOV permit holders receive a U-PASS for the fee, but only if they request it. Mr. Dewey added that the proposed fee of \$4.50 a month was much smaller than the pass's value, which is \$100 or more a month. Mr. Dewey reiterated Ms. Henderson's point that there should be improved transit script for people who want to try the bus (e.g. free to all new employees).

Mr. Brown noted that parking fees have increase at an accelerated rate since the beginning of the U-PASS program. SOV permits subsidize the U-PASS program. Mr. Dewey responded that the way that transit trips are charged to the University has changed, from a flat amount to a cost per U-PASS trip. If it were not for SOV permits subsidizing the U-PASS the University would have to build extensive parking structures and area wide road improvements, which would be much more costly in the long run. Mr. Weatherford noted that the vehicle infrastructure around the University is at saturation already.

Mr. Dewey clarified that the fees in the fee schedule were for the Seattle U-District campus. Ms. Shawcroft asked about the inclusion of Roosevelt Commons. Ms. Galloway responded that Roosevelt Commons parking is administered by Parking Services and Parking Services fees have traditionally required Board of Regents approval.

There was a discussion about safety at night being a reason to drive to campus. Parking fees are discounted in the evenings to reflect the lower demand for parking in the evenings. Employees get the Reimbursed Ride Home and Individual Commuter Ticket benefits for the higher U-PASS fee they pay, and the U-PASS program pays for the Night Ride. Students who live in the no carpool

zone (approximately one mile from Drumheller Fountain) who carpool rather than walking and taking the Night Ride home take up parking spaces that could be used by people coming from farther away. In response to this discussion Ms. Lehman suggested that each carpool be allowed to park for free two or three times in a quarter. Mr. Root and Mr. Dewey said such a program would be technically feasible, though it may be expensive to set up. It was decided this suggestion could be explored.

Mr. Winstead brought up the need to address the concerns of single parents in the marketing of the fee changes. Single parents and people who drive to work when alternatives are less available and have no schedule flexibility see driving alone to work as a necessity not a privilege. It is important to be clear about the reason for the changes and to explore what alternatives are available.

### **Review of Financial Projections**

Mr. Dewey said that in the 2/3/2004 projections (attachment 3) the capital program costs are more accurate than in the previous projections.

Mr. Winstead asked about the constraints on fees charged by Metro. Mr. Dewey responded that the cost is based on an estimate of the number of trips and the negotiated fare per trip. The fee per trip that the University gets charged is less than the least expensive adult cash fare so it is felt that we are currently getting a pretty good deal.

Ms. Shawcroft noted that several ideas about different ways to structure the fees and transportation options had been brought up at the last meeting. She wanted to know if they could be explored in the midst of the upcoming three year fee schedule, or whether they would have to wait. Mr. Dewey responded that it would be possible to go back to the Board of Regents within those three years with proposed changes. However, conversion to the Smartcard fare media is the most logical time to make changes to the pricing of the transit benefit and this won't come on line until after the three year period.

Mr. Anderson made a motion that the proposed fee schedule move forward. Ms. Henderson seconded. The motion carried. Ms. Diligencia cast a dissenting vote.

### **Proposed Washington Administrative Code Changes**

(Attachment 4)

Mr. Root began by saying that the proposed changes to the Parking Services section were for the purpose of making the WAC consistent with current terminology and more clear. The one suggestion in the Parking Services section was from Ms. Henderson, who said that the word lease should be changed to rent in section 478-116-131.

Assistant Chief Wittmier went over the UWPD portion of the proposed changes. The change to 478-116-431 makes people whose cars have been impounded pay for the car's release up front. This is the practice of the City of Seattle in its impounds and will prevent the high rate of default on promissory notes that has been experienced. In section 478-116-520 the late fee is being increased from \$10 to \$25. This is still less than the late fee charged by the City of Seattle.

Assistant Chief Wittmier described the reasoning behind the proposed change in 478-116-531. Currently a person cannot appeal a parking ticket after 21 days. However, sometimes the

reasons for parking violations are things such as sudden and severe injury. The UWPD would like to be able to hear appeals after 21 days in cases like this.

Assistant Chief Wittmier noted that the goal of fines is to discourage violators. In keeping with this, the fine for improperly displaying a permit is being raised above the cost of a daily permit. In response to a question from Ms. Henderson, Assistant Chief Wittmier explained that the reason some of the fines for “parking where you aren’t supposed to be parking” are higher is because it is especially important to discourage people from parking in locations where they will create a safety hazard. Ms. Perey added that the proposed fines for Parking out of area and improper display are designed to prevent repeated violations for those who might think a low fine was worth it.

Mr. Harris asked how clear the signage on campus is, particularly for new students. Assistant Chief Wittmier replied that the UWPD works with Parking Services on signage and that the student Citation Hearing Officers considered inadequate signage in reviewing citation appeals.

Mr. Brown made a motion that the UTC support the proposed Parking Services and UWPD Parking Enforcement proposed changes to the Washington Administrative Code. Mr. Winstead seconded. The motion carried.

### **Other**

Mr. Winstead spoke of the importance of letting people know that their parking fee does not necessarily guarantee them a parking place in their assigned lot. Also, it is important to not oversell daily permits and to reduce violations.

Ms. Shawcroft requested that the next meeting feature a report on the communication made to the campus community about the proposed fee changes.

Ms. Henderson requested that the UTC meetings be at a set time each month (e.g. the second Tuesday at 2pm). Meetings that were not needed could be cancelled.

Mr. Rutherford let the group know that the next meeting previously scheduled for 2/24 is cancelled.

Ms. Perey added that the next meeting should be scheduled after meeting with student groups and University committees. Early April would probably be the most appropriate time.

### **Attachments:**

Attachment 1 Comparison of Proposed Carpool Rates

Attachment 2 Proposed Parking Fee Schedule 2004-2006

Attachment 3 Parking Services and U-PASS Projections

Attachment 4 Proposed Changes to the WACs