

Report regarding responses to potential parking model changes at CSU

Completed by Martín Carcasson, Associate Professor of Communication Studies & Director, CSU Center for Public Deliberation

Presented to Amy Parsons, CSU VP of Operations and representatives from ASCSU, the Faculty Council, the Administrative Professional Council, and the Classified Personnel Council on April 6, 2015

This report is available online at: <http://col.st/W6h46>

What was examined

- Emails to Amy Parsons and Martín Carcasson over last several weeks
- Reports from Classified Personnel Council and Administrative Professional Council
- Online survey based on Amy's memo sent to all faculty and staff (616 responses as of April 1, 22% faculty, 49% Admin pro, 28% State classified)) Results available online at <http://col.st/6xaB2>
- Open forums on March 27 – Three 45 minutes forums (106 completed worksheets. 34% Admin pro, 16% faculty, 40% classified staff) Data from the worksheets from the forums available online at <http://col.st/jMUYA> Notes from the table discussions were also examined.

Overall responses to two models:

	Survey		Forum		Classified Personnel Council	Administrative Professional Council
Strongly prefer Current model	78	17%	25	26%	Unanimously support	38
Somewhat prefer current	105	23%	28	29%		
No opinion	63	14%	9	9%		
Somewhat prefer tiered	140	30%	25	26%		39
Strongly prefer tiered	77	17%	10	10%		

Key Tensions

Primary causes of tension: Need for low cost and preference for parking close by, but limited spaces, with variety of abilities to pay and variety of needs. CPD analysis identified five particular tensions that warrant additional engagement and discussion.

Tension 1: Equality v. equity

Tension 2: Flexibility v. Consistency/Clarity

Tension 3: Prioritizing and balancing the preferences of faculty, employees, students, and visitors

Tension 4: Space availability v. maximizing the use of prime lots

Tension 5: Supporting alternative transportation and campus green space v. keeping parking costs low

Most common messages throughout the data

Frustration/concern with cost and cost increase

Particularly in terms of impact on low-income employees
Disconnect with state university/place of employment

Issues with alternative transportation as a viable option

Difficult for working parents, out of town employees, employees that use their vehicles during work
Current limits of AT in Fort Collins (not enough hours, lack of service to certain parts of town)

Call for flexibility

Many employees explained their specific situation

Call for sliding scale and “punch card”

Strong pushback on PTS covering costs of losing spots to construction, especially regarding stadium

Key facts regarding parking stock:

Losses 2006 to present: 2,138
Gains 2006 to present: 1,258
Net loss: 880

Upcoming Losses

Stadium : 1674 (lots 240, 505, 515, and 630)
Bio/Chem: 196 (lot 547)
Innovation Food Center: 205 (lot 455)

Upcoming Expected Gains

Research drive: 900 (cost of \$5.4 million)
South College garage: (net of 450) – (cost of \$20 million)
Upcoming net loss: 725

Themes related to the current model

- Works well for some (if they arrive early and don't need to leave)
- Frustration with “hunting” model likely to increase significantly with higher cost and lower stock

Themes related to the tiered model

- Problem with N/S/AR zones (loss of flexibility to park in other zones, movement during the day)
- Polarization with “class system” (many agree, a few pushed back)
- Assumption that hunting will still be required (especially for C lots)
- Call for “guarantee” of availability (without clear recognition of consequences)
- Concern about sharing with students, and concern that students left out too much
- Many expressed interest in C, but not clear if they understand the distance (‘walking a bit’)
- Low cost option with fund help may bring back many that currently do not use passes at all
- Concerns with waiting lists
- Moving cars during day seemed problematic
- Support for fund, but many questions and some pushback

Limited misconceptions (arguments made by survey respondents or forum participants that involve factual errors or faulty assumptions)

- Mostly minor
- Assumption of need for parking solely for the stadium
- Assumption that university benefits from parking rates
- Assumption of decision already being made for Tiered Model
- Assumption that assistance fund would be a “loan” required to be paid back

Frequently mentioned suggestions/new ideas from data

- Set parking permit cost as a percentage of salary or tiered by salary
- “Punch card” permit to incentivize alternative transportation. Employees could purchase 100 days of parking for the year and decide when to use them (though snow days will be problematic)
- Passes for temporary faculty, or by semester
- Provide assistance for employees that need transportation for work during the day (department assists with costs? Pool vehicles?)

Additional Issues/Outstanding questions that warrant further discussion

- Past promises unfulfilled (garage at Moby?)
- Free permits to retirees and 30 year employees
- Issue with Foothills campus
- Limits of flexible options (daily/monthly)
- State vehicles in current spots
- Use of Hughes lot
- Clarity on street parking in community and MAX parking
- Not allowing freshman to have vehicles or moving them off campus
- How changes impact visitor parking
- How changes impact metered/daily parking
- Pushback on rate comparisons
- Effectiveness/route for Around the Horn
- Enforcement issues (students in current A lots)

CPD recommendation

- Tiered model needs more study before decision
 - Survey did not have map available, assumptions seemed off
 - Potential to have low cost remote lot with current system
- Need clearer understanding of reason for PTS bearing full burden of losing lots to new construction
- Need to study and engage employees regarding tying parking cost to salary
- Explore potential of punch card as significant motivator for alternative transportation and tool for flexibility
- More engagement on extending enforcement time past 4pm
- Need student voice (especially from those that work)