



California State University | Stanislaus

**ASSOCIATED STUDENTS INCORPORATED OF
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS**

**Resolution Opposing Specific Recommendations and Assumptions
of the Ad Hoc Parking Task Force Committee Final Report**

WHEREAS, the Associated Students, Inc., is the representative body and the official voice of the students at California State University, Stanislaus, and;

WHEREAS, although we support many of the recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Parking Task Force Committee in its *Final Report* (attached hereto and included as Attachment A), we oppose the specific recommendations and assumptions as follows:

- 1) We disagree with using a 1.5% (per year) projected enrollment increase for impact estimations, particularly when enrollment growth has been projected at 1% by Enrollment Management Committee and is widely accepted system-wide as the standard for growth projection; and
- 2) We oppose the recommended fee increases (COLA) beginning in 2016-17, with additional 5% and 6% increases in years seven and eight, respectively as stated in recommendation E; and
- 3) We oppose selling only Fall/Winter and/or Spring/Summer passes, inevitably requiring many students to pay for parking during terms in which they are not enrolled in classes as stated in recommendation H.

WHEREAS, basing findings and recommendations on an inaccurate (inflated) 1.5% projected yearly enrollment growth rate has resulted in an unrealistic and skewed fee increase schedule; and

WHEREAS, we strongly believe that fee increases would actually have the negative effect of discouraging even a greater number of students from purchasing parking permits, thereby resulting in *less* revenue being generated for a future parking structure; and

WHEREAS, previous trends illustrate an inverse relationship between the cost of permits and the number of students purchasing permits (attached hereto and included as Attachment B).

WHEREAS, higher parking fees would increase the number of vehicles parking in the surrounding neighborhoods, upsetting and negatively impacting area residents at a time when our campus is striving to build ties between our university and the Turlock community.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Associated Students, Inc., of California State University, Stanislaus, opposes parking permit fee increases as well as selling permits only for Fall/Winter and Summer/Spring

Attachment A

Ad Hoc Parking Task Force Final Report

Task Force Charge:

On September 12, 2014, President Sheley convened the Campus Ad Hoc Parking Task Force. Advisory to the President, the Task Force charge was to provide the context for the campus parking situation, including a sense of current parking demand and predicted pressures for the next seven years, revenues and expenditures generated by our current parking fee structure, and a responsible plan -- balancing costs, demand, security, and maintenance issues -- for meeting campus parking needs over the next seven-year period. To the extent possible, the plan was to include reasonable parking options for the various segments of the campus community.

Analysis:

With the above charge in mind, below is a brief on the Task Force considerations by which to accomplish the goals of the proposed parking plan.

Currently the University does not have an on-site parking space availability issue. There appears to be enough parking spaces on campus to accommodate the campus community. At any given time there are many spaces available. During peak hours of classes, there is an impact on the amount of spaces that are closest to the buildings, including faculty and staff parking. The task force agreed to utilize an enrollment growth rate of 1.5% over the next several years for budgeting purposes, and these numbers indicate that there will no longer be sufficient parking spaces on campus beginning in the 2019/2020 academic year. According to a study on University Parking Master Planning, parking consultants, Kimley-Horn and Associates, note the industry standard for universities is to utilize a ratio that averages 2.8 students per parking stall. In 2006, our campus experienced a parking impact concern when the ratio of student per parking stall was above 3.2.

The task force recognizes that although there is plenty of parking available on campus today, some members of the campus community choose not to pay for parking and are parking on the campus perimeter and surrounding neighborhoods. The task force discussed ways to market to and encourage those parking in the surrounding neighborhoods to park on campus. When it is absolutely necessary for students/faculty/staff to park in the neighborhoods, they should be respectful and courteous to the campus neighbors. The task force also reviewed alternative and more sustainable methods of arriving on campus other than by personal vehicle.

During fall 2014, the task force administered the *Parking Survey*. The purpose of the survey was to gather feedback from the campus community regarding their perception and experience with parking.

The result was a total return of 2,465 surveys and of those there were 2,343 completed surveys. The results indicated that a majority (85%) of students, faculty, and staff drive as their primary mode of transportation to campus. The majority of students, faculty and staff respondents commute from outside the Turlock city limits, and most reported driving their own vehicles due to concerns with public transit or the need to meet commitments before and after class/work. More than half (65%) of respondents who reported having a parking permit described the current parking situation as fair or poor. The overall cost of a parking permit is too expensive, some parking spaces are too small, and it is difficult to find parking spots in preferred lots are a few of the reasons why the respondents rated the current parking situation as fair or poor. There were suggestions by respondents stating that there should be different types of permits for evening-only students and Tuesday/Thursday students. Reducing the cost of the student parking permit was also suggested.

The task force understands the uniqueness of being a small campus and how we don't benefit from economies of scale. Meaning, some of the larger campuses are able to offer lower rates because they have a greater number of students enrolled on campus, needing parking. The task force conversed about the possibility of students being able to make monthly automatic payments rather than paying for the entire semester up front. Other suggestions that were discussed involved allowing students to purchase annual passes and that the Fall and Spring semester passes would also cover the Winter and Summer periods, respectively. The task force also discussed encouraging drivers to park in the available stalls in outer parking lots, such as the renovated Lot 2, to relieve some of the impact on the congestion in lots closest to buildings and to serve as a healthy alternative.

The task force reviewed the possibility and advantages of the University maintaining a standing parking committee to review the program as changes in enrollment, neighborhood parking permits, and parking availability could affect conditions central to the program. The standing committee could also evaluate demand on an annual basis, evaluate sales of various types of permits, and discuss alternative options for funding to decrease the cost of a parking permit and reduce parking in the surrounding neighborhoods. Any recommendations regarding impact and fees are contingent on the current projected enrollment numbers and surrounding neighborhood conditions. Any significant changes to these criteria would create a need for the standing committee to re-evaluate the recommendations.

There was much discussion regarding utilizing alternative forms of transportation. The task force would like to see more of the campus community utilizing public transit and/or bicycling. These are sustainable measures that contribute to a healthy environment and lifestyle, as well as addressing many of the concerns of the task force.

During several meetings, conversations were held regarding changing the current fee and designated locations of parking on campus. Included in the conversations were explanations of what types of financing requirements would be necessary to construct a parking structure facility to accommodate future parking. Below are various parking program models that were considered by the task force:

1. **“Tiered” parking** - a program that includes Premium, General, and Student Economy parking spaces. The Premium spaces would typically be closer to the buildings and would be available for students, faculty, and staff to purchase. The Premium parking permit cost would be in

addition to what each sector (student, faculty, staff) currently pay. The General parking permit would be one in which the student, faculty or staff, who pay their respective standard fee, would use the permit to park in the majority of spaces on campus. The Student Economy parking would be spaces in the outer parts of the lots that are not fully utilized and the students would pay a reduced fee for an economy parking permit to park in these areas.

- **Pros:** Every member of campus would have the opportunity to pay more to park closer to buildings, based on availability.
 - **Cons:** Faculty and staff that have been parking close to buildings would have to pay a premium for those spaces or park further from buildings in General Parking spaces.
2. **Mandatory parking** – a program in which every student would have to pay a parking fee, which would entitle them to a parking permit or transit pass. This fee would be similar to the current University Union, Health Center and Student Recreation Complex fees. Current CSU system wide policies may not allow this since parking is a Category 5 fee.
- **Pros:** It would create an incentive to park on campus because everyone has already paid for it, therefore reducing parking in surrounding neighborhoods. If all students pay the fee, the fee could be greatly reduced due to the number of parking passes sold. The revenue generated annually would be easily determined and could be used for more accurate revenue projections.
 - **Cons:** Unfair to students who do not drive to campus or utilize public transit. This may not encourage alternative modes of transportation or promote environmental responsibility. A mandatory fee would have to go out to the students for a vote.
3. **Current program with 400 student economy spaces** – a program that maintains faculty/staff parking, general/student parking and adds student economy parking. Many variations (philosophies) of this were reviewed which included reduced student rates, maintaining the current student rates, and increased student rates (both gradual and large increases at time of seeking a loan.)
- **Pros:** Student Economy rate would be at one-third the cost of the current Student General parking fee and will incentivize on-campus parking with a goal of reducing parking in the surrounding neighborhoods. This would create a more equitable rate comparison between students and faculty / staff.
 - **Cons:** Offering 400 economy spaces slightly increases the cost of general permits.

After much discussion, the task force favored Model 3 above. Based on this, several scenarios were run with varying philosophies on rates. The task force learned of the various financing requirements for a program to qualify for system-wide revenue bond financing. This included understanding that the campus program sustains a debt service ratio of 1.25 which insures a net income above operating expenses and debt payment. Depending on the philosophy chosen, below are examples of what

estimated general student parking fees would be needed to construct a 500 space parking structure facility when demand requires it. All options include 400 student economy spaces at one-third the general student parking fee rate. The date student economy parking goes on sale should be well marketed. The amount of permits sold for the student economy parking will be 10% above the number of spaces. These numbers are all approximate dollar amounts required for estimating purposes; actual numbers will vary.

1. Reducing student parking rates to \$120 per semester for the next five years, and then raising the rate 20% in year six, 35% in year seven, and 40% in year eight to reach **\$271** at the time needed to make a loan payment with COLA increases thereafter.
2. Keeping the student parking fees at the current rate of \$180 per semester, and then raising the rate 6% year six, 12% year seven, and 14% year eight to reach **\$243** at the time needed to make a loan payment with COLA increases thereafter.
3. Starting gradual increases (COLA) to student parking fees in 2016/17 raising the rate an additional 5% in year seven and 6% year eight to reach the projected rate of **\$232** per semester year eight at the time needed for a payment on a loan with COLA increases thereafter.

Task Force Recommendations *(in no particular order):*

- A. The University shall implement a standing parking committee.
- B. The University shall advocate, at the system-wide level, for parking fee increases in bargaining unit contracts that more equitably share the cost of parking maintenance and construction so that the students do not bear the majority of the burden.
- C. The Campus Parking Program will be one which maintains faculty/staff parking, general/student parking, and adds student economy parking.
- D. Future parking construction should be in the form of parking structure facilities to maintain campus green space and reduce heat gain from solid, paved, flat lots.
- E. Student parking fees will gradually increase (COLA) each year starting in 2016/17 (year one), with an additional 5% in year seven and 6% year eight to reach the projected rate needed in year eight for a payment on a construction loan, with COLA increases thereafter. It should be noted that this recommendation was not unanimous: eight members were in favor and three members were not in favor.
- F. Student Economy parking fees will be one-third the cost of the general student parking fee.
- G. Reduced student fee permits (half the cost of the regular semester permit) will be offered for evening parking only (4:00 p.m. until 11:00 p.m.).
- H. Student parking permits at proposed fees would be for Fall and Spring semester passes that would also cover the Winter and Summer periods, respectively. (Fall/Winter and Spring/Summer)

- I. When technology permits, a program in which students can be charged monthly rather than all at one time at the beginning of a semester.
- J. Through the implementation of a marketing program, the University shall encourage students/faculty/staff to park on campus and not in surrounding neighborhoods as well as educate the campus community on the new parking program.
- K. All campus events that charge an entrance fee will pay a parking fee for off campus attendees.
- L. The University shall continue to encourage the use of alternate transportation, to include the use of public transit and ride sharing, to travel to and from the University. The University should partner with the City to contribute to public transportation fees for students. The University should work with the local public agencies to improve public transit to campus.
- M. The University should encourage the use of bicycles to commute to campus by creating safe bike routes and secure bike parking. The University should continue to work with the City to develop and maintain a safe bicycle network for travel to and from campus.
- N. All recommendations regarding impact and fees are contingent on the current projected enrollment numbers and surrounding neighborhood conditions. Any significant changes to these criteria would create a need to re-evaluate the recommendations.
- O. All changes to the parking program are on a trial basis and should be reviewed in two years.

Summary:

In summary, given the information that the task force has to date, the above recommendations address each of the items given in the original charge. The task force utilized the most recent enrollment data available to reach a predicted 1.5% enrollment growth to use for impact estimations. Historically, the campus has experienced a parking impact issue when the ratio of students per stall is over 3.2 to 1. Given these criteria, it is estimated that the campus will begin to experience a parking impact issue in 2019/20. At that point, the engineering and loan process should begin for an estimated 500 space parking structure on the east side of Lot 11, as that is where the last parking demand study reflected there to be the largest need. In addition, due to traffic impact problems on Crowell Road, the University Master Plan does not reflect further development on the west side of campus.

The task force strived to be responsible decision makers for the current and future campus parking community. There was much analysis performed on various fee proposals with the understanding that the cost of parking is difficult for many students. However, the campus will inevitably be required to add parking as enrollment grows and additional parking facilities will require proper funding that needs to be planned far in advance.

The task force expressed concern with the amount of cars parked in the surrounding neighborhoods due to the traffic safety (mid-block pedestrian crossings) and quality of life impacts to residents and felt that adding student economy parking spaces may help reduce some of these impacts. A marketing program encouraging the campus community to park on campus, rather than in the surrounding neighborhoods would be necessary to accomplish this. However, the task force recognizes that even if these recommendations are fully implemented, they may not have a significant effect within the residential

neighborhoods. It will also be important to educate the campus community on all changes in the new parking program. The task force is very supportive of the University taking the necessary measures to encourage all of the campus community to consider and use alternate means of transportation to campus, which includes public transit and bicycling. Funding student transit passes would encourage ridership on local bus lines.

Because there are new features being recommended in this Parking Program, the task force felt very strongly that a standing parking committee should be implemented to regularly review the program. It may take at least two years to set all the details in place and the program should be reviewed at that time. The standing committee could evaluate demand on an annual basis, sales of various types of permits, and discuss alternative options for funding to decrease the cost of a parking permit and reduce parking in the surrounding neighborhoods. The task force recognizes that significant changes to any of these criteria could change the reasoning of today. A standing committee would be able to address these concerns quickly.

In closing, the task force would like to state that we understand and recognize that any additional fees are difficult for students. We have developed the above recommendations to the best of our abilities, given all known criteria, in an effort to be responsible to current and future students, the campus community as a whole, as well as our neighbors in the City of Turlock.

Ad Hoc Parking Task Force Members:

Augustine Avwunudiogba
Tammy Horner
Melody Maffei, Chair
Lisa McMullen
Lisa Medina
Mariam Salameh

Marvin Hooker
Nicole Larson
John Mayer
Scott Medeiros, City of Turlock, Non-voting
Andy Roy, *ex officio*
Wayne York, City of Turlock