

Parking & Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting

Tuesday April 8, 2014

1:00 pm, OM 340

MEETING NOTES

Present: Bill Managan, Ira Hyman, Kurt Willis, Maxwell Evans, Wendy Johnson, Doug Adelstein, Carol Berry, April Markiewicz, Julia Gassman

1. Approval of February 27th Meeting Notes

Ira Moved, and Kurt Seconded the Motion to approve the amended version of the February 27th Meeting Notes. **Motion Approved Unanimously.**

Approval of the April 1st Meeting Notes was postponed to the next PTAC meeting to clarify the nature of the reserve funds that Parking Services has.

2. Review and discuss updated Parking Services financial data - Brian

Brian was out sick and so was not present at the meeting. Moreover, updated financial data were not sent out to the PTAC prior to the meeting. The PTAC members therefore discussed in more detail the Parking Lot Construction and Repair Costs document and the Parking Proforma spreadsheet Brian provided at the last PTAC meeting on April 1, 2014. A number of questions arose and the consensus of the group was that more detailed information about lot condition and lifespan was needed.

Action Item: Julia will see whether she can find when each of the paved parking lots were last paved. This information will help provide greater detail on the exact lifespan of that lot.

There were also questions regarding whether the financial information took into account other expenditures associated with lot maintenance, repair, and replacement.

Ira expressed concern that the plan under consideration included no maintenance. Instead the plan allows all lots to degrade to poor status before reconstruction. He noted that this would substantially raise the costs of maintaining and preserving the lots. He was especially concerned since repaving poor lots costs 15.00 per square foot whereas patching and sealing would cost considerably less (according to the plan). Ira also expressed concern that the plan had incorrect long term maintenance costs since it only included an inflation adjustment for future costs but did not include adjustments based on the degrading condition of the lots if no maintenance is conducted.

Doug suggested that a better investment may be to maintain existing lots in the best condition possible rather than putting the repaving of poor lots as the top priority.

Bill suggested that the capital and operating plans should include three different types of expenditures: operating, maintenance, and capital reserves for long-term replacement of lots that can no longer be maintained.

Bill explained how capital projects are budgeted in Facilities Management, and provided more information about the subbase of parking lots. The purpose of the subbase is to facilitate the drainage of water away from the overlaying pavement. The physical, chemical, and hydrological properties of the surrounding soil will dictate the depth of the subbase needed. The loads to which the pavement will be subjected will dictate depth of the subbase, as well as thickness of the paving material. The subbase of a parking lots is designed and built to handle cars and light trucks, whereas for roads, it is designed to handle large trucks. If the subbase is too shallow or applied in a water-prone area, then the life of the overlaying pavement will be shortened. Since many areas on Western's campus are former peat bogs, parking lots built in those areas may have a very deep subbase. Bill cited the parking lot that used to be close to the tennis courts (where SMATE is now located). He said when they excavated the parking lot area during the construction phase, six feet of subbase was removed. The reason the subbase was so deep was because the parking lot was overlaying a peat bog.

Moreover, if the function of the subbase is to drain water away from the paving material, its porosity will decline over time as small particulate matter accumulates in the spaces. This could be part of the explanation of why repairs to lots require the removal and replacement of a certain percentage of the subbase along with the paving.

The consensus of the PTAC was that the current financial projections provided by Brian may not reflect all the true costs of lot maintenance, repair, and replacement. There was agreement that we did not want to base revenue needs on data that may be underestimates of the true costs. Since Brian has not sent out updates of the financial information yet, the decision was to compile our comments and questions, and then forward them to Brian to address if he could. We will also send them to Rick Benner and Ed Simpson since some of our questions address the consultant's data and capital projects.

Action Item: April will compile all the questions and comments made during the meeting and will send the first draft of them to the PTAC members present at the meeting to make sure she accurately captured everyone's input. Once she has everyone's feedback and edits she will route them to all the PTAC members, including Rick Benner and Ed Simpson.

Meeting was adjourned at 1:50 pm.

The draft comments and questions are enclosed on the following pages.

Questions for Brian Sullivan, Rick Benner, Julia Gassman

The following questions are a result of the PTAC's in-depth review of the Parking Lot Construction and Repair Costs document and the Parking Pro-forma spreadsheet Brian provided at the last PTAC meeting on April 1, 2014.

In keeping with its guiding principles that each that “...each parking space has a value that is based on location and time of day, week, month, and year. No parking space has a value of zero (Parking and Transportation Advisory Committee 2012-13).” additional information about the true cost of parking lot maintenance, repair, and replacement are needed. Specifically, the PTAC needs to know

1. Operational Costs: total operational costs that includes annual lot maintenance expenses as they relate to the lifespan of each lot, including patching and sealing.
2. Renewal Costs: cost per year revenue stream needed to have money to replace a lot when it reaches the limit of its lifespan. Investment of revenue funds in interest-bearing account to add additional funds over time and address inflation.
3. Cost to put asset back in new condition, i.e., address all backlogged maintenance, repair, and replacement needs.

Several of the committee members concluded that the estimated costs for construction and repair of lots severely underestimate the true cost of lot maintenance, repair, and replacement. These estimates only take into consideration lot degradation based on number of cracks and depth of crack, plus inflation. Some examples of costs associated with lot maintenance and repair are:

1. Cost of light fixture maintenance (cleaning, bulb replacement) and replacement
 - a. What is the lifespan of a light fixture? The Pole? Wiring?
 - b. What is the frequency of bulb replacement?
 - c. What is the frequency of cleaning?
2. Signage and painting lines or using buttons to indicate parking space stalls
 - a. What is the cost of signage in each lot and is this cost part of its maintenance?
 - b. What is the cost of painting lines or applying buttons to indicate parking stalls?
 - c. What is the lifespan of the paint, i.e., how frequently are parking stall lines needed to be repainted?
3. Snow removal, sand removal, chemical applications
 - a. Does PTAC need to consider associated costs with the paving of the C lots, i.e., more snowplows to plow those lots in winter plus the cost of additional deicing chemicals/sand to treat the lots and pathways to keep them safe?
 - b. Snowplows damage the surface of lots and need to be included in a maintenance and repair estimate?
 - c. Sand removal is also a costly activity and estimates should be included as well.
4. Actual lot condition and lifespan
 - a. The PTAC has qualitative assessments of each lot's condition based on being categorized as in poor, fair, good, or excellent condition.
 - i. What is the actual condition of each lot?

- ii. What is the lifespan of each lot?
 - iii. When was the last time it was paved?
 - iv. When a lot is rated in “Good” condition why is it assumed that 20% of existing asphalt and subbase needs to be replaced? The “repair” seems extreme given that it is supposed to be in good condition. Why is there no mention of other pavement repair options like chip sealing since lots are only subject to light vehicular traffic
 - v. The Pro-forma targets fixing the “Poor” lots first, however some back-of-the-envelope calculations show that the best value is to prioritize maintaining the “Excellent” lots and implementing repairs to the “Good” lots first.
 - vi. Sealing a lot was evaluated as a means to prolong the life of a lot, but was rejected. The PTAC would like to see the data to determine for itself what criteria were used and scenarios tested to come to that decision. The PTAC understands it needs to be re-applied every five years, but there may be some lots that are better suited for this treatment that would keep overall repair and replacement costs down.
5. Applying a sealant to lots to prolong their lifespan
- a. Common accepted practice is to apply a sealant to a lot once it has been installed to help prolong its lifespan. The sealant is reapplied approximately every 5 years. Western has not nor currently follows this practice. The quoted cost of \$0.65/ft² to seal a lot seems high. Is that the cost to seal a new or Excellent lot, or to patch and seal a Good or Fair lot?
 - b. Based on square footage in the Excellent and possibly some of the Good lots it appears to be more cost effective to apply a sealant on those lots and thereby extend their current condition and lifespan. As Poor and Fair lots are addressed they can have a sealant applied as well.
6. Stormwater runoff treatment systems/facilities/structures maintenance, repair, and replacement costs
- a. Will these costs be addressed by the university or is this another expense to Parking Services that needs to be included in the true cost of a lot?
7. ADA Compliance Expenses
- a. As lots are paved or replaced, expenses to comply with ADA regulations and standards need to be addressed. Are these included in the Other Expenses category?
 - b. Are these expenses considered part of institutional costs for complying with state and federal regulations or are they an appropriate expense paid for by Parking Services?

Meeting Notes approved April 17, 2014.