University Transportation Committee  
January 23, 2012

Present:
Sara Brydges, Commuter Services  
Josh Kavanagh, Transportation Services  
Mark Stanley, Student Life & HFS  
April Millar, WSNA representative  
Steve Kennard, Real Estate Office  
Alicia Halberg, Commuter Services (Guest)  
Nathan Jones, Commuter Services (Guest)  
Ron Kahler, Fleet Services (Guest)  
Joles Tahara, Fleet Services (Guest)  
Dave Amiton, Commuter Services  
Bob Ennes, Health Sciences Academic Services & Facilities  
William Dow, ASUW  
Scott Baebler, ICA  
Patricia Riley, UWMC  
Peter Dewey, TIP  
Scot Roselli, GPSS  
Colin Morgan-Cross, GPSS  
Michelle Rhoads, Transportation Services  
Miranda Leidich, SLU  
Jean Garber, Dentistry

Absent:
Sean Wilson, ASUW  
Melanie Mayock, GPSS  
John Schaufelberger, Faculty  
Chuck Treser, Faculty  
Luther Martin, WPSE  
Laura Davenport, SEIU 925  
Matt Weatherford, PSO  
John Vinson, UWPD  
Jeanette Henderson, Real Estate Office  
Rebecca Barnes, Planning & Budgeting  
Anneke Szyperski, Disability Services Office  
Celeste Gilman, Commuter Services  
Charles Kennedy, Facilities Services  
Daniel Kraus, Labor Relations

Minutes accepted, not approved by the UTC
1. Fleet Mix & Carbon Reduction Policy
   a. Many UTC members are familiar with Joles Tahara. She has now moved onto another role and Ron Kahler will oversee all of Fleet Services.
   b. This conversation is a preliminary meeting to Fleet rates; the UTC will talk about policies.
   c. There is a new state law that requires state fleets to meet a composite 36 mpg for vehicles under 36,000 lbs. Therefore, UW must purchase more hybrid vehicles in order for its fleet to be in compliance. In the past, there have been more non-hybrid vehicles in the sedan class.
   d. The new proposal is to integrate hybrids and sedans so that both vehicle types will be rented under the same rate. This means that customers who utilize regular sedans will now start to pay towards using hybrids, which cost more.
      i. The SUV and minivan class would also be grouped into the hybrid version of these vehicles.
      ii. Transitioning to hybrid vehicles will bring the program in compliance with the new state law as well as the University’s environmental goals.
         1. Until all vehicles are replaced with hybrids, fleet is suggesting that the price groups be collapsed so that there is not a financial disincentive to the departments that currently rent hybrid vehicles.
   2. Question: Has fleet considered transitioning into other alternatives, such as electric vehicles?
      a. Electric vehicles are prohibitively expensive at this point.
      b. UW does not have the infrastructure to support a fleet of electric vehicles.
      c. Peter said speaking to the electric, it is very expensive to install charging stations; esp. the additional power required to charge. The short term price build up for those who have gas cars right now? Approx. $400-500 per vehicle per year. That works out to about a 30% increase in annual cost; those already with hybrids will see only a slight decrease.
   iii. So from a policy perspective, there are two choices:
      1. Let the current rates stay in place, which won’t encourage departments to convert to hybrid vehicles.
      2. Collapse the two categories, which would have increased prices, but would prove to be a positive change in the long-term.
   iv. The UTC approved these programmatic changes with none in opposition.
      1. A new rate package should be ready by the end of February or beginning of March.

2. Universal Student U-PASS Advisory Board
a. The Advisory Board chair, William Dow, said that the board is starting to look at student costs and revenue from summer and autumn quarters.

b. The board is still fielding comments and questions from students and is looking into exemptions and scholarships to address the concerns and perception of U-PASS.
   i. Question: On the likelihood of exemptions
      1. The board may not pursue an exemption policy, but is looking into all possible paths forward.
   ii. The board has received about 300 comments from unique individuals since the beginning of the academic year in September. Comments have dissipated since the beginning of the school year.

c. The board is looking at renaming the fee on the tuition statement. If this occurs, it will likely be called a “transportation fee” instead.

3. Parking Transportation Plan for 2012 Football
   a. There are requests for Scot Baebler to present two items at the next meeting.
      i. Transportation to and from CenturyLink Field from the UW-Seattle campus, particularly as it relates to students.
      ii. Bicycle parking at the new Husky Stadium.

4. Parking System Values & Priorities
   a. Transportation Services is currently in the process of replacing parking systems. It hopes that change will take away some of the pains of doing daily business alongside making things better and easier for the campus community.
      i. There will be a number of conversations about these changes in the next few UTC meetings.
      ii. Today’s conversation will look at the big picture of the parking system and how the UTC would like it to work for the campus as a whole.
   b. Contract parking v. Daily Parking
      i. Contract means a patron has purchased a permit for unlimited parking.
      ii. Daily parking refers to short-term parking permits sold at the campus gatehouses.
         1. At the end of the day, it would be hard to imagine a system that didn’t have room for both of these permit types. The question is where the UTC wants the majority of UW parkers to be on this scale between contract and daily permits.
      iii. A majority of the nursing staff works 50% of the time, therefore they tend to prefer daily parking to contract permits—particularly in a system where Sundays are free.
iv. Contract parking is always a secure choice because patrons will always know what the bill amount is. Additionally, they do not need to stop and purchase a daily permit, which saves time.

v. Currently, more than half of the parking on campus consists of daily permits.

vi. UTC members stressed that flexibility is an important trait to include because there are many employees who change their schedule on a monthly basis.
   1. Some groups are adopting “flex schedules” for their employees in the future. Because of this, parking flexibility is a must.
   2. Flexibility should not only be included with the amount of products available, but how can they be used.

vii. Question: If there are changes to accommodate more flexibility, would we want to maximize that flexibility into a more limited space?

Josh asked if, as we shift and change this system, we want to maximize flexibility into a more limited space. Patty said reduced rate for non-premium time is very important which is another one for the flexible product options. While we’ve said that there has to be flexibility, the preference around the table is for daily charges so the connection is park more pay more park less pay less (most people agreed)

c. Diversity in product offerings
   i. Currently, there are many products that are only accessible to certain people in certain situations.
      1. It might be more users in the end if the system is simplified. This also might implement a better sense of fairness among customers.
      2. By simplifying the amount of products it would not only make work easier on the business end, but also easier for people to make an informed decision about their transportation options.
         a. This could potentially be spread across multiple campuses – making it simpler and more user friendly for those traveling between campuses.
   ii. Patricia Riley, of UWMC, suggested looking at premium time v. non-premium times and changing them from the current levels.
   iii. Question: What proportion of the parking demand comes from students?
      1. Transportation Services estimates that 13% of students drive to school and that about half of those park on campus.
         a. But, there are nearly 40,000 students, so that number is still fairly large.

d. Parking predictability and availability
i. Bob Ennes, of Health Sciences Academic Services & Facilities, said that those who park in S1 place a large value on predictability and the guarantee that having a contract pass gives.

e. System stratification

i. The current system has a lot of stratification when it comes to eligibility rules. At some level, politically and professionally, there is a need to have priorities within the parking system for certain people

   1. For example, surgeons will need to get to a particular spot, and quickly, in some instances.

ii. Question: Should these rules be simplified in order to create a greater equality in regards to access?

iii. Question: When there is a conflict among these parking groups, who gets priority to park?

   1. Patients, the disabled, departmental visitors, contractors, volunteers, donors, fans/special events, retirees, employees, resident students, commuter students.

      a. Patients ranked first, followed by the disabled. Employees ranked third. Discussion ensued about the other categories but no ranks were determined.

      i. Retirees were ranked last.

         1. UTC members agreed that retirees parking benefits should be decreased. Currently they receive free parking. Most agreed that they should see the same access to the parking system as current employees. This way, parking would no longer be free, but would still be cheaper than the daily gatehouse rate.

f. Locations

   i. Question: Should parking be discounted based on location?

      1. The UTC agrees that high-demand locations ought to cost more than lower-demand locations.

9. In conclusion

i. Preferences

   1. Daily parking permits are preferred to contract permits

   2. UTC members prefer equal access to products

   3. There ought to be location flexibility built in to the permits

      a. Including multi-campus flexibility

ii. Demand elements

   1. Flexibility to the customer

   2. An emphasis on daily parking permits
3. Eligibility more closely aligned to business needs
4. Pricing should correlate to demand