University Transportation Committee
21 May 2012 – 11:30 a.m. – Gerberding 142

Present:
Josh Kavanagh, Transportation Services
Peter Dewey, TIP
Robert Johnson, Transportation Services, guest
Miranda Leidich, South Lake Union
Laura Davenport, SEIU 925
Steve Kennard, Real Estate Office
Mark Stanley, Student Life and HFS
Jean Garber, School of Dentistry
John Schaufelberger, Faculty Representative
Scott Baebler, Intercollegiate Athletics
Bob Ennes, Health Sciences Academic Services & Facilities
Larry Kalahiki, UWMC
Michelle Rhoads, Transportation Services
Chris McDivit, Transportation Services
Sara Brydges, Commuter Services
Stephanie Parkins, Commuter Services
Alicia Halberg, Commuter Services

Absent:
Bill Dow, ASUW Representative
Sean Wilson, ASUW Representative
TBA, ASUW Representative
Melanie Mayock, GPSS Representative
Colin Morgan-Cross, GPSS Representative
Scot Rastelli, GPSS Representative
Chuck Treser, Faculty Representative
TBA, Faculty Representative
Luther Martin, WFSE
April Millar, WSNA
Matt Weatherford, PSO
John Vinson, UWPD
Rebecca Barnes, Planning & Budgeting
Kristin Francisco, Disability Services Office
Celeste Gilman, Commuter Services
Charles Kennedy, Facilities Services
Daniel Kraus, Labor Relations

1. Meeting called to order – Josh Kavanagh
a. There is a large backlog of minutes from the last few years. These minutes will be sent out in one large PDF to the UTC and at the next meeting Josh would like to accept them rather than approve them as he doesn’t expect most UTC members to remember the details from each meeting over the past few years.

2. 12 passenger van training – Michelle Rhoads
   a. Any driver of a 12 passenger van (not large cargo vans) will receive behind-the-wheel training effective this summer quarter.
      i. Trained persons will receive a card they can keep in their wallet or purse to indicate that they are certified to drive a 12 passenger van.
   b. This is a partnership with UWPD which will provide the actual trainers
      i. These trainers will become certified in early June.
      ii. Training will be a combination of behind-the-wheel training as well as online training. It is meant to be practical and a supplement to the online training that is already in place.
   c. Transportation Services hopes to begin training drivers by the week of June 18.
   d. More information will be sent out to the entire UW community soon; many student groups and departments have already reserved these 12 passenger vans for trips this summer. These groups will be the first to receive training.

3. Faculty/Staff U-PASS subcommittee update – Laura Davenport
   a. All subcommittee members have worked together to schedule a first meeting for early June. Because this meeting hasn’t occurred yet, there’s not much to report.
      i. Chuck Treser will represent faculty, Laura Davenport for classified staff, Matt Weatherford for pro staff and Celeste Gilman for Transportation Services. The group has reached out to WFSE but has not heard any response.
   b. The mission of the subcommittee is to work on ways to stabilize the faculty and staff U-PASS program and looking at the potential for changing funding models.
      i. Michelle Rhoads said she can provide more information about peer institutions, such as Oregon State, about how transportation passes have been rolled into university employee benefits.
      ii. Laura Davenport said she was interested in making the program a part of the benefits offered by the university, as opposed to its current pseudo-concrete status.
   c. Updates from this subcommittee will be a standing item on future agendas.

4. Burke-Gilman trail party – Sara Brydges
   a. This trail party is a part of May’s “Bike to Campus Month” events. It will be this Thursday, May 24 from 4-7 p.m. in the small park off the Burke-Gilman Trail between Brooklyn and University Way.
b. Cascade Bicycle Club, Commuter Services, Zipcar, Theo’s Chocolates and many others will be there. The event features bike and helmet fittings, bike maintenance, safety checks, food and snacks, music, giveaways and more.

c. UTC members should pass this on to others who may find it useful or interesting.

5. Transportation Services’ resource re-alignment – Josh Kavanagh
a. TS has identified key opportunities for growth and cost issues that have been discussed at the UTC over the past few years.
b. The Transportation Systems group has historically had a technical staff member, currently held by David Amiton, and a staff member focused on marketing and outreach, currently filled by Sara Brydges.
   i. Refocusing these resources in alignment with key growth areas will better serve the University. The new Transportation Systems group will now have one staff member focused on active transportation, David Amiton, one person focused on rideshare programs, Sara Brydges, and one person dedicated to transit, Stephanie Parkins.
      1. This will be the first time there’s been a person solely dedicated to vanpool and carpool. Empty seats coming into the U-District every day are the largest untapped resource.
c. Alicia Halberg has served as the student U-PASS liaison this last year and will be staying with TS after her graduation this June on a one year assignment on public engagement efforts within the public relations and marketing team.
   i. TS will see many changes this next year with a parking system replacement, policy changes, faculty and staff U-PASS research, student U-PASS program potential renewal and a new UW transportation strategy in advance of the institutional master plan.
   ii. Alicia will now be in charge of UTC minutes and coordinating meetings. We ought to thank Sara Brydges for her service over the past few years!

6. Bike enclosures and the Burke-Gilman Trail – Josh Kavanagh
a. TS is continuing to charge forward in both projects. A second grant application is out and TS is just starting to receive preliminary results back from its first application. The project scored extraordinarily well in all areas except one; TS believes there could be errors in that one category and is currently looking into it.
b. TS will continue to keep the UTC updates and will hopefully have good news to share soon.

7. South Campus Transportation Committee – Bob Ennes
a. The system is going well however, there have been some twists and turns while looking at a multitude of potential systems.
   i. Currently the committee is looking at a point system, rather than a pure allocation system. This would allow some units to use different points and
allocate them as they see fit. It’s an interesting concept that Josh Kavanagh helped to come up with, but the group is still looking into the details.

b. The allocation system in S-1 has not worked well for anybody in south campus for quite some time.

c. The committee hopes to have recommendations to the full committee by later this week; there is a group meeting on Wednesday.

d. Michelle Rhoads commended the group for tackling a difficult subject. Chris McDivit and Mariann Woodland have also been a big help to the committee.

8. New parking system concept presentation – Peter Dewey

a. The current parking system is many decades old in terms of policy and procedure – the current hardware and software is about 15 years old, essentially obsolete.

   i. Before TS buys new hardware and software, it wants to take stock of what it has, what is available in the marketplace, and think big about how it can better serve the needs of the University.

   ii. This committee has had good conversations about the parking priorities on campus and TS is incorporating those into the system moving forward.

   iii. Josh Kavanagh: The current system is an administrative parking allocation system which includes a complex way of having points or ranking people.

      1. This system leads to many situations where there are too many people who want to park in one location, and not enough for other locations. It leads to rationing, which is unsatisfying for everyone involved.

         a. TS is looking at using the market and pricing to sort out where people park. This will take pressure off of some high-demand areas.

         b. TS’ ultimate desire is for people to show up and have a place to park, every time

         c. TS used the feedback provided at previous UTC meetings, particularly the continuum scales used when demonstrating preferences, to help create these recommendations.

b. Peter would like to outline the major features TS is contemplating at this point and also outline the schedule moving ahead in implementation.

   i. TS is presenting this to the UTC because it wants feedback from members and others about the proper areas for these sorts of things

c. Eliminate physical permits

   i. One idea is to greatly remove or reduce the number of physical permits on campus. New permits would be “virtual,” that is, based on license plate recognition technology.

      1. Parkers would purchase a permit to park on campus by registering their vehicle and acquiring a product based on their license plate number.

      2. There would be license plate recognition technology mounted on cars that drive around campus and read license plates
a. Optical character recognition has greatly improved over the years. Technology now enables plates to be read while traveling at 60-70 mph.

b. After photographing a license plate, the technology could compare it to a database of permits showing which plates are allowed to park in which lots.

ii. Another idea is to increase the number of gated facilities on campus, thus reducing the need to drive around and enforce parking laws on a very large campus.
   1. Perhaps cordon off areas such as the parts of S1, Padelford, and the Central Plaza garage; changing the orientation of E12 and E1; adding gates to facilities such as Cedar and Portage Bay.
   2. The goal would be to use the RFID chip in the card rather than the magnetic stripe as it puts less wear on the card.
   3. **Statement (Michelle Rhoads):** These gated areas are places where TS have gotten fare media into the hands of the person parking (most people have ID cards). But, there’s a body of people in south campus that have separate parking cards now. These cards would need to be replaced with different fare media so that they have everything they need in hand prior to showing up at the gate.
      a. This highlights the important need to segregate transient parkers from pre-approved contract or permit parkers. This would also reduce the burden on customers that go to the gatehouses.

iii. There are a certain number of pay stations/remote pay devices that allow customers to pay with a credit card or cash. TS is currently trying to figure out if these pay-by-space machines could be used with the same license plate recognition technology.
   1. **Question:** Would customers prefer to go back and put a permit from the pay station on their dashboard, or remember their license plate number before paying?
      a. This could be mitigated by having the computers programmed to autocorrect incorrect punched-in numbers to the correct number based on what the patron has used in the past.

iv. This change would likely increase parking enforcement on campus; therefore there would likely be no material change in staffing levels.
   1. There is also a burden associated with maintaining new equipment, which has the potential for new staff.

d. **PPUP – pay per use parking**
   i. TS is looking to greatly expand the use of PPUP parking. This is the system currently in place at the Portage Bay Garage; where customers pay for each use
rather than for a monthly or quarterly pass. It has been a key component of the University’s TDM system over the last 20 years.

1. PPUP is different from pay and display in that an account is established in advance.
   a. Comment (Laura Davenport): If you’re already someone who is an SOV commuter parking in Padelford, for example, each day, would you continue to be able to park in Padelford as an SOV?
      i. Yes; instead of buying a $141 permit, customers would only be charged for the days that they park. Currently this is $7/day. This could result in higher costs on heavy months, but lower costs on months that include telework, conferences or vacations.
      ii. This system helps people realize the cost of parking on campus each day, encouraging them to take other modes part time or consider teleworking a few days each week.
   ii. There are three different primary parking products: PPUP in Portage Bay, E1, and individual commuter tickets.
      1. PPUP has been a very effective solution in the Portage Bay garage.
      2. If this system could be dispersed across campus in an efficient way, then TS could look at getting rid of physical commuter tickets and switching to an entirely virtual system.
   iii. Question (Laura Davenport): By turning Padelford into a PPUP area, would people still be able to drive in and park there as guests?
      1. Those with no paycheck deduction would need to establish a Husky Card account in advance. It would be charged for the number of times a person parks there, similar to how the 520 tolling system works.
      2. There can also be a discussion of which groups are allowed to participate in which products.
      3. Not all contract permits are being replaced with PPUP. Many north campus lots would be non-gated and customers would acquire their monthly or quarterly permit, though now virtual.

E. Eliminating the pay on entry/refund on exit system

i. The University has had this system in place for the last 30 years because it wanted to receive the payment from customers up front. This is a very unusual practice in the marketplace. Also, as parking has become more expensive over the last 20 years, payment up front has become more of a financial burden on people.

ii. Elsewhere people buy time in advance at a parking meter or other private facility for a specific amount of time. Regularly people find that they misestimate. Ideally, TS would find a way to enable these customers to go
online and add time to the “meter” per say, or go to a physical location and add time.

f. Integrating remote facilities
   i. Currently the South Lake Union, Pavilion, Roosevelt 2 and Triangle garages run on separate systems. There is a desire to have all facilities integrated with a common validation technology. This way, customers could move between facilities and be familiar with the technology at all UW facilities.

g. Area-specific pricing system
   i. Reforming the pricing system would allow TS to charge for parking based an area’s demand. Currently there’s E1, which is discounted, and everywhere else. With a new system, TS could discount areas with lower demand.
      1. In the 1980s there was a two-zone parking system wherein E12 and E1 were discounted, but for one reason or another it was eliminated.
   ii. Certain areas on campus sit unused or very lightly used. Peter Dewey refers to these as “zone 4” areas and showed a map of proposed “zone 4” areas across campus. Discounting these areas, based off their current use, would give people reason to walk away from zones 1, 2 and 3.
      1. Central campus would be zone 1 and would not be discounted. This is the area with the highest demand. Areas in the periphery need to be discounted so that customers have motivation to walk a little bit farther to get to their cars.
         a. Potentially this could take some pressure off of high-demand areas across campus.
   iii. These price structures could change over time based on the experience TS has with people shifting where they choose to park.
   iv. Question (Laura Davenport): What about SOV customers who, for example, choose to park in a low-demand area near the IMA for a workout, then want to move to a higher-demand area later?
      1. Currently there are out-of-area parking permits.
      2. There could be a few different ways of approaching this:
         a. People could move within their own zones without reassignment (ex: a zone 2 permit could always park in a zone 2 area)
         b. People could move between zones after going online and acquiring the right to park within a different zone.
            i. Customers would likely pay a premium for “parking up” – ie: moving from zone 3 to zone 2 would cost them more.
            ii. People with permits could park down for free – ie: zone 1 holders could park in other zones at no extra cost.
               1. Josh Kavanagh said a feature of the system today includes neutral zones, where automatic
out-of-area rights are extended to all customers. This exists around the IMA and UW Tower.

iii. This issue as well as U-Designators still need to be discussed and resolved in terms of new systems and business rules.

v. *Comment (Miranda Leidich):* I like the idea of pricing zones, but would heavily discounting areas in the periphery take away from transit riders?
   1. TS does not anticipate that outcome. Some areas on the periphery are already free (street parking provided by the City of Seattle). The new parking system will be in line with the University’s TDM goals.
      a. Perhaps those parking for free in the neighborhoods might have some incentive to park in the UW periphery at a low cost.

h. **Time-specific pricing system**

   i. Today parking is discounted at certain times of day. Currently it is free between 9 p.m. and 6 a.m. and discounted between 4 a.m. and 8:30 a.m.
   
   ii. Currently it is common to have two price differentiations in the marketplace. The UW is more uncommon, having four different differentiations.

i. TS’ desire is to see what various vendors have and what is commonly found in other universities. It would like to specify a system that it can acquire, rather than writing a system that is completely custom or unique to the UW. Writing a new system would be very expensive and could be confusing and difficult in later years.

   i. Right now TS is learning about what systems are available in the marketplace as well as what requirements the University needs met.
   
   ii. After talking with potential vendors, TS has heard back from at least nine that are interested in speaking with the University and presenting more about their products.

   iii. TS is sending a contingent to the IPI conference next month to learn more about the marketplace and what’s out there.

j. **Schedule of implementation**

   i. It is very likely that this new system will be implemented over a period of time. For example, TS could purchase and install remote pay stations around campus, then add gate arms later, and follow it up with another change.
      1. In this, TS wants to partner with different agencies and departments to see what should be implemented in what order.

   ii. TS is trying to articulate business rules, as previously discussed in the out-of-areas section, and vet them in an appropriate way so that it put out bids and proposals in the next several months.
      1. Hopefully these business rules will be articulated by July.
      2. An RFP draft should be ready in August or September
      3. Proposals in October
4. Evaluate proposals in Winter Quarter 2013 and hire by the end of that quarter.
5. There is a desire for everything to be fully implemented by summer 2014.

iii. The June and July UTC meetings will be chock full of discussion of potential business rules.

1. Many members might have vacations or conferences planned, so they should be sure to appoint proxies in advance and take notice of the meeting minutes.
2. TS would like for this process to be very collaborative; taking into account the needs of customers, employees, systems administrators and different departments. This approach will result in a system that works well for everyone; one that can be used, easily understood and explained.