MEETING NOTES

Present: Barbara Lewis, Joan Hoffman, Wendy Johnson, Kunle Ojikutu, Kurt Willis, Brian Sullivan, April Markiewicz, Darin Rasmussen, Julia Gassman

1. Approval of January 16th Meeting Notes
   Kurt Moved, Darin Seconded to approve the Meeting Notes. Motion Approved unanimously.

2. Consultant report on paving south campus and stormwater treatment
   Please refer to the South Campus Parking Lot Map that April handed out during the meeting and attached to these Meeting Notes.

   The map highlights the graveled C lots at the south end of campus and were the focus of the consultant’s review of the costs (in today’s dollars) to pave them, as well as address stormwater runoff issues. The consultant, Craig Parkinson, is an engineer and managing principal of Cascade Engineering Group, Inc. In conducting his assessment of the lots, he numbered them from 1-5 as denoted on the map. He then calculated the costs for site preparation, i.e., grading, landscaping (with possible installation of bioswales for stormwater retention and infiltration), relocating lights, and extra stormwater runoff treatments as needed, in addition to the cost of paving.

   Craig determined that 4 out of the 5 lots needed very little stormwater treatment retrofits. The existing stormwater detention vaults under the tennis courts and in the detention/treatment facility just south of the Bill McDonald Parkway has capacity to handle stormwater runoff from 4 of the lots once they are paved. The fifth lot would need stormwater detention vaults in addition to landscaping to address runoff. He arbitrarily selected lot 5 for costing out stormwater mitigation measures in addition to paving, but any lot could have been selected. Stormwater mitigation approximately doubles the cost of paving that lot. A breakdown of the costs for site preparation, paving, and stormwater mitigation (for lot #5) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Number</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost:</strong></td>
<td>~$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paving and striping would not result in any gain (or loss) in parking spaces due to the need for landscaping, re-locating lights, and possibly installing permanent bus/campus shuttle shelters. Lot improvements and paving would have to be phased over a 2-year period with implementation in the summer months to cause the least disruption to the campus community.

Craig also investigated the use of porous materials for paving, but the materials are more expensive and have a much shorter life than regular paving that lasts ~15 years. Most companies also have a sealer applied to the paving once it is installed to prolong the life. Western has not followed that practice, but it might be something that the committee considers as part of its recommendations. Craig is now looking at the current condition of all lots and will be reporting the results of that assessment in the next few weeks. It might influence PTAC’s prioritization of lot repairs and maintenance when it makes its recommendations.

Kunle asked whether consideration was made regarding campus growth over the next 10-20 years since construction of a new building would negate the need for paving a lot. April stated that it had been considered and there are no new buildings planned for campus over the next 10-15 year horizon.

Brian is in the process of investigating bond options to pay for the paving and lot upgrades. Current estimates indicate that for a $5 million dollar bond, annual payments would be ~ $375,000/year for 20 years. There has also been some discussion to include the Lincoln Creek Transportation Center in the assessment process for eventual paving.

3. Zone Parking

Please see attached Parking Guide Map of Western’s parking lots. A map is also available online at [http://www.wwu.edu/ps/parking/map.shtml](http://www.wwu.edu/ps/parking/map.shtml). Julia brought Parking Guide maps that April handed out to everyone present. The remainder of the meeting was spent discussing the advantages and possible challenges in designating lots by letter and/or color-coding. April pointed out that the map clearly shows we have color-coded zone parking already:

1. **Residential** (“R” red color-coded) parking around the dormitories
2. **Restricted** (“G” green color-coded) parking along East College Way behind Old Main, Miller Hall, and Ross Engineering Technology, as well as on West College Way around the Health Center and the PAC.
3. **Faculty/Staff** (“G” blue color-coded) parking north of Old Main, south of College Hall, south of Parks Hall, east of Arntzen Hall, and east of the Communications Facility.
   a. Faculty/Staff (“G” blue color-coded) parking off campus is located at the Archives Building, 32nd Street, and the Physical Plant.
   b. **Faculty/Staff** (“A” blue color-coded) parking is located south of the AIC and west of Fairhaven College.
4. **Student, Commuter, and Residential** (“C” yellow color-coded) parking south of West College Way.

These also reflect parking demand, with highest demand in the core of campus (Green (restricted) and Blue (employee) lots) closest to academic and administrative buildings, and lowest demand at the south end of campus in the Yellow lots. Permit pricing needs to be adjusted to reflect demand-based parking so that there is a greater differential between Blue and Green lots, and between them and Yellow lots.

April proposed removing the letter designations and retaining the existing color coding to designate lots. Employees and students driving to campus have preferred (assigned) parking locations and have a good understanding of parking space availability during the day. Removing the number and letter designation would enable that person to park in any lot in their assigned color-coded zone. Those people with a high demand zone permit also have a “parking down” privilege and can park in any lower demand zone as needed. For example, a Blue lot permit holder could park in any Blue, Green, or Yellow zoned lot. This provides much greater flexibility to the permit holder when displaced from her/his preferred Blue lot or using her/his vehicle to run errands on campus or to Western facilities off campus.

**The advantages are:**
1. The change is a small one, but would increase flexibility for permit holders to find a parking space on campus.
2. When coupled with zone pricing, reduced parking rates in lower demand lots creates an incentive for people to park in less utilized lots and frees up high demand lots for more people willing to pay the higher rate. It also provides more spaces for visitors and guests to campus. (Caveat: low demand lots should provide the permit holder the same level of accessibility, safety, and mobility.)
3. Color-coding is easier to enforce.
4. Lot utilization on campus averages 70-80% during peak times, except in the restricted lots which averages in the high 80 to low 90% range and can accommodate increased movement of vehicles that may result.
5. Increases efficiencies by eliminating the need for the permit holder to call Parking Services informing them s/he is not parking in her/his assigned lot. Moreover, Parking Services staff would no longer receive numerous calls during the day freeing up their time.
6. Efficiencies can result in cost savings in terms of less signage, as well as less staffing for monitoring and enforcement.

**The disadvantages are:**
1. Initial costs to update lot signage on campus
2. Visitors may find it more difficult to find their assigned lot to park, however Darrin and Julia stated it would be easy enough to have their own internal numbering system to help guide visitors.
3. It may generate more driving within campus as permit holders seek out an “optimal” parking space for their needs.
4. This may also increase utilization rates in some high demand lots causing some permit holders to be displaced to lower demand lots when they have paid a higher rate to park in a high demand lot, creating the perception of inequity.
5. It may generate more driving within campus as permit holders use their cars to run errands rather than walk.

After further discussion, the consensus of the committee was to recommend the university transition to using the existing color-coding to identify parking zones on campus and remove the number/letter designations. Moreover, the committee recommended that no changes be made until new parking rates are implemented, most likely in the 2015-17 biennium. The PTAC recommends the time prior to implementation be used to fully communicate the changes to the campus community, as well as for signage, permits, etc to be updated with the changes.

**Action Item:** April will prepare a draft of our recommendations and circulate them to the PTAC before the next meeting on Thursday the 13th.

April pointed out that the committee should evaluate parking lots off campus at the Physical Plant, Commissary, Archives Building, and 32nd Street that are currently color coded blue. Employees are paying the high demand rate of a G lot, but park in locations far away from the core of campus or off campus where demand for parking is low. Joan recommended using a unique color code and reduced permit rate for those lots, specifically 22G (Commissary), 24G (Physical Plant), 32G (32nd Street), and 33G (Archives).

There was some concern expressed about employees at the Physical Plant parking on both sides of Taylor Street which reduces it to one lane of traffic. A fire truck or other emergency vehicle would not be able to enter the street if needed. Further discussion is needed.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 am.

*Meeting Notes approved unanimously February 13, 2014.*