

# Parking & Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting

Tuesday March 10, 2015

9:00 am, OM 435

## MEETING NOTES

**Present:** Doug Adelstein, Rick Benner, Chris Loar, Doug MacLean, April Markiewicz, Kunle Ojikutu, Darin Rasmussen, Stephanie Scott, Brian Sullivan, and Kurt Willis. *Ex officio:* Carol Berry, Julia Gassman and Paul Mueller.

### 1. Approval of February 24, 2015 Meeting Notes

Rasmussen **Moved** and Scott **Seconded** the Motion to approve the February 24, 2015 Meeting Notes as amended. Changes were as follows:

- Page 3, Item 2a continued, second paragraph change “*Adelstein suggested the PTAC tell a story...*” to “*Adelstein suggested the PTAC tell the story...*”
- 2016-2017 Parking Fine Analysis Attachment changes:
  - Merge “*Altered/Forged Daily Permit Displayed*” with “*Altered/Forged Quarter/Academic/Annual Permit*” to be one violation.
  - Simplify the name of the “*Altered/Forged*” permit to “*Forged Permit*”.
  - Charge one rate of \$250 for any forgery violation starting in FY2016 and increase to \$255 in FY2017. The PTAC members supported the higher rate.

Since the 2016-2017 Parking Fine Analysis had already been approved by the PTAC at its February 24, 2015 meeting, Scott **Moved** and Ojikutu **Seconded** the Motion to amend the approved fines as indicated above. The **Motion was approved unanimously**.

**The Motion** to approve the amended February 24, 2015 Meeting Notes was **approved unanimously**.

### 2. Discussion of Parking Operating and Maintenance Financial Pro Formas

Ojikutu and Adelstein voiced their support for approving the pro formas for addressing projected costs using modest increases in parking permits. It is a sound business plan that is sustainable, reasonable, and prudent to move forward. Adelstein added that the PTAC approval is needed for the next step in the review and negotiation process with the unions.

Sullivan reiterated that this has been a 2 ½ year process with a lot of analyses, discussion, review, and revisions before finalizing the current pro forma. Since the projected 5.4% and subsequent 3% parking permit rate increases are based on estimates of Parking Services’ staff salary increases and inflation, these percentages may go up or down based on actual amounts, but that is part of the risks identified in the Draft Comprehensive Parking Master Plan.

Willis asked about the 2.4% difference in rate increases for the 2015-16 fiscal year (5.4% vs 3%) compared to the rest of the years projected rates and whether that was for both maintenance and Parking Services' staff. Sullivan stated that each of the staff positions were reviewed and the 5.4% is the cost to cover salary increases for those staff. That amount cannot be changed since the state mandates that the increases have to be paid.

That said, each employee bargaining unit has a different contract and process by which compensation is addressed. So different employee groups get different salary increases. The 5.4% is specific to classified staff and was used in the pro forma since most employees in Parking Services are classified staff. That is why Sullivan prepared the Assumptions page that precedes the maintenance and financial pro formas. Rate increases will be linked to collective bargaining agreements (CBAs).

Ojikutu suggested decoupling the rates from union bargaining since most, if not all, will not be in favor of parking permit rate increases and that will result in insufficient revenues to address rising costs. Plus, it does not take into consideration rising construction costs. Sullivan stated that the pro formas would be updated and adjustment made to balance the budget if that is the case. The result would be reduction in Parking's scope of operations including reduction of personnel, lot maintenance, enforcement, customer service, etc.

**Adelstein Moved** to accept the recommendation for parking permit rate increases as proposed in the Financial Pro Formas, recognizing they are based on current assumptions regarding maintenance and personnel costs. **Ojikutu Seconded** the Motion. The **Motion was Approved** by a vote of eight for the Motion, one against, and one Abstention.

The suggestion was made that the PTAC develop a one page document listing the key assumptions of the Parking Master Plan, the key drivers, and a summary of its recommendations.

**Action Item:** Sullivan and Markiewicz will work on formulating a draft for the PTAC.

Meeting adjourned at 9:52 am.

*Approved unanimously April 17, 2015.*