Parking & Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting
Thursday January 29, 2015
2:00 pm, OM 340

MEETING NOTES

Present: Doug Adelstein, Doug Dugovich, Bernie Housen, Chris Loar, Susan Banton (for Doug MacLean), April Markiewicz, Kunle Ojikutu, Darin Rasmussen, Stephanie Scott, Ed Simpson (for Rick Benner), Brian Sullivan, and Kurt Willis. Ex officio: Julia Gassman, and Paul Mueller

1. Approval of January 13, 2015 Meeting Notes
   Doug Adelstein Moved and Brian Sullivan Seconded the Motion to approve the January 13, 2015 Meeting Notes. Motion approved unanimously.

2. Status of PTAC Recommendations Phase I & II
   Darin Rasmussen and Julia Gassman went through the 2013 and 2014 PTAC Recommendations Progress Report they had prepared (attached) that had been sent out to the PTAC members earlier in the week with the other documents to be presented at the meeting. The PTAC Phase I and II Recommendations and Response table (attached), summarizes the Progress Report. Rasmussen acknowledged that some of the approaches for addressing the PTAC recommendations will go to the unions as items for negotiation.

Sullivan stated for the benefit of the new PTAC members that the recommendations by the 2013 and 2014 PTAC have resulted in savings to Parking Services in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, as well as brought greater transparency, consistency, and fairness to the university’s parking program.

In summary:
- **Evening and Retired Faculty and Staff Permits**: Parking Services is seeking university funding to offset the cost of both, resulting in an estimated total revenue of $9,000. Preliminary feedback from administration indicates support for this approach. Rasmussen stated he should know in about a month whether the university will fund these.
- **Commuter packets** will be available for purchase as 1) five one-day permits for $20 with a maximum of two packs per quarter, or 2) 10 one-day permits for $30 with a maximum of one pack per quarter.
- **Department Reserved Space** are currently $76. Over the next four years, gradual increases in the rate to equal the cost of a parking permit in that lot will be implemented. Rasmussen added that the Student Health Center parking spaces are currently not being charged, but will be starting this fall quarter.
- **Foundation and Admissions Permits** will be paid by the respective entities with $1,000 paid by The Western Foundation and $10/permit paid by Admissions.
• **Other Events Permits** are still being addressed with resolution expected by November 2015.

• **Lincoln Creek Transportation Center** permits will be issued at no charge for one year (2015 - 16) to help identify how many of Western and non-Western people, including WTA are using the lot. The second year (2016 – 17), permits will cost $25 per quarter. As part of its communication plan, Western will work with WTA and other partners to address parking and transit issues. It will also work with the city of Bellingham to monitor and address potential impacts to residential parking from drivers seeking alternative free parking on the streets.

• **Contractor Permits** are already at $200 per space in construction staging areas. Issuing contractor parking permits for C lots and residential lots is still under consideration. Benner and Rasmussen will discuss this further and bring their recommendation back to the PTAC.

• **University Business Stickers** will be free since the user has already purchased a parking permit and is filling a programmatic need of the university. This may be revisited in the future.

• **Carpool Permits** will be increased in price over a two year span to full space value since each carpooler is paying no more than half the cost of the permit.

• **Fines** and increases to them have been identified as a topic of negotiation with the unions. The last rate increases were approved by the unions and implemented in 2014. Parking is also reviewing ways to streamline the types of fines issued by consolidating similar types and aligning costs so that similar types of fines have the same rate.

Scott asked about contractors parking at no charge in nontraditional parking spaces, i.e., on bricks. Rasmussen clarified that staging areas are delineated by fencing and within those areas contractors pay to park. If they park outside those area without a permit they are fined. Simpson stated that the university includes the cost of the permits for contractors in the contract as part of the cost of doing business.

### 3. Parking Improvements and Maintenance Plan

Ed Simpson reviewed the **Parking Improvements and Maintenance Plan** spreadsheet that lists the lots by condition from Excellent to Poor, followed by the Gravel lots and maps out the maintenance plan for each lot from 2015 to 2068. The maintenance schedule is based on assuming that each paved lot has a 42 year life span. That assumption is based on lot maintenance data and the results of the lot condition assessment conducted by the Craig Parkinson the consultant. In summary:

- New lots: Seal coated and striped
- After 7 years: Cracks repaired, lot seal-coated, and striped
- After 14 years: Cracks repaired, lot seal-coated, and striped
- At 21 years: Replace 10% of asphalt and underlying base, crack repair, seal coat lot, and stripe
- Repeat maintenance every 7 years for 21 more years
- At 42 years: Replace 10% of base and repave 90% of lot, followed by seal coating and striping
The lots identified for immediate crack repair, seal coating, and striping are the Good condition lots. According to the maintenance schedule, work would start this summer and be completed the summer of 2017. In 2016, paving of the gravel lots will begin, ending with the paving of the Lincoln Creek Transportation Center in 2018. Fair and Poor lots will be sequenced for repair starting in 2019.

The question was asked why we were paving the Lincoln Creek Transportation Center. Rasmussen stated storm water runoff issues are part of the reason, as well as concerns about liability due to potholes that need constant maintenance. Mueller interjected that a claim had recently been filed against the university alleging damage to a vehicle from a pothole. The cost to settle the claim will probably be a few thousand, but if someone falls and is injured due to a pothole, the costs to the university could increase to the tens of thousands.

Simpson suggested that everyone look over the plan and to contact him or Rick Benner if there are any questions.

Housen asked about the R residential lots and whether paving them would come from a separate funding source. Willis stated it would not come from the Residential funding source. Gassman stated that when contractors are renovating buildings the university usually leverages improvements to the campus roads and/or parking lots impacted by the construction. That mechanism has been used in recent years to get several lots repaved and striped.

Due to time constraints, Brian Sullivan will present in detail the Parking Operating and Maintenance Financial Pro Formas at the next PTAC meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.
To: Parking and Transportation Committee Members

From: Darin Rasmussen, Director of Public Safety

Date: January 21, 2015

Re: 2013 and 2014 PTAC Recommendations Progress Report

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the PTAC Committee with the status of the recommendations made by PTAC in 2013 and 2014.

1. Evening Permits

“The committee recommends discontinuing the current practice of issuing evening permits to students at no charge. (After-hours parking C-lot parking is available at no charge, and pay boxes are accessible in the closer-to-core lots to purchase evening permits.)”

Estimated revenue: $4,000

In keeping with the guiding principle that every space has a value, there is a value for parking on campus during evening hours and on weekends.

Approach:

1. Meet the university’s programmatic interests of providing this service to students, as well as those faculty, and staff who purchase the bus pass through seeking $4,000 in university funding to offset this impact to the parking system
2. Continue to provide free parking in the C-Lots to address the same programmatic interests.
3. Explore the feasibility of simplifying administrative impacts to the parking system through purchasing this permit either through on-line sales and/or via the pay stations.
4. Index the amount of funding annually to address inflation and major changes in scope.
2. Commuter Pack Permit

“The committee recommends increasing the price of Commuter Packs (Scratch permits) (10 permits/pack) from the current rate of $13.60 to $50.00, which is half of the daily parking rate, i.e., 10 permits/ $50.00 equals $5.00/day.”

Estimated revenue: $8,000

In keeping with the guiding principle that every space has a value, there is a value for parking on campus at all times.

Approach:

1. Create two options that are available for purchase based on quantity:
   a. Option 1- Allow a customer to purchase five (5) one-day permits for $20.00, with a maximum of two packs per quarter.
   b. Option 2- Allow a customer to purchase ten (10) one-day permits for $30.00, with a maximum of one pack per quarter.
2. Explore the feasibility of simplifying administrative impacts to the parking system through purchasing this permit either through on-line sales and/or via the pay stations.
3. Creates an estimated revenue of $5,300
4. Review amount annually with regard to inflation and major changes in scope.

Rationale:

This approach addresses PTAC’s recommendation, ties the value of each permit into line with the daily permit rate, and also addresses the increased value of each permit based on the quantity of permits being purchased. It also provides the customer with added flexibility and additional choices of different quantities of permits available for purchase.

3. Retired Employees

“The committee recommends discontinuing the current practice of issuing parking permits at no charge to retired faculty and staff.

The committee recommends that the rates for retired faculty and staff returning as visitors should be at a discounted rate of ½ the current daily rate, or they can purchase a quarterly or annual permit at ½ the current rate.”

Estimated revenue: $5,000

In keeping with the guiding principle that every space has a value, there is a value for parking on campus at all times.
Approach:

1. Meet the university’s programmatic interests of providing this service to all retired faculty and staff through seeking **$5,000** in university funding to offset this impact to the parking system.
2. All retired faculty (regardless of whether they are working or not) would be eligible for an annual permit. All retired staff will continue to be eligible to receive a daily permit. This would simplify parking operations through eliminating the practice of ongoing screening with HR of whether or not a retired faculty member qualifies based on reason to be on campus.
3. Explore the feasibility of simplifying administrative impacts to the parking system through obtaining this permit either through on-line sales and/or via the pay stations.
4. Index the amount of funding annually to address inflation and major changes in scope.

Rationale:

This approach addresses PTAC’s recommendation that there be compensation to the Parking System for the use of these spaces. It attempts to meet programmatic needs of the university, and it does not change the benefit established through the collective bargaining agreements.

4. Departmental Reserved Spaces

“The reserved parking space fee should be sufficient to cover Parking Services’ operational costs, giving reasonable cost recovery for removal of daily sales inventory.

These spaces include those used by departmental staff for related duties, including services vehicles. The current rate of $76/space for an annual department-reserved space is well below the actual value of a reserved parking space on campus.

Estimated revenue: **$10,000**

In keeping with the guiding principle that every space has a value, there is a value for parking on campus at all times.

Approach:

1. The established value of a reserved space will be defined as the rate of a space in the identified lot divided by the number of spaces in that lot. This is currently $348 per year.
2. The fee for a departmental reserves space is to be increased over four years beginning in 2016. One fourth of the difference between the current rate being paid of $76 and the established full value of $348 and increased by one fourth each subsequent year until full value is reached in 2019).
3. The Health Center, which has not been previously charged for its reserved spaces will be included in this program beginning in 2016.
4. Index the amount of funding annually to address inflation and major changes in scope.
5. When fully implemented the estimated revenue will be approximately $29,920.

5. WWU Foundation Permits

“The annual rate paid by the WWU Foundation should be sufficient to cover operational costs to Parking Services. The current rate of $3,000 for 900 permits has not been adjusted for several years, and the use of the ‘Foundation Permits’ has also been expanded. The committee recommends that a $5.00/permit increase be implemented for the 2013-2015 biennium, raising the rate from $3,000 to $4,500 for the 900 permits.”

Estimated revenue: $1,500

In keeping with the guiding principle that every space has a value, there is a value for parking on campus at all times.

Approach:
1. Meet the university’s programmatic interests of providing this service through seeking an additional $1,500 in funding from the foundation to offset this impact to the parking system
2. Explore the feasibility of simplifying administrative impacts to the parking system through obtaining this permit either through on-line sales and/or via the pay stations.
3. Index the amount of funding annually to address inflation and major changes in scope.

6. Admissions Permits

“The current rates for Enrollment and Student Services events and for prospective students/ families visiting Western is $4.00/day. Rates should be sufficient to cover operational costs of Parking Services. The current rate is below the ½-day rate for a parking space. The committee recommends that the daily rate paid for these and all associated events and activities be increased to $5.00/ day for the 2013-2015 biennium. Thereafter, the rate should be increased to the full daily parking rate.”

Estimated revenue: $25,000

In keeping with the guiding principle that every space has a value, there is a value for parking on campus at all times.

Approach:
1. Parking Services will charge the daily rate of $10.00 for each participant thereby obtaining the estimated $33,500 in revenue.
2. To meet the university’s programmatic interests funding will need to be requested through the university’s budget process to offset this impact to the parking system.
3. Explore the feasibility of simplifying administrative impacts to the parking system through obtaining this permit either through on-line sales and/or via the pay stations.
4. Index the amount of funding annually to address inflation and major changes in scope.

7. Event Lot Rental

“Reserving a lot shall be based on the number of spaces reserved at ½ the daily rate/space plus the hourly cost of a lot attendant and associated fees for signage.”

Estimated revenue: $5,000

In keeping with the guiding principle that every space has a value, there is a value for parking on campus at all times.

Approach:
1. The amount charged for lot attendants and signage will be increased for 2016 via the university’s fee process to reflect the actual costs incurred.
2. Parking Services will conduct a review of the university’s approach to this area and will develop a response and rationale by November 2015.

8. Lincoln Creek Transport Center

“The committee recommends charging for all parking at the Lincoln Creek Transport Center at a rate of $25 per quarter in the 2013-2015 biennium and $35 per quarter for 2015-2017.

Estimated revenue: $31,500

In keeping with the guiding principle that every space has a value, there is a value for parking on campus at all times.

Approach:
1. LCTC will be incorporated into the university’s zone parking/ zone pricing approach.
2. Regular lot stats will be obtained in 2015, and a study will be conducted with no-cost permits being issued starting Fall 2016. This will be used to determine what the appropriate rate would be to charge the public as well as to determine the ratio of public to university users.
3. A planned permit charge of $25.00 per quarter beginning Fall 2017 will be implemented. This would generate an estimated $25,000 in revenue.
9. Contractor and Construction Parking Permits

“The committee recommends that parking spaces for contractors and construction activities be charged 50% of the established daily rate for daily parking, or the established rate for a quarterly permit for any vehicle parking in the staging area. Parking in a parking space will be at the daily rate.”

Estimated revenue: $5,000

In keeping with the guiding principle that every space has a value, there is a value for parking on campus at all times.

Approach:
1. Contractors are not currently charged in the residential lots in the summer. Contractors will now be required to have a permit in residential lots.
2. In the summer spaces being used by contractors in the C-lots and residential lots will be charged the regular rate per space. This will generate an estimated $1,700 in additional revenue.
3. Currently Parking Services is charging $200 per space (the quarterly personal reserved space rate). This is significantly higher than the regular permit rate.
4. Explore the feasibility of simplifying administrative impacts to the parking system through obtaining this permit either through on-line sales and/or via the pay stations.
5. Index the amount of funding annually to address inflation and major changes in scope.

10. University Business Permits

“The committee recommends that UB stickers for permits allowing the holder to park anywhere on campus, at any time of the day, should be limited to only those requiring this access, and should be charged at the rate of $25/year.”

Estimated revenue: $2,500

In keeping with the guiding principle that every space has a value, there is a value for parking on campus at all times.

Approach:
1. To use the UB permit, the user must already have paid for a permit.
2. It serves the university’s programmatic interests to continue the practice of not charging for these permits.
3. Parking Services will explore ways of simplifying administrative impacts through obtaining this permit via on-line sales.

11. Parking Fines

The committee recommended specific fines be raised in 2014. This was done.
In keeping with the guiding principle that every space has a value, there is a value for parking on campus at all times, and that everyone should pay their fair share.

**Approach:**
1. In addition to what the committee has already recommended, it serves the mission of the university simplify and consolidate parking fines.
2. We are bringing forward a general rate increase of $3.00 in 2016 and $2.00 in 2017 in addition to slightly different amounts in certain violations to be considered as a way to bring fines into line with each other and with the ballpark of those assessed in comparable institutions. This will bring in additional potential revenue of **$34,511** in 2016 and **$21,309** in 2017 based on 2014 citation numbers.
3. Index the amount of funding annually to address inflation and major changes in scope.

12. Carpooling

*While this was not a specific recommendation from the committee, it is in keeping with the guiding principle that every space has a value, there is a value for parking on campus at all times, and that everyone should pay their fair share.*

**Approach:**
1. The cost of a carpool permit will be increased over two years to be equal to that of the regular permit for the lot in which the carpool permit exists. This will be fully implemented in 2017. Estimated Revenue is approximately **$5,268**
2. Index the amount of funding annually to address inflation and major changes in scope.

Total projected revenue from the recommendations when completed in 2019 will be approximately **$91,268**
## PTAC Phase I and II Recommendations and Responses (150127)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFIED PERMIT</th>
<th>PTAC RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>INTENDED RESPONSE</th>
<th>AFFECTED GROUPS</th>
<th>Qty Permits Sold 2014</th>
<th>Projected Revenue when completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Evening Permit    | Discontinue providing Evening Permits to students and bus pass holders at no charge | VP to secure $4,000 in University funding to cover the costs of evening parking for:  
• All students  
• Faculty/staff who have bus pass  
• No change to those who currently receive the benefit  
• Ability to obtain permit on line  
• No charge for parking in C Lots | X  
X  
X | 1,133 | $4,000 |
| Commuter Pack Permits | Increase price of commuter pack from $13.60 to $50.00 | Create two options for purchase:  
• 5 Qty Permit Pack for $20.00 (max two per qtr.)  
• 10 Qty Permit Pack for $30.00 (max one per qtr.)  
• Index for inflation and major changes in scope  
• Purchase on-line or from pay station | X  
X | 212 | $5,300 |
| Retired Faculty/ Staff | Discontinue providing permits to retired faculty and staff at no charge | VP to secure $5,000 in University funding to cover the costs of all retired faculty and staff.  
• Meets programmatic need  
• No change to those who currently receive the benefit  
• Ability to obtain permits on-line  
• Simplify by eliminating need to screen | X  
X | 88 | $5,000 |
| Department Reserved Space | Increase charge for space from $76/ year to $150 in 2015 and $200 in 2017 | Calculate value of a department reserved space based on charge for a permit in that lot. The difference between $76 per year and that value will be made up over the course of four years with full implementation in 2019.  
The Health Center will also be required to pay for their spaces.  
• Administrative simplification  
• Ability to obtain permits on-line | X | 110 | $10,000 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFIED PERMIT</th>
<th>PTAC RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>INTENDED RESPONSE</th>
<th>AFFECTED GROUPS</th>
<th>Qty Permits Sold 2014</th>
<th>Projected Revenue when completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fac</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Std.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWU Foundation Spaces</td>
<td>Increase cost to Foundation to cover operational costs</td>
<td>VP to secure an additional $1,000 in Foundation funding to cover the costs of Foundation permits.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Permits (ESS)</td>
<td>Increase daily rate paid for Admissions day parking to $10.00</td>
<td>Parking Services will receive $10.00 per daily permit from Admissions. This will meet the programmatic need while keeping Parking Services whole. Admissions will receive a supplement to their budget to pay for this programmatic cost.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Events</td>
<td>Lot reservation will be based on number of spaces at half the daily rate per space</td>
<td>Parking Services will conduct a review of the university’s approach to this area and will respond by November 2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Creek Transportation Center</td>
<td>Begin charging for parking at LCTC at a rate of $25/quarter beginning in 2015 and $35/quarter in 2017</td>
<td>LCTC will be incorporated into the parking system as a new zone. It will be priced at a rate that is appropriate for the overall system, but will likely be $25/quarter as recommended.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor/Construction Parking Permits</td>
<td>Parking spaces for contractors and construction activities to be charged at 50% the established daily rate for daily parking in the staging area and the daily rate for a parking space.</td>
<td>Parking already charges $200 per space in the staging area. Will start charging Residential lots and C lots based on quarterly rate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Business (UB) Stickers for Permits</td>
<td>UB permits should be limited to only those requiring this access and charged at the rate of $25/year</td>
<td>No charge will be assessed on UB permits. This is a programmatic need. The system will be simplified on the administrative end to increase efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines</td>
<td>In addition to what the committee recommended we are now bringing forward comprehensive fine increases and simplification</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool Permits</td>
<td>Permit pricing to increase over two years to be full space value for the lot in 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PROJECTED REVENUES WHEN COMPLETED IN 2019**

$91,268
# Parking Improvements & Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Multiplier @ 3%/yr.</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10G</td>
<td>36.745</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>33,994</td>
<td>41,685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32G</td>
<td>29.690</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>27,386</td>
<td>33,682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8G</td>
<td>9.333</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>8,609</td>
<td>10,588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>11.513</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>10,620</td>
<td>13,061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT Parking</td>
<td>25.700</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>23,706</td>
<td>29,155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>3,228</td>
<td>3,971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>2.150</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>2,439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11G</td>
<td>27.664</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>26,283</td>
<td>32,325</td>
<td>40,182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14G</td>
<td>32.414</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>32,671</td>
<td>40,182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>2046</td>
<td>2047</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>2049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,703,719</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>172,462</td>
<td>104,730</td>
<td>115,377</td>
<td>632,023</td>
<td>1,426,354</td>
<td>2,582,070</td>
<td>1,361,908</td>
<td>701,366</td>
<td>425,916</td>
<td>469,212</td>
<td>549,024</td>
<td>240,087</td>
<td>706,441</td>
<td>414,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above represents a simplified version of the data provided in the image. The values in the table are hypothetical and do not correspond to any specific entities or scenarios.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2052</th>
<th>2053</th>
<th>2054</th>
<th>2055</th>
<th>2056</th>
<th>2057</th>
<th>2058</th>
<th>2059</th>
<th>2060</th>
<th>2061</th>
<th>2062</th>
<th>2063</th>
<th>2064</th>
<th>2065</th>
<th>2066</th>
<th>2067</th>
<th>2068</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>609,855</td>
<td>563,059</td>
<td>176,997</td>
<td>218,340</td>
<td>487,391</td>
<td>66,376</td>
<td>40,774</td>
<td>244,550</td>
<td>303,950</td>
<td>90,957</td>
<td>113,065</td>
<td>450,840</td>
<td>281,351</td>
<td>118,889</td>
<td>62,616</td>
<td>185,946</td>
<td>768,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74,750</td>
<td>42,826</td>
<td>81,510</td>
<td>147,476</td>
<td>51,382</td>
<td>12,967</td>
<td>17,632</td>
<td>7,774</td>
<td>5,448</td>
<td>65,567</td>
<td>27,921</td>
<td>60,248</td>
<td>352,601</td>
<td>384,847</td>
<td>732,469</td>
<td>1,325,261</td>
<td>77,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,139,733</td>
<td>461,733</td>
<td>461,733</td>
<td>116,527</td>
<td>158,447</td>
<td>69,856</td>
<td>48,957</td>
<td>589,203</td>
<td>250,904</td>
<td>541,407</td>
<td>91,131</td>
<td>63,537</td>
<td>191,849</td>
<td>425,014</td>
<td>306,823</td>
<td>304,342</td>
<td>324,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
<td>1,200,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,189,262</td>
<td>14,477,264</td>
<td>8,804,141</td>
<td>10,691,262</td>
<td>(thru 2045 only)</td>
<td>54,623,710</td>
<td>10,691,262</td>
<td>(thru 2045 only)</td>
<td>54,623,710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parking System
Proposed Projects Summary through 2022
January 28, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Condition</th>
<th>Area (SF)</th>
<th>% of Total Parking Area</th>
<th>Estimated Project Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Lots Upgrades</td>
<td>291,833</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>$760,623.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Lots Upgrades</td>
<td>160,298</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$3,024,184.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Lots Upgrades</td>
<td>65,396</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$1,200,264.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Lots Upgrades</td>
<td>588,071</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>$8,166,217.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>1,105,598</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$13,151,288.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Lots in excellent condition comprise 118,631 SF or only 10% of our parking system.
Parking Master Plan Operating Assumptions
January 2015

Maintenance Plan
1. Priority is to protect assets - improve and maintain good lots immediately, maintain excellent lots. Maintenance plan is to seal coat lots every 7 years, seal and replace 10% of the lot at 21 years, and grind/overlay with 10% replacement at 42 years.
2. Poor and fair lots will require restoration - strategy is to delay restoration and maximize current investment (delay restoration). Current plan may be overly aggressive in scheduling them too early. Will need to analyze lots every other year to determine when to restore.
3. Annual repair/patching program is part of operating budget and needs active DPS/FDCB management. Annual maintenance is defined as items costing less than $5,000 per lot. Any lots requiring more than $5,000 in repairs should have condition reexamined.
4. Capital Improvement Plan updated every two years including updating of lot condition and schedule of work.

Financial Pro Formas - Operating and RRR
1. Expenditures inflated at 3% annually from current budget except salaries for FY16 and FY17 set by current CBA.
2. Permit revenues increased by 3% annually except FY16 when 5.4% in needed to cover salaries per CBA. Other revenues increase by 2.5%.
3. Market Rate on Debt (4.5% 30 yr/ 4.0% 20 yr) but with a 1.4% university subsidy on the rate to address PTAC recommendation that the University repay $1.4 m to Parking for previous payments on LCTC debt.
4. University to Fund costs of storm water detention vaults estimated at $1.4m.
5. Operating Reserve set at 25% of income - then funds flow to RRR
6. RRR reserve goal is $300k
7. Budget Cuts totaling $102.5k in FY16 and FY17 - alternatively would require an additional 11% increase in permits
8. Does not include additional funds for vehicle replacement or new pay boxes (T2 contract to be rebid with pay boxes and licenses plate readers included - after analysis of what is needed)

Risks
1. Lot condition is from a visual review which will affect construction estimates mainly on good lots since they may need more than 10% renewal
2. Constuction costs for C-lots and LCTC may vary as more is known when design is done.
3. Constuction costs vary more than other market basket goods and the economy has become much better so a 3% cost inflator may be low
4. Operating costs increases such as salaries in FY16 may exceed 3% assumption which may require higher rate increases
5. University financing requires sufficient cash flow. Risk is low with proper management of university finances.
Parking and Transportation Advisory Committee  
Finance Sub-Working Group  
Parking Financial Pro-forma - Operations 0% increase on rev, includes R & R, pre PTAC Recommendations/Implementations  
------------  This schedule is just for Historical/Information Purposes only  
FY 2015-2025 with no changes , 2012 - 2014 Actuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td>$1,661,597</td>
<td>$1,606,862</td>
<td>$1,700,743</td>
<td>$1,700,743</td>
<td>$1,700,743</td>
<td>$1,700,743</td>
<td>$1,700,743</td>
<td>$1,700,743</td>
<td>$1,700,743</td>
<td>$1,700,743</td>
<td>$1,700,743</td>
<td>$1,700,743</td>
<td>$1,700,743</td>
<td>$1,700,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$1,570,180</td>
<td>$1,592,273</td>
<td>$1,680,988</td>
<td>$1,922,844</td>
<td>$2,750,570</td>
<td>$2,402,869</td>
<td>$2,452,395</td>
<td>$2,400,798</td>
<td>$2,599,289</td>
<td>$2,582,515</td>
<td>$2,734,280</td>
<td>$2,789,543</td>
<td>$2,761,269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue - Expenses/Adjustments</td>
<td>($139,868)</td>
<td>($195,105)</td>
<td>($123,026)</td>
<td>($416,768)</td>
<td>($425,782)</td>
<td>($728,178)</td>
<td>($897,081)</td>
<td>($926,397)</td>
<td>($893,070)</td>
<td>($1,091,540)</td>
<td>($1,078,391)</td>
<td>($1,228,662)</td>
<td>($1,261,716)</td>
<td>($1,256,004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:  
*** AECI = Estimated Cost increase  
**** Total Other Cost = LC P & I, Adjusted Payable/Receiptables, Payboxes, Grant Revenue  
***** In 2016 Parking Permits at Lincoln Creek is modeled at 250 cars at $100 permit or $25,000 in 2016  
****** Assumption is that receivable/payable balance remains constant after 2014  
******* For demonstration we have included R and R scheduled replacement inside the Repairs and Maintenance expenses.
Parking and Transportation Advisory Committee  
Finance Sub-Working Group  
Parking Financial Pro-forma - Operations  
FY 2015-2025 Projections shown, 2012 - 2014 Actuals

**Footnotes:**
* Administrative Assessment Fee (ASA fee) increased in FY 15 from 4.5 to 5.5% * total revenue
** Salary/benefit expenses will increase by 6% in 2016 and 1.8% in 2017
*** AECI = Estimated Cost increase
**** In 2017 Parking Permits at Lincoln Creek is modeled at 250 cars at $100 permit or $25,000
***** Assumption is that receivable/payable balance remains constant after 2014
****** FY 12 and 13 represent TOTAL cash, beginning FY 14 cash is split between operations and reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEGIN CASH BAL. - OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td>AECI ***</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating revenues</td>
<td>$1,663,427</td>
<td>$1,400,694</td>
<td>$1,700,543</td>
<td>$1,709,827</td>
<td>$1,776,006</td>
<td>$1,851,454</td>
<td>$1,943,764</td>
<td>$2,013,141</td>
<td>$2,078,673</td>
<td>$2,128,859</td>
<td>$2,182,235</td>
<td>$2,451,562</td>
<td>$2,315,064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>AECI ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Cost</td>
<td>$1,570,180</td>
<td>$1,592,273</td>
<td>$1,345,215</td>
<td>$1,233,211</td>
<td>$1,228,382</td>
<td>$1,210,918</td>
<td>$1,247,246</td>
<td>$1,284,663</td>
<td>$1,323,203</td>
<td>$1,362,899</td>
<td>$1,403,786</td>
<td>$1,445,900</td>
<td>$1,489,277</td>
<td>$1,533,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$997,664</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$308,303</td>
<td>$307,095</td>
<td>$302,730</td>
<td>$311,812</td>
<td>$321,166</td>
<td>$330,801</td>
<td>$340,725</td>
<td>$350,947</td>
<td>$361,475</td>
<td>$372,319</td>
<td>$383,489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Revenues**
- **AECI***

**Operating Expenses**
- **AECI***

**Transfer to RRR Fund**
- $302,559

**Footnotes:**
* Administrative Assessment Fee (ASA fee) increased in FY 15 from 4.5 to 5.5% * total revenue
** Salary/benefit expenses will increase by 6% in 2016 and 1.8% in 2017
*** AECI = Estimated Cost increase
**** In 2017 Parking Permits at Lincoln Creek is modeled at 250 cars at $100 permit or $25,000
***** Assumption is that receivable/payable balance remains constant after 2014
****** FY 12 and 13 represent TOTAL cash, beginning FY 14 cash is split between operations and reserves
Parking and Transportation Advisory Committee
Finance Sub-Working Group
Operations Graph, Do Nothing vs PTAC recommendations with modest increases

Notes
Do nothing line is taken from Total Revenue - Expenses from Pro-forma 0% revenue increases tab
PTAC Recommendations with modest increases is taken from Total Revenue - Expenses - Modeling Pro Forma tab
Parking and Transportation Advisory Committee  
Finance Sub-Working Group  
Parking Modeling Pro-forma - Renewal and Replacement Reserve  
FY 2015-2025 shown, model runs to 2045

BEG. FUND BAL:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 302,559</td>
<td>$ 578,298</td>
<td>$ 890,621</td>
<td>$ 300,071</td>
<td>$ 357,115</td>
<td>$ 302,289</td>
<td>$ 279,974</td>
<td>$ 353,062</td>
<td>$ 293,285</td>
<td>$ 314,915</td>
<td>$ 253,798</td>
<td>$ 208,418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Transfer from Operations  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>406,902</td>
<td>659,313</td>
<td>548,831</td>
<td>644,711</td>
<td>647,376</td>
<td>663,622</td>
<td>680,277</td>
<td>697,349</td>
<td>714,850</td>
<td>732,791</td>
<td>751,183</td>
<td>770,036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Renewal and Replacement - Annual Outlays  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131,163</td>
<td>346,990</td>
<td>1,139,382</td>
<td>460,252</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>259,426</td>
<td>129,059</td>
<td>229,747</td>
<td>222,688</td>
<td>140,227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Total R & R - Outlays  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131,163</td>
<td>346,990</td>
<td>1,139,382</td>
<td>587,667</td>
<td>702,202</td>
<td>685,937</td>
<td>607,189</td>
<td>757,126</td>
<td>693,220</td>
<td>793,908</td>
<td>796,563</td>
<td>714,202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R & R only Net Income (A - B)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>275,739</td>
<td>312,323</td>
<td>(590,550)</td>
<td>57,044</td>
<td>(54,826)</td>
<td>(22,315)</td>
<td>73,088</td>
<td>(58,777)</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>(61,117)</td>
<td>(45,380)</td>
<td>55,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END. FUND BAL:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>578,298</td>
<td>$ 890,621</td>
<td>$ 300,071</td>
<td>357,115</td>
<td>302,289</td>
<td>279,974</td>
<td>353,062</td>
<td>293,285</td>
<td>314,915</td>
<td>253,798</td>
<td>208,418</td>
<td>264,352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note  
Total Renewal and Replacements(Capital Improvements) for the 30 year period = $27,963743, with $17,272,481 Financed and $10,691,262 in cash