

PARKING COMMISSION MINUTES

March 24, 2014

Attendees: Steve Schrock, Miranda Wagner, Glen White, Drew Harger, Robin Merritt, Margaret Mahoney, John Staniunas, Barb Menke, Marcus Tetwiler, Barry Swanson, Callie Long, Mary LeGresley, Drew Humphreys, Donna Hultine, Danny Kaiser, and Margretta de Vries.

The meeting was called to order at 2:04 p.m. Staniunas made a motion to approve the minutes from March 3rd, which was seconded by Wagner. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Reports

McCollum Replacement Update

Hultine reported that the construction fence went up over Spring Break, to begin construction on two new residence halls. As of this morning, Section E was full, and Section D was half full; warning tickets were written today. We also created extra staff parking in Jayhawker Towers. Housing offered refunds, only 2 people took them, but perhaps more will take them now that they see the reality of it. Tetwiler asked how the process for the refund works. Hultine explained that an email was sent out, in which students were instructed to return their permit to parking, and then we pass their names on to housing for the refund.

New Business

Permit Price Increases

Swanson explained that with the master plan process coming to a conclusion, the university learned and documented many things through that process, including the current status of the parking lots, with a significant need to address \$15 million in deferred maintenance. A goal of the master plan is to get to a sustainable business model. Hultine added that parking funds are the only monies that can be used for fixing parking. In addition, there is other parking-related infrastructure.

Long explained that the goal was how she came up with prices. To address the deferred maintenance over a 10-year period, an additional \$1.8 million is needed each year, although this estimate is probably a little low, when considered together with projects already being planned, such as Memorial Drive (\$3.5 million), McCollum replacement parking, etc. Long explained the spreadsheet showing permit price increases and percentages over the next ten years. Hultine explained the recommendation from the master plan to change from color zones to a tiered parking system based on "Proximate", "Near", and "Remote" parking, with no colors associated. Garage permits would no longer valid outside the garage, and a new "Flex" permit is an additional fee for those who need the option to move their car during day, but we don't know how this will work yet.

There was discussion about the many questions that arise about how to make these changes work, the many factors that need to be taken into account, and the significant cultural change this will cause on campus. Enforcement will be an important factor; Long pointed out that new rules would need to be written, and Hultine said that an option might be to invest in license plate recognition software. Hultine reported that the university is considering a concession agreement, such as other universities have

done, although those universities now lack flexibility to respond to issues (e.g. construction, events) as needed. In either scenario, the prices will go up. This is an effort to keep us local, with university employees who understand the situation. However, the deferred maintenance needs are drastic.

There was additional discussion about how to convince university staff this is a good idea, and Hultine said that University Communications will help us with the messaging for the open forum next Wednesday, and the sooner it's out there, the sooner we can take the anger and frustration and answer the questions, which is important. Swanson added that the message needs to be transparent, explaining what we're doing and why; if we want to have the infrastructure that we need to have, this is necessary.

There discussion about changing to a new carsharing partner, and adding carpool and rideshare matching to our options. There was also discussion about ticket prices, event permit rates, and the transfer from the parking budget to transit. These changes to parking have a high level of dependence on transit functioning, but there is no way to project for an imaginary increased need. Moving more people around campus, then that would need to be on parking, but not getting people to campus. Swanson said that this will be very interesting; students of today and younger faculty/staff don't have as much aversion to public transit, riding a bike, etc. Hultine said that she doesn't see any possibility of keeping the hunting license, assigned parking will be more "managed".

Mahoney pointed out that last year, the commission talked about annual 2% increases, and this regressive for staff. She asked if any thought has been given to charging based on salary. Swanson said there have been talks about it.

Schrock pointed out that the cost of concrete, asphalt, goes up faster than inflation, and labor drives that up. 5% is probably a minimum.

There was discussion about timing of open forum, and given that the message needs to be more carefully crafted, should it be rescheduled. Tetwiler said framing is important and a top down mandate is a very bad idea, invite people to be a part of the process, but stand strong on the bottom line. It will be important to allow special interest groups a way to participate. It seems like only one forum is not enough; there should be various other options to participate.

There was discussion about the timeline; rates have to be approved and updated before last week of April, in time for employee payroll deduction to be online. Today's meeting is discussion only: the forum will be rescheduled to allow time for staff to formulate the message, with the next commission meeting also rescheduled for final discussion on permit rate increases.

The meeting adjourned at 3:37 p.m.