

Annual Hearing on 2007-08 Parking Policies, Budget, & Capital Improvements

(Proposals in Column #3 endorsed by PAC following testimony taken at 2/15/07 Public Hearing on Parking Policies, Budget and Capital Improvements.)

Parking Advisory Committee Pre-Hearing Recommendations (1)	Changes to Original Plan Due to Feb. 15 th Hearing Testimony (2)	Parking Advisory Committee Recommendations Post-Hearing – 2/15/07 (3)	Administration Action As of April 6, 2007 (4)
<p>1. Lot 23 parking permit is proposed for \$40 for the Academic Year (\$20 Spring Semester) along with the use of a free bus tag. (Semester bus pass is worth \$40 so the free bus tag translates into an \$80 value.) Lot 23 permit holder pays \$40 and receives a permit and a bus tag worth \$120.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Lot 23 permit is needed to help pay for the \$213,860 estimated cost for paving the existing gravel lot (a.k.a “Free Lot”) and for the installation of improved lighting. [A heated bus shelter will be installed this summer.] Initial estimate of 460 paved stalls x 35% oversell = 621 Permits x \$40 Academic Year Permit = \$24,840. (Oversell reflects history of “come and go” parking habits of permit holders. The larger the parking stall base the higher you can oversell and still have the customer find a stall at peak demand times.) Without a Lot 23 permit the Parking Program budget would absorb the costs as well as future annual expenditures associated with Lot 23 including lighting, plowing, pothole fills, permit enforcement, battery jump start service, door unlock service, etc. The general Parking Program budget now absorbs all “free lot” costs including gravel lot grading and plowing. Creating a “permit” for Lot 23 discourages those associated with nearby retail stores and visiting apartment complexes from using lot. No controls now exist for keeping non-MSU related people from using current “free lot”. Permit allows for easier enforcement of lot protecting Lot 23 permit holders from those without permits. Existing violations in free lot include triple parking, parking in turn lanes, parking on grass, parking in bus lane, etc. Existing free lot parking habits include parking further from adjacent vehicles as no stall lines exist so poor utilization of gravel lot is a result. A \$1 per hour “Paybox” exists in Lot 21 where people can park in Lot 21 North Purple or Lot 21 South Orange using a Paybox receipt as a dashboard permit for the time purchased. Those who come to the campus infrequently who refuse to pay the higher Paylot fees (\$2 first hour/\$1 thereafter), have the Lot 21 Paybox as an alternative. The existing gravel or “free lot” is the last lot on campus which is not paved. City ordinances required that no “temporary” parking area which is graveled can remain so after a year. Though the ordinance may not specifically affect the separate jurisdiction of the University, it is important to cooperate as much as possible to eliminate the large amount of dust that now comes from the free lot and into the air ducts of nearby retail establishments. MnSCU <i>Procedure 5.11.1 Part 4 Mandatory Fees, Subpart B. Parking fees</i> is clearly intended to ensure that each MnSCU campus create a parking fee collection program designed to cover much of the costs associated with maintaining campus parking operations. Not that long ago only a few large campuses like Minnesota State Mankato, St. Cloud State, and Winona, had sophisticated parking income mechanisms in place to generate large amounts of money necessary to cover annual costs. MSU’s \$1,335,000 FY’06 revenue mix was heavily dependent on permit revenue (FY’06 - \$734,000 or 55%). The balance came from Paylot receipts (\$302,000 or 23%), fine collections (\$264,000 or 20%), meters (\$25,500 or 2%). Though each of MSU’s 5,300 stalls don’t have to generate income, a case can be made that a large 400+ stall lot like Lot 23 should be expected to contribute to the parking revenue stream and not be set aside as “free.” Specifically the MnSCU parking fees procedure states: <i>Colleges and universities may collect fines and towing fees for parking violations . . . Colleges and universities shall develop a policy to charge parking fees to generate revenue for parking lot construction, improvements and maintenance, and parking enforcement . . . The president shall determine the fees. Students shall pay an amount that is equal to or less than that paid by the institution’s employees for the same type of parking.</i> 	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Changed After Annual Hearing on Parking Policies, Budget and Capital Improvements</u></p> <p>PAC now recommends that the proposed \$40 Lot 23 Permit be reduced to \$20 for Academic Year.</p> <p>PAC now recommends that the free bus tag privilege tied to the \$40 permit package be eliminated since the permit has been reduced to \$20 for the Academic Year. Lot 23 permit holders taking the bus would have to pay the standard 50¢ per ride.</p> <p>Note that during 2005-06 bus cash fares totaled \$14,748 in 50¢ a ride income. Over half of the revenue was for rides to and from the gravel Free Lot (Lot 23). The free bus tag is now given to Green, Purple, and Orange permit holders and is included as part of the package when they buy their plastic permit. The permit stays in the vehicle and the bus tag is shown to the bus driver who then lets the person ride the bus free to and from the campus core.</p> <p>PAC post hearing vote: 3 yes; 1 no; 1 abstention.</p>	<p>1. Considerable testimony was made part of the official Hearing Record. Virtually all of the testimony can be summarized in the phrase “Keep the Free Lot free.” Hearing testimony, as well as over 500 responses from a survey conducted by the Minnesota State Student Association, weighed heavily on the minds of PAC members when they met immediately following the Public Hearing. The Parking Advisory Committee agreed to reduce the proposed permit’s cost to \$20 for the nine-month academic year. However, the free bus tag (valued at \$80) contained in the original proposal was withdrawn by the PAC.</p> <p>PAC members continue to believe that there is considerable merit in having a Lot 23 permit because there will be far better control of parking behaviors, the elimination of non-MSU parkers, as well as greater maximization of overall lot space once the stall lines are painted on a hard surface.</p> <p>The independent Parking Citation Appeals Board backs the creation of a Lot 23 permit to help reduce the large number of violations occurring in the existing “free lot”. Triple parking, parking in traffic and bus lanes, parking on the grass, etc., are tickets coming from that gravel lot, many of which are appealed and land on the agenda of the PAB.</p>	<p>PAC revised recommendation to create a \$20 permit for Lot 23 - Not Approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing Free Lot will continue as an open parking lot and no parking permit will be required for 2007-08. <p>Control issues advanced by the PAC in favor of creating a Lot 23 parking permit will be examined again after Fall Semester to gauge the positive impact of stall stripes on how users park their vehicles, whether the number of violations declined, and if non-MSU parkers park in significant numbers to warrant the adoption of a permit system.</p> <p>Providing 400 paved stalls free and open to the public is a significant commitment warranting another review by the PAC in light of MnSCU’s Policy 5.11.1. Part 4. Subpart B on mandatory fees.</p> <p>PAC recommendation to commit \$213,860 to hard surface the Free Lot and install permanent lighting -</p> <p>Approved as revised to \$227,625.</p> <p>Converting the existing gravel lot to a hard surfaced lot with state-of-the-art lighting may now cost as much as \$227,625, not the \$213,860 initially estimated.</p>

2. Increase to \$25 the \$15 Standard Parking Violation Fine for Gold Permit Stalls Only.

The existing \$15 parking violation fine would increase to \$25 for vehicles illegally parked in a Gold Permit stall. The traditional “early bird” payment would lower the new fine to \$20 if paid within 4 working days.

The \$15 fine makes no distinction between illegal parking in closer-in Gold stalls or outlying Purple and Orange parking stalls. Too many violations are occurring in Gold permit stalls.

No Change

Testimony supports \$25 Fine for illegally parking in Gold permit stall.
PAC post hearing vote: 5 yes; 0 no.

2. Hearing testimony strongly supports a different fine rate for those choosing to park illegally in a Gold permit stall.

PAC recommendation to create \$25 fine for parking illegally in a Gold parking stall – Approved

- **Early Bird \$20 payment allowed within 4 work days.**

3. Recommend approval of the Parking Program’s \$ 1,470,050 projected income and \$1,396,000 spending plans for 2007-08.

Includes funding to pay for 2007 summer capital improvements including:

Proposed Summer 2007 Projects	1/2/07 Forecast	3/15/07 Revised Forecast
Lot 1 (Behind Gage)	\$ 29,950	\$ 33,398
Lot 7 (by Blakeslee Stadium across from Myers Field House)	57,377	67,727
Lot 12 (by Library)	25,680	31,271
Lot 23 (aka “free lot”)	199,880	227,925
Engineering	20,240	20,240
Patching	15,000	10,250
Contingency	26,771	25,000
Totals	\$ 374,898	\$ 415,811

Changed After Hearing

Income Estimate increased by \$9,200 to \$1,479,250 to reflect:

- - \$12,500 to reflect the lower \$20 Lot 23 permit;
- - \$6,900 due to loss of 30 Gold stalls from Lot 4a (22) and Wigley On-Street curbside Gold (8)
- +\$28,600 for 22 additional Paylot stalls x \$1,300 each = \$28,600
- PAC post hearing vote: 5 yes; 0 no.

3. Income and spending proposals were reviewed at the public hearing and testimony was taken. Amendments were made by the Parking Advisory Committee in the special meeting which immediately followed the Public Hearing.

Capital Improvement Program for Summer 2007 approved 5-0 by PAC. No objections were heard concerning the overall plan. *PAC does not wish to link decision to pave Lot 23 with the Administration’s final decision either to create a Lot 23 permit or to continue Lot 23 as free lot.*

PAC revised recommendation to approve \$1,479,250 income and \$1,396,000 spending plan -

Income Plan Modified – Income plan reduced by \$12,500 to reflect loss of income tied to decision to keep Free Lot free. Approved figure: \$1,466,750.

Spending Plan Modified – Spending plan increased to \$1,436,913. Includes an updated figure of \$415,811 for work this summer in lieu of the \$374,898 originally predicted.

4. Paylot Overflow Demand Problems Weighed. \$3 first hour/\$2 per hour thereafter Rate proposed.

The existing rate has not been raised since 2000-01. The Parking Advisory Committee recommends replacing existing \$2 first hour/ \$1 per hour thereafter with a \$3/\$2 combination. Existing department Paylot passes sold to departments would not be affected – \$5 Full Day Paylot Pass and \$2.50 Four Hour Paylot Pass remain for MSU department guests and visitors. The \$3/\$2 Paylot rate is not viewed as a revenue generator but as a “wake up call” to existing Purple and Orange permit holders not to come to the campus core and park in a lot designed for visitors and campus guests notwithstanding poor weather. What appears to be a rate increase may well be “revenue neutral” because of the drop off in demand from Purple and Orange permit holders.

Since the Student Union became fully operational following its major reconstruction effort, more conferences and meetings find the CSU as their venue stimulating added visitor and guest traffic into the campus core. The Paylot’s 180 stalls are further stressed when weather conditions worsen and regular MSU \$130 Purple and \$94 Orange permit holders elect to park in close to campus core buildings despite paying a hourly charge at the Paylot (\$2 for the first hour; \$1 per hour thereafter).

On peak demand days, which are becoming all too frequent, vehicles waiting to use the Paylot become stacked up bumper-to-bumper from the Paylot entrance to the intersection of Ellis and Stadium (Gage Corner) and all the way down South Road in front of Wigley and the Student Union. This stacking situation occurs from 20 minutes to the top of the hour and can start as early as 9 AM on a class day. When stacking occurs there is a very real risk other vehicles will be trapped that could care less about the Paylot, i.e., buses, shuttles, security and emergency vehicles.

Changed After Hearing

- “\$3 first hour/\$2 per hour thereafter” PAC recommendation unchanged after hearing testimony. Vote 3 yes; 2 no.
- Added to the \$3/\$2 package is a recommendation that 22 stalls be taken from Gold Lot 4a and added to existing 180 Visitors’ Paylot stall inventory. Requires the moving of existing lower level fence now separating Gold Lot 4a with the lower level of the Visitors’ Paylot. This stall remix differs from the Student Senate’s proposed 40 stall remix and the dedication of any additional Visitors’ Paylot revenue to keep the Free Lot free. PAC is opposed to “fencing” in any revenue stream for specific items.

4. The change is requested not because of an overriding revenue need, but to help MSU permit holders think twice about using the Paylot even when the weather is bad. The last time this tactic was employed to dissuade students and staff from routinely using the Paylot, relief was evident though a year later the positive results had lessened.

Maintain the existing “paybox” and its low rate now in place in Lot 21 for those willing to use quarters and pay \$1 per hour minimum and 25¢ for each 15 minutes.

The Lot 21 now is used for cash paying customers when the Paylot is filled – Purple and Orange permit holders wanting to park close-in to the campus core on a bad weather day normally park in Lot 20, 21, or 22, so have nothing to gain by using this cash option.

PAC recommendation to increase Paylot rate to \$3 first hour/\$2 per hour thereafter.

Approved

- **Higher rate should be enough to provide a financial disincentive to students and employees who already own a parking permit to avoid using the Paylot.**

PAC revised recommendation to transfer 22 stalls from Lot 4a Gold to Paylot for cash customer use –

Approved

<p>5. Scooter, Mopeds, Mini-bikes – Road licenses machines to be treated as motorcycles requiring MSU permits.</p> <p>Amend existing Article V. Section H of <i>Parking & Traffic Guidelines</i> handbook motorcycle standard deleting reference to “125 cc or larger”. Enlarge existing motorcycle parking zones to accommodate influx of scooters and mini-bikes which are now parking at bike racks. Amendment would require scooter and mini-bikes owners to buy the \$60 permit motorcycle permit (or \$30 with other MSU permit).</p> <p>The design and engineering changes affecting the smaller bikes are such that it is not that easy to figure out what is “125 cc or higher” and the scooters and mini-bikes are overwhelming the bike racks. To get to most of the 77 bike racks the two wheeled motorized vehicles have to ride on the sidewalks which is a hazard to pedestrians.</p>	<p><u>Changed After Hearing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAC now recommends reducing proposed \$60 cost to \$40 for all motorized two wheeled vehicles including motorcycles, scooters, mini-bikes, and mopeds. PAC post hearing vote: 3 yes; 2 no. • This represents a reduction in what motorcycles have been paying. 	<p>5. Considerable testimony was presented arguing for no fee for two wheeled motorized vehicles with smaller engines like mopeds, mini-bikes, and scooters. Special space was asked for such two wheeled vehicles which would keep them separate from the campus’ 77 bike racks (877 limited bicycle capacity) and off the sidewalks. PAC recommends enlarging existing motorcycle zones.</p> <p>Recognizing that certain gas saving efficiencies are linked to two wheeled vehicles, including motorcycles, the PAC amended the proposed permit to \$40.</p>	<p>PAC revised recommendation to reclassify scooters and mopeds requiring them to buy a \$40 permit Lower existing \$60 motorcycle permit to \$40. Expand existing motorcycle parking zones to incorporate scooters and mopeds.</p> <p><u>Approved</u></p> <p>Permit rate set at \$40 for all three types of vehicles (e.g., mopeds, scooters, and motorcycles. (As in the past, a half rate charge will be available for those who already own a regular MSU vehicle permit.) Effective next Fall Semester scooters and mopeds no longer can park in or near bicycle racks but only in expanded motorcycle parking zones. New signage replacing existing motorcycle zone signs must be in place by Fall, 2007.</p>
<p>6. Eliminate remaining Gold curbside permit stalls on Ellis Avenue for safety reasons.</p> <p>Considerable traffic now uses Ellis Avenue between the sunken Paylot and Otto Recreation Center. Buses, vehicles on the left turn lane waiting to get into the Paylot, vehicles exiting the Paylot, those turning right off of South Road, plus the nine Wigley On-Street Gold parking permit holders. With snow build-up Wigley On-Street Gold permit holders now walk in the street to and from their vehicles. In Fall 2007 several curbside Gold permit stalls were painted out of existence, an act which helped traffic flow to a degree. More needs to be done to ensure pedestrian safety and avoid gridlock.</p>	<p><u>Changed After Hearing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on information presented at the hearing, the PAC now recommends that the 9 Gold permit stalls be eliminated. • PAC post hearing vote: 5 yes; 0 no. 	<p>6. The PAC, the University’s Safety Officer, and the bus drivers, all concur that the stalls should be eliminated from their curbside location on Ellis Avenue.</p>	<p>PAC recommends elimination of 9 “Wigley On-Street” Gold permit stalls on Ellis Avenue for safety reasons –</p> <p><u>Approved</u></p>