

University of Idaho

Transportation Management Plan – *Draft*



Pedestrians



Bicycles



Transit



Parking

University of Idaho

Parking and Transportation Services

Contents

Introduction	3
Process	3
Planning for the Future	4
Executive Summary	5
Goals	7
Capital Projects	8
Current Funding Methodology	9
Funding Proposal	10
Option One	11
Option One Proforma	12
Option One Fee Scenario	13
Option Two	14
Option Two Proforma	15
Option Two Fee Scenario	16
Option Three	17
Option Three Proforma	18
Option Three Fee Scenario	19
Next Steps	20
Acknowledgements	21
Appendices	21 – 23
A. Transportation Advisory Group Members	21
B. Transportation Demand Management	22
C. Transportation Planning and Sustainability	23

Introduction

The draft Transportation Management Plan is an important guiding document, developed through a comprehensive campus and community-wide planning process. This plan highlights that with a changing campus population and demands for mobility, the transportation elements that support the mission of this institution must change as well. The primary intention of this plan is to ensure a safe and effective campus transportation system, for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and motorists. Safety and effectiveness are necessary factors in order to have efficient development and high quality of life on campus. As the University of Idaho's Strategic Plan describes, "We will be widely recognized as a creative university that is both environmentally and fiscally sustainable and is an engaged partner in addressing the changing needs of our stakeholders in Idaho, the nation, and the world." To support the strategic plan and mission of the University of Idaho, the transportation system and programs must be planned, developed, operated and maintained in a fully integrated and intended manner.

Process

In 2008, a Transportation Advisory Group (TAG) was formed and facilitated by the University of Idaho's Parking and Transportation Services (PTS). Membership was representative of students, faculty and staff, members of the City of Moscow administration and City Council, and community members. The group reviewed existing conditions for four modes of transportation used at the University of Idaho – pedestrian, bicycle, vehicular and transit. Conflict zones for each mode were identified and mitigations or improvements to the conflicts were discussed. Staff Affairs, Faculty Council and Associated Students of the University of Idaho (ASUI), as well as the general campus community, were given an opportunity to provide input during the initial phases, and throughout the development of creating the draft plan.

In January 2009, the TAG regrouped. Conflict zones were revisited and mitigations refined. PTS staff and TAG began to identify capital projects addressing improvements for each of the conflict zones.

The TAG regrouped again in January 2011 to finalize mitigations for the draft plan and complete the review of identified capital projects, including recommendations for prioritizing projects and funding methodology.

Throughout the planning process, PTS strived to maintain an inclusive process; all materials, meeting notes, and planning progress were available on PTS' website for public review. Comments were encouraged throughout the process.

Planning for the Future

Parking and Transportation Services strategic direction has changed over time. It is now recognized that the parking and transportation system is a key land use component of the campus plan and the system must be managed so that access to campus and parking is safe, efficient and effective. There is an increased awareness of the true costs of operating and maintaining the parking and transportation system that necessitates close scrutiny of funding sources and levels. Most importantly, there is growing consensus that the transportation systems, and options for mobility, are critical to the success of the institution.

Due to this recognition, PTS' priorities have shifted toward strategic transportation planning, focused on meeting future needs of a growing campus. Transportation, as it relates to the University of Idaho, is dynamic; the cost of vehicle ownership is increasing as is the cost of higher education. The emphasis now must be on ensuring and providing mobility options to students and the campus community to allow the institution to continue to be competitive in the world of higher education. Being prepared to meet the future transportation needs of students, faculty, and staff, will contribute directly to the on-going and ultimate success of the University of Idaho.

Executive Summary

The University of Idaho's draft Transportation Management Plan (TMP) is presented for review following two years of preparation and consultation. The plan describes specific projects, programs, and funding initiatives intended to improve pedestrian safety, emphasize and preserve the pedestrian core of campus, and enhance alternative modes of travel for the campus community.

The planning process has focused on the need to plan for the future, provide adequate and appropriate mobility options and ensure the university's competitiveness. As stated prominently in the *Leading Idaho, 2011-2015, Strategic Plan* "The University of Idaho is the first choice for student success and statewide leadership." The campus transportation system must reinforce our campus as the first choice for students and must not detract from a student's choice to attend the University of Idaho.

The goals of this plan are as follows (a more detailed explanation of goals is found on page 7):

1. Provide direction for Parking and Transportation Services
2. Ensure the safest and most effective transportation system for our campus
3. Prepare to meet the transportation needs of the future
4. Provide sufficient mobility for students
5. Be known as a campus and community where a car is not needed
6. Identify and prioritize transportation system capital projects
7. Identify appropriate and sustainable funding

The Transportation Advisory Group (TAG) was formed and included staff, faculty, members of the Associated Student body, and City of Moscow administration and Council members. The TAG met regularly and assisted PTS staff with a thorough review of elements and issues of the campus parking and transportation system. TAG work included the identification and analysis of existing transportation-related conditions on campus, areas of conflict, review of potential improvements, development and prioritization of capital projects, and funding methodology.

The combination of internal work and input from the TAG indicated clear consensus that specific transportation-related conditions must be addressed. Pedestrian safety and circulation, and the bicycle and transit systems became the focus of the improvements, with funding being recognized as the most challenging aspect of completing these projects.

Two methods have been identified for funding transportation capital projects. One method places the funding responsibility on campus parkers through increased parking permit fees. The second method more equitably spreads the cost amongst all transportation system users via a new dedicated transportation fee for all employees and students. The latter of the two options

is preferable because it allows the campus community members who walk, bicycle, or ride the bus the opportunity to fund improvements specific to those alternative transportation modes. Just as there was consensus that areas of the campus transportation system need improvement, there was consensus that a transportation fee is the preferred, and more equitable funding method.

We are now seeking administration review of the draft Transportation Management Plan, including the options for funding transportation capital projects.

Carl Root
Director – Parking and Transportation Services

Goals

- 1. Provide direction for Parking and Transportation Services**
 - Direction for funding and planning for improvements
- 2. Ensure the safest and most effective transportation system for our campus**
 - Support and promote pedestrian orientation as the primary mode of travel
- 3. Prepare to meet the transportation needs of the future**
 - Plan for increase in enrollment, resulting in increased demand on parking, bicycle, and transit systems
 - Plan for sustainable transportation modes as demand increases
 - Cost of vehicle ownership is increasing, plan for mobility options for increasing number of students who don't bring a car to campus
- 4. Provide sufficient mobility for our students**
 - Relates directly to the recruitment and retention goals of the university, must provide options for those who don't bring a car
- 5. Be known as a campus and community where a car is not needed**
 - Promote connectivity with greater Moscow community for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit modes
 - Local and regional transit is vitally important to the University of Idaho and to meeting student mobility needs; regional transit, such as provided by Northwest Trailways is crucial to provide the link home for students to destinations outside of the area
 - Moscow Valley Transit provides a critical transit service for the Moscow and campus community; the service must be maintained and then expanded to meet the changing and growing needs of the Moscow community and the University of Idaho
- 6. Identify and prioritize transportation system capital projects**
- 7. Identify appropriate and sustainable funding**
 - Current funding model will struggle to meet future transportation needs

Capital Projects

The Transportation Advisory Group spent a significant amount of time identifying and analyzing areas of the campus transportation system that present safety concerns or potential conflicts between interacting modes (pedestrians, vehicles, bicycles). Review of the issues and conflicts allowed for development of the capital projects and ultimately, this draft Transportation Management Plan. Each conflict area is fully described in the Transportation Analysis document, found on PTS' website (www.uidaho.edu/parking). The capital projects, with preliminary estimated costs are listed below. It is important to note that the projects listed below are only conceptual at this time and full designs with estimates are needed as a next step. More definitive cost estimates will allow for specific prioritization of projects.

- 1. Pedestrian safety mitigations across campus (Est. \$300 - \$500K)**
 - Speed table at 6th Street Crosswalk
 - Speed table on Deakin Avenue at SUB and VandalStore
- 2. Walkway zone improvements (Est. \$300 - \$500K)**
 - Access control and re-routing
 - Surface treatment
 - Designed drop-off areas
- 3. Pedestrian circulation improvements from Kibbie dome lot 57 (Est. \$150K)**
 - Sidewalk on Stadium Way
- 4. Transit contribution**
- 5. Bicycle storage (Est. \$50K-\$250K)**
 - Covered structure at Renfrew Hall
 - Covered bike storage at 2-3 additional locations
 - Additional racks and lockers (evaluate costs and demand of lockers)
- 6. Kibbie Dome Lot 57/110 Improvements (Est. \$1.5 - \$3 million)**
 - Paving, storm water, lighting, safety improvements, landscaping, bus parking, pedestrian connectivity
 - Unknowns: future of Poultry Hill, LRCDP plans, effective measures for storm water
 - Improved motor home parking for campus events
- 7. Signage (costs unknown at this time)**
 - New sign standards identified to upgrade and replace campus signage
- 8. Nez Perce Drive – Band Field Project (Est. \$600 - \$700K)**

- Service road created for garbage and service access to improve aesthetics and pedestrian safety on Nez Perce Drive

9. Health Center Gold Lot 35 Improvements (Est. \$250 - \$300K)

- Recent internal proposal completed
- Improve lot with pavement and storm water system design, construction and maintenance
- Currently requires significant maintenance
- High demand lot with only 23 spaces – gravel lot is in poor condition

10. Lot Asphalt Replacement (Est. \$350K)

- Excavation and replacement of asphalt
- 5 lots will require replacement within next 10 years

Current Funding Methodology

Parking and Transportation Services is a self-supporting unit within Auxiliary Services. With no outside funding, parking permit sales constitutes the majority of all revenues. Historically, and to some degree currently, permit fees have been undervalued. From fiscal year 2007 to fiscal year 2010, over 60% of all permits sold were priced at a rate less than \$100/year (see Table 1). Permit fees have increased modestly over recent years, but due to economic conditions, only Gold permits will increase in price for fiscal year 2012, an increase of only \$13/year. PTS revenues continue to be insufficient to fund the necessary improvements that have been identified in this planning process.

Inequity in the permit fee structure also exists. Residential permit prices (\$126/year) have been identified as needing to be closer to the Red (commuter) permit price (\$172/year). They are closer in relative value than the pricing reflects.

These important funding issues are being addressed in this plan, and are described in more detail in the Funding Proposal section beginning on page 10.

Table 1: Historical Permit Prices

Permit Type	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
Gold	\$250	\$262	\$288	\$300	\$312	\$325
Red	\$125	\$131	\$144	\$150	\$172	\$172
Purple/Silver/Green	\$55	\$59	\$74	\$99	\$126	\$126
Blue	\$55	\$59	\$59	\$61	\$64	\$64

Funding Proposal

Parking and Transportation Services and the Transportation Advisory Group feel it is crucial for the transportation system capital projects to become a priority. This refocusing of priorities requires dedicated funds be developed. Establishing a funding source for transportation capital projects recognizes and prioritizes transportation as an important element of the university, as well as addresses improvements for alternative modes of transportation. Three funding options have been explored; PTS is seeking review, consensus and ultimately approval from university administration for one of the funding options described below.

In funding option one, the current model is continued with parking permit revenue being the sole funding source for PTS operations and maintenance, as well as capital projects. Option two and three describe a funding plan that includes a newly created transportation fee of \$15/year, or \$30/year, respectively.

With options two and three, the amount allocated for capital projects (on the proformas) is greater than the amount generated by the transportation fee. This means that a portion of the capital project funding would come from permit fees, even with parkers contributing via the transportation fee. This is considered appropriate since some of the projects are parking system capital projects, additional contribution should come from permit holders. It should also be noted that the improvements described for parking system capital projects (lot 57/110, lot 35), require significantly higher funding amounts relative to the pedestrian and bicycle projects. However, in both of these options the funds generated by the transportation fee would be dedicated solely to capital projects, and the operation and maintenance of PTS would continue to be funded by permit fees.

For planning purposes, a figure of 14,000 was used to represent Moscow campus faculty, staff and students to determine an estimated amount of revenue generated by a transportation fee. Significant discussion occurred during the planning process regarding the transportation fee concept and the consensus was that employees and students should all be expected to contribute. See Table 2 for potential revenue generation from a transportation fee. It is important to note that the three options must reflect absolute numbers, but the details of the options could be variable and a variety of combinations or pricing levels could be considered.

Table 2: Potential revenue generated by transportation fee

Transportation Fee Amount	Students/Employees Contributing	Annual Amount Generated
\$15	14,000	\$210,000
\$20	14,000	\$280,000
\$25	14,000	\$350,000
\$30	14,000	\$420,000

Funding Option One – Parking Permit Fees

Funding option one suggests that pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and parking system capital projects are funded solely through parking permit revenue. In this option permit prices need to rise appreciably. In addition, the parking permit revenue would continue to fund operations and maintenance of PTS. The financial proforma for funding option one is found on page 12, followed by the accompanying parking permit fee scenario on page 13.

Pros for Funding Option One

- Parking permit fee structure is existing, no new fee would be created
- Vehicles contribute to the impacts that are proposed to be mitigated so it is appropriate that parkers fund transportation system improvements
- Permit holders would recognize benefits in the pedestrian system, as they too are pedestrians on campus, as well as improvements to parking lots included in the capital project list

Cons for Funding Option One

- Pedestrian, bicycle, and transit improvements make up many of the capital projects and users of those systems would not be contributing
- Full funding responsibility is placed on parkers, while many benefits will be recognized by pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users
- Permit prices would have to increase dramatically
- Funding for transportation system improvements would be dependent on sale of parking permits; number of permits sold has potential to decrease in the future due to the increase in permit price, cost of gas, cost of operating a vehicle, and increase in use of alternative transportation modes
- Funds generated are subject to use for Auxiliary Services capital projects (Housing, Golf, VandalStore projects), and not guaranteed to be available for transportation system improvements

OPTION 1	Proposed 10-Year Proforma - Projects Funded by Permit Revenue										DRAFT
	FY2011*	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	
REVENUE											
Permit Sales	927,679	959,237	1,098,286	1,276,586	1,309,019	1,336,252	1,369,088	1,395,676	1,425,049	1,452,873	
Parking Meters	133,791	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	
Fines	300,862	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	
Parking Events	52,800	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	
Misc. Revenue	37,459	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	
Total Revenue:	1,452,591	1,418,237	1,557,286	1,735,586	1,768,019	1,795,252	1,828,088	1,854,676	1,884,049	1,911,873	
OPERATING EXPENSES & TRANSFERS											
Total Salaries/Benefits	595,582	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	
Bad Debt Write Off	9,347	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	
Operational Expenses	187,515	200,000	225,000	225,000	225,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	
Operational Reserves	9,376	10,000	11,250	11,250	11,250	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	
Transfers - Bond Debt	245,500	245,500	245,500	245,500	245,500	245,500	55,600	55,600	55,600	55,600	
Transfers - UI G&A	144,119	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	
Transfers - Aux G&A / Capital Reserves	244,186	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	
Parking Lot Maintenance / Vehicles		25,000	74,000	50,000	92,000	18,000	274,000	274,000	274,000	274,000	
Transportation Capital Projects		100,000	175,000	350,000	375,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	450,000	500,000	
Total Operating Expenses:	1,435,625	1,410,500	1,560,750	1,711,750	1,778,750	1,781,000	1,847,100	1,847,100	1,872,100	1,922,100	
Net Earnings (Loss)	16,966	7,737	(3,464)	23,836	(10,731)	14,252	(19,012)	7,576	11,949	(10,227)	
Rollover from previous year	0	16,966	24,703	21,239	45,075	34,344	48,596	29,584	37,160	49,109	
Ending fund balance	16,966	24,703	21,239	45,075	34,344	48,596	29,584	37,160	49,109	38,882	
* End of Year											

OPTION 1	Proposed 10-Year Fee Scenario - Projects Funded by Permit Revenue											DRAFT
		FY 2010*	FY 2011*	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
Gold	# of Permits:	732	831	750	750	750	750	750	750	750	750	750
	Permit Price:	\$300	\$312	\$325	\$342	\$363	\$371	\$380	\$388	\$396	\$404	\$413
	Projected Revenue:	\$219,600	\$259,272	\$243,750	\$256,500	\$272,250	\$278,250	\$285,000	\$291,000	\$297,000	\$303,000	\$309,750
Red	# of Permits:	1,760	1,734	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,776
	Permit Price:	\$157	\$172	\$172	\$190	\$213	\$218	\$223	\$228	\$233	\$238	\$243
	Projected Revenue:	\$276,320	\$298,248	\$305,300	\$337,250	\$378,075	\$386,950	\$395,825	\$404,700	\$413,575	\$422,450	\$431,568
Residential - Silver	# of Permits:	859	860	850	850	850	850	850	850	850	850	850
Residential - Purple	# of Permits:	659	566	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670
Residential - Green	# of Permits:	289	322	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	280
	Permit Price:	\$99	\$126	\$126	\$163	\$213	\$218	\$223	\$228	\$233	\$238	\$243
	Projected Revenue:	\$178,893	\$220,248	\$226,800	\$293,400	\$383,400	\$392,400	\$401,400	\$410,400	\$419,400	\$428,400	\$437,400
Blue	# of Permits:	1,142	1,421	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,151
	Permit Price:	\$61	\$64	\$64	\$84	\$111	\$113	\$116	\$118	\$120	\$123	\$125
	Projected Revenue:	\$70,073	\$90,680	\$73,387	\$96,136	\$127,861	\$130,419	\$133,027	\$135,688	\$138,401	\$141,169	\$144,118
Visitor	# of Permits:	4,683	3,052	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,001
	Permit Price:	\$2	\$2	\$2	\$3	\$3	\$4	\$4	\$5	\$5	\$6	\$6
	Projected Revenue:	\$9,366	\$6,104	\$10,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$27,300	\$27,300	\$30,030	\$30,036
Total Projected Revenue		\$851,763	\$927,679	\$959,237	\$1,098,286	\$1,276,586	\$1,309,019	\$1,336,252	\$1,369,088	\$1,395,676	\$1,425,049	\$1,452,873
* End of Year												

Funding Option Two – Parking Permit Fees and Transportation Fee of \$15/year

Funding option two suggests a combination of a more modest increase in parking permit fees and the implementation of a \$15/year transportation fee applicable to all active faculty, staff and students of the University of Idaho Moscow campus. The financial proforma for funding option three is found on page 15, followed by the accompanying parking permit fee scenario on page 16.

Pros for Funding Option Two

- Establishes a fee structure where all users (pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, motorists) contribute equally and all recognize benefits
- Funds generated would be dedicated to transportation system improvement projects (pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and parking improvements)
- Permit prices would increase at a modest level; not as dramatic as option 1, but a slightly greater increase than in option 3

Cons for Funding Option Two

- New fee is created; additional fees are controversial and generally unwanted

OPTION 2	Proposed 10-Year Proforma - Projects Funded by \$15 Transportation Fee									DRAFT
	FY2011*	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020
REVENUE										
Permit Sales	927,679	959,237	1,005,625	1,052,548	1,107,640	1,161,801	1,219,796	1,241,646	1,270,596	1,297,191
Parking Meters	133,791	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000
Fines	300,862	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Parking Events	52,800	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000
Misc. Revenue	37,459	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000
Transportation Fee (\$15 x 14,000)	0	0	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
Total Revenue:	1,452,591	1,418,237	1,674,625	1,721,548	1,776,640	1,830,801	1,888,796	1,910,646	1,939,596	1,966,191
OPERATING EXPENSES & TRANSFERS										
Total Salaries/Benefits	595,582	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Bad Debt Write Off	9,347	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Operational Expenses	187,515	200,000	225,000	225,000	225,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Operational Reserves	9,376	10,000	11,250	11,250	11,250	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500
Transfers - Bond Debt	245,500	245,500	245,500	245,500	245,500	245,500	55,600	55,600	55,600	55,600
Transfers - UI G&A	144,119	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Transfers - Aux G&A / Capital Reserves	244,186	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000
Parking Lot Maintenance / Vehicles		25,000	74,000	50,000	92,000	18,000	274,000	274,000	274,000	274,000
Transportation Capital Projects		100,000	275,000	350,000	375,000	475,000	475,000	475,000	525,000	525,000
Total Operating Expenses:	1,435,625	1,410,500	1,660,750	1,711,750	1,778,750	1,831,000	1,897,100	1,897,100	1,947,100	1,947,100
Net Earnings (Loss)	16,966	7,737	13,875	9,798	(2,110)	(199)	(8,304)	13,546	(7,504)	19,091
Rollover from previous year	0	16,966	24,703	38,578	48,376	46,265	46,066	37,761	51,307	43,803
Ending fund balance	16,966	24,703	38,578	48,376	46,265	46,066	37,761	51,307	43,803	62,895
* End of Year										

OPTION 2	Proposed 10-Year Fee Scenario - Projects Funded by \$15 Transportation Fee											DRAFT
		FY 2010*	FY 2011*	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
Gold	# of Permits:	732	831	750	750	750	750	750	750	750	750	750
	Permit Price:	\$300	\$312	\$325	\$325	\$329	\$336	\$344	\$350	\$357	\$365	\$373
	Projected Revenue:	\$219,600	\$259,272	\$243,750	\$243,750	\$246,750	\$252,000	\$258,000	\$262,500	\$267,750	\$273,750	\$279,750
Red	# of Permits:	1,760	1,734	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,776
	Permit Price:	\$157	\$172	\$172	\$178	\$184	\$190	\$196	\$200	\$204	\$209	\$214
	Projected Revenue:	\$276,320	\$298,248	\$305,300	\$315,950	\$326,600	\$337,250	\$347,900	\$355,000	\$362,100	\$370,975	\$380,064
Residential - Silver	# of Permits:	859	860	850	850	850	850	850	850	850	850	850
Residential - Purple	# of Permits:	659	566	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670
Residential - Green	# of Permits:	289	322	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	280
	Permit Price:	\$99	\$126	\$126	\$139	\$153	\$167	\$183	\$200	\$204	\$209	\$214
	Projected Revenue:	\$178,893	\$220,248	\$226,800	\$250,200	\$275,400	\$300,600	\$329,400	\$360,000	\$367,200	\$376,200	\$385,200
Blue	# of Permits:	1,142	1,421	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,151
	Permit Price:	\$61	\$64	\$64	\$70	\$77	\$84	\$92	\$100	\$102	\$104	\$106
	Projected Revenue:	\$70,073	\$90,680	\$73,387	\$80,725	\$88,798	\$96,790	\$105,501	\$114,996	\$117,296	\$119,641	\$122,140
Visitor	# of Permits:	4,683	3,052	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,001
	Permit Price:	\$2	\$2	\$2	\$3	\$3	\$4	\$4	\$5	\$5	\$6	\$6
	Projected Revenue:	\$9,366	\$6,104	\$10,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$27,300	\$27,300	\$30,030	\$30,036
Total Projected Revenue		\$851,763	\$927,679	\$959,237	\$1,005,625	\$1,052,548	\$1,107,640	\$1,161,801	\$1,219,796	\$1,241,646	\$1,270,596	\$1,297,191
* End of Year												

Funding Option Three – Parking Permit Fees and Transportation Fee of \$30/year

Recommended Funding Option

Funding option three is the recommended funding option for transportation capital projects. This option suggests a very minimal increase in parking permit fees and the implementation of a \$30/year transportation fee applicable to all active faculty, staff, and students of the University of Idaho Moscow campus. The financial proforma for funding option three is found on page 18, followed by the accompanying parking permit fee scenario on page 19.

Pros for Funding Option Three

- Establishes a fee structure where all users (pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, motorists, parkers) contribute equally and all recognize benefits
- Funds generated would be dedicated to transportation system improvement projects (pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and parking improvements)
- Permit prices would increase at a very minimal level
- Permit holders would recognize benefits to transportation systems and programs, have enhanced mobility options to choose from, and realize minimal permit increases
- Creates a funding source separate from Auxiliary Services capital project priorities

Cons for Funding Option Three

- New fee is created; additional fees are controversial and generally unwanted

OPTION 3	Proposed 10-Year Proforma - Projects Funded by \$30 Transportation Fee										DRAFT
	FY2011*	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	
REVENUE											
Permit Sales	927,679	959,237	998,475	1,030,219	1,072,964	1,108,457	1,147,242	1,180,376	1,207,026	1,223,349	
Parking Meters	133,791	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	
Fines	300,862	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	
Parking Events	52,800	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	
Misc. Revenue	37,459	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	
Transportation Fee (\$30 x 14,000)	0	0	420,000	420,000	420,000	420,000	420,000	420,000	420,000	420,000	
Total Revenue:	1,452,591	1,418,237	1,877,475	1,909,219	1,951,964	1,987,457	2,026,242	2,059,376	2,086,026	2,102,349	
OPERATING EXPENSES & TRANSFERS											
Total Salaries/Benefits	595,582	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	
Bad Debt Write Off	9,347	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	
Operational Expenses	187,515	200,000	225,000	225,000	225,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	
Operational Reserves	9,376	10,000	11,250	11,250	11,250	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	
Transfers - Bond Debt	245,500	245,500	245,500	245,500	245,500	245,500	55,600	55,600	55,600	55,600	
Transfers - UI G&A	144,119	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	
Transfers - Aux G&A / Capital Reserves	244,186	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	
Parking Lot Maintenance / Vehicles		25,000	74,000	50,000	92,000	18,000	274,000	274,000	274,000	274,000	
Transportation Capital Projects		100,000	475,000	550,000	550,000	625,000	600,000	650,000	650,000	675,000	
Total Operating Expenses:	1,435,625	1,410,500	1,860,750	1,911,750	1,953,750	1,981,000	2,022,100	2,072,100	2,072,100	2,097,100	
Net Earnings (Loss)	16,966	7,737	16,725	(2,531)	(1,786)	6,457	4,142	(12,724)	13,926	5,249	
Rollover from previous year	0	16,966	24,703	41,428	38,897	37,111	43,568	47,710	34,986	48,912	
Ending fund balance	16,966	24,703	41,428	38,897	37,111	43,568	47,710	34,986	48,912	54,161	
* End of Year											

OPTION 3		Proposed 10-Year Fee Scenario - Projects Funded by \$30 Transportation Fee										DRAFT
		FY 2010*	FY 2011*	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
Gold	# of Permits:	732	831	750	750	750	750	750	750	750	750	750
	Permit Price:	\$300	\$312	\$325	\$325	\$325	\$329	\$333	\$337	\$341	\$346	\$350
	Projected Revenue:	\$219,600	\$259,272	\$243,750	\$243,750	\$243,750	\$246,750	\$249,750	\$252,750	\$255,750	\$259,500	\$262,500
Red	# of Permits:	1,760	1,734	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,775	1,776
	Permit Price:	\$157	\$172	\$172	\$176	\$180	\$184	\$188	\$192	\$196	\$198	\$200
	Projected Revenue:	\$276,320	\$298,248	\$305,300	\$312,400	\$319,500	\$326,600	\$333,700	\$340,800	\$347,900	\$351,450	\$355,200
Residential - Silver	# of Permits:	859	860	850	850	850	850	850	850	850	850	850
Residential - Purple	# of Permits:	659	566	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670
Residential - Green	# of Permits:	289	322	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	280
	Permit Price:	\$99	\$126	\$126	\$137	\$148	\$159	\$169	\$177	\$188	\$196	\$200
	Projected Revenue:	\$178,893	\$220,248	\$226,800	\$246,600	\$266,400	\$286,200	\$304,200	\$318,600	\$338,400	\$352,800	\$360,000
Blue	# of Permits:	1,142	1,421	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,151
	Permit Price:	\$61	\$64	\$64	\$70	\$74	\$80	\$87	\$94	\$97	\$98	\$100
	Projected Revenue:	\$70,073	\$90,680	\$73,387	\$80,725	\$85,569	\$92,414	\$99,807	\$107,792	\$111,026	\$113,246	\$115,612
Visitor	# of Permits:	4,683	3,052	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,001
	Permit Price:	\$2	\$2	\$2	\$3	\$3	\$4	\$4	\$5	\$5	\$6	\$6
	Projected Revenue:	\$9,366	\$6,104	\$10,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$27,300	\$27,300	\$30,030	\$30,036
Total Projected Revenue		\$851,763	\$927,679	\$959,237	\$998,475	\$1,030,219	\$1,072,964	\$1,108,457	\$1,147,242	\$1,180,376	\$1,207,026	\$1,223,349
* End of Year												

Next Steps

Once a review of the draft Transportation Management Plan is completed and a recommended funding option is finalized, the next step is to make the plan available for public review and comment. Additionally, PTS will work with Architecture and Engineering Services to develop more detailed project estimates, design details, and an implementation schedule, as funding allows.

The Transportation Management Plan will then be published on PTS' webpage and will guide PTS in the areas of funding and planning for capital project implementation. The document will be reviewed and updated on an annual basis, or as new information is gathered.

Acknowledgements

Parking and Transportation Services would like to thank all the dedicated faculty, staff, students and members of the community who have contributed to this planning process, and served on the Transportation Advisory Group. Without their expertise and assistance this process would not be possible. It is important to recognize AES, Facilities, Auxiliary Services and the entire team that makes up the DFA side of the University. A special thanks to the ASUI Leadership and student participation. A list of Transportation Advisory Group members is included in Appendix A.

Appendices

Appendix A. Transportation Advisory Group Members

University of Idaho Faculty Representatives

Philip Cook, Research Associate – College of Natural Resources

Dan Eveleth, Academic Faculty – Department of Business; Faculty Senate Chair 2010-11

Rod Hill, Research Faculty – Animal and Vet Science; Faculty Senate Secretary 2010-11

Mike Lowry, Academic Faculty – Civil Engineering

Steve Hollenhorst, Research Faculty – Conservation Social Sciences

Mark Hoversten, Dean – College of Art and Architecture

Michael Kyte, Academic Faculty – Civil Engineering

Matthew Morra, Academic Faculty – Plant, Soil and Entomological Sciences

University of Idaho Staff Representatives

Rob Anderson, Director – University Support Services

John Bales, Director – VandalStore

Karee Head, Undergraduate Admissions; Staff Affairs 2010-11

Debra Rumford, Family and Consumer Sciences; Parking Committee Chair 2010-11

Tyrone Brooks, Assistant Vice President Auxiliary Services

Ray Gasser, Director – University Housing

Gloria Jensen, Coordinator – Disability Support Services

Brian Johnson, Assistant Vice President – Facility Management

Matt Kitterman, Media Equipment Specialist – Information Technology Services

Mark Miller, Associate Director – Idaho Commons and Student Union

Ray Pankopf, Director – Architecture and Engineering Services, Facility Management

Darin Saul, Sustainability Coordinator – Environmental Science

Charles Zillinger, Director – Landscape & Exterior Services, Facility Management

Geoffrey Wood, UI Library; Parking Committee 2010-11

University of Idaho Student Representatives

Stephen Parrot, ASUI President – 2010-11

Jennifer Fountain, ASUI Programs

Bryan Stafford, Student – ASUI Senate and UI Parking Committee – 2010-11

Parking and Transportation Services Staff

Carl Root, Director

Todd Broadman, Office Manager

Stuart Robb, Parking Services Supervisor

Rebecca Couch, Information Specialist

City of Moscow Representatives

Nancy Chaney, Mayor

Tom LaPointe, Transportation Commission

Bill Belknap, Community Development Director

Tim Brown, City Council

Don Meyer, Transportation Commission

Gary Riedner, City Supervisor

Les MacDonald, Director – City of Moscow Public Works

Walter Steed, City Council – City of Moscow

Appendix B. Transportation Demand Management

Transportation demand management (TDM) is the application of strategies and policies to incentivize the reduction of travel or parking demand (specifically that of single-occupancy private vehicles), or to redistribute this demand in space or in time. Within institutional parking systems, financial incentives are a common method to manage demand. Specifically, on a college campus, parking demand can be managed by increasing the cost of parking and lowering the cost of more preferred, alternative modes of travel. Managing demand can be a cost-effective alternative to increasing capacity, or capital investment needed to increase capacity.

While the typical conditions necessitating specific TDM programs are not considered present on the University of Idaho campus or in Moscow Idaho, these options are presented for awareness and educational purposes. If conditions change, such as, populations increase, parking demands increase, parking supply becomes scarce, air quality becomes an issue, then more formal TDM programs may need to be implemented. Some examples of the broad range of TDM measures are:

- Leverage public and private funds to increase the use of ridesharing and other commuting options that reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality
- Including or improving pedestrian-oriented design elements, such as short pedestrian crossings, wide sidewalks and street trees
- Requiring users of parking to pay the costs directly, as opposed to sharing the costs indirectly with others through increased rents and tax subsidies
- Including and improving public transportation infrastructure, such as bus stops and routes
- Subsidizing transit costs for employees or residents
- Bicycle-friendly facilities and environments, including secure bike storage areas
- Providing active transportation (AT) facilities including bike lanes and multi-use trails
- Flex-time work schedules with employers to reduce congestion at peak times
- Congestion pricing tolls during peak hours
- Road space rationing by restricting travel based on license plate number, at certain times and places
- Workplace travel plans
- Roadspace reallocation, aiming to re-balance provision between private cars which often predominate due to high spatial allocations for roadside parking, and for sustainable modes
- Time, Distance and Place (TDP) Road Pricing, where road users are charged based on when, where and how much they drive; some transportation experts believe TDP pricing is an integral part of the next generation in transportation demand management

Appendix C. Transportation Planning and Sustainability

At the most basic level, a sustainable transportation system is one that meets the transportation and other needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. In considering the needs of our campus community, however, the benefits of the present transportation system should not be excessively inhibited or used as the justification for precluding future choices. Our transportation planning must consider the trade-offs between the economic and societal benefits of transportation and the associated unsustainable environmental, safety, health, ecosystem, and equity impacts.

A sustainable transportation system requires a culture that not only sees sustainability as desirable but also accepts the inclusion of sustainability concepts in the transportation planning process and supports the tough decisions necessary to make sustainability a priority. The public and policy makers in this culture will understand and consider potential solutions, such as integrated land use and transportation and innovative public transportation (for example, bus rapid transit and car sharing). This cultural acceptance will be supported by the provision of adequate and reliable transportation funding consistent with fiscal constraints. Legislators and policy makers will recognize that a sustainable funding source is needed to meet current mobility needs while addressing the unsustainable effects of transportation. In addition, transportation providers must be able to ensure that investments in transportation facilities have adequate operations and maintenance funding.

A sustainable transportation system will have accountability in the planning process. Performance measurement and feedback loops will enable planners to learn from past experiences and understand fully the ramifications of decisions on the components of sustainability. Continuous improvement enabled through flexibility and innovation will be a key element of sustainable transportation as travel patterns, vehicle and fuel technologies, land use patterns, population densities, and individual travel choices change.