

**Subcommittee on Twin Cities Facilities
and Support Services Meeting Minutes**

November 16, 2010

8:30 ~ 10:00 a.m.

Weisman Room 111

[In these minutes ~ University winter closures; transportation update and central corridor light rail project]

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration or the Board of Regents.]

Present: Lyndel King (chair), Bernadette Corley Troge, Lorelee Wederstrom, Laurie Schiech, Joseph Jameson, Michael Berthelsen, Denny Olson, Jeremy Todd, Gregory Cibuzar, Gary Davis, Stephan Roos, Kevin Upton, David Crane, Anthony DeAngelis

Regrets: Mathew Pensyl, George Wilcox

Absent: Keith Carlson

Guests: Bob Baker, Executive Director of Parking and Transportation, Lonetta Hanson, Program Associate

Lyndel King called the meeting to order and welcomed those present. She asked the committee members to introduce themselves.

Winter Closures and Availability of Services; Establishing Standard Building Hours
– Mike Berthelsen, Associate Vice President of Facilities Management

Associate Vice President Berthelsen stated that as a cost saving measure the University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus would be shut down between December 24, 2010 and January 2, 2011. The dates vary slightly for the coordinate campuses. During this time, only essential services will be open. Associate Vice President Berthelsen a website was created to provide information about the shut down from multiple perspectives. <http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/faculty-staff/closure/index.htm>. He provided the committee with a print out of information from that website.

Associate Vice President Berthelsen went on to discuss the distinction between active buildings and non-active buildings during the closure. Active buildings, he stated, will maintain operations during the closure. They will have public access, “occupied” temperature settings and targeted custodial service. One example is the University of Minnesota Physicians. Non-active buildings will be locked but still accessible via key or keycard. Temperatures will be cooler, similar to conditions found during a holiday. Facilities will “ramp down” fan exchanges, but there will be enough air, heat, and power to allow research to continue. General snow removal will continue with only emergency

exits/stairs being cleared for non-active buildings. There will be no custodial service in non-active buildings and Facilities Management (FM) will field a skeleton crew to respond to critical building needs. With regard to energy management, most buildings will be in a “holiday” mode, with temperatures reflecting an “unoccupied “ setting. Ms. King asked if this would be managed centrally. Associate Vice President Berthelsen responded that it depended on the age of the building and whether it had digital controls. The newer buildings with digital controls are managed centrally.

Associate Vice President Berthelsen noted that Facilities Management is still working with the Bridge Group to determine which buildings will be open on a daily and hourly basis. Researchers are submitting plans about their activities and needs to FM so that they can plan accordingly.

The U.S. Mail will treat the furlough like a Saturday. Residence halls will continue to receive mail deliveries, however, incoming U.S. Mail to all other University buildings will be held. Outgoing U.S. Mail will continue to be picked-up from the blue USPS box locations across campus. If special mail delivery accommodations are needed, departments must contact their local mail carrier or the University Station Branch Manager, Justin Priess at 612-378-1853 to make special arrangements.

Ms. King asked if this is the first time the University of Minnesota has closed its buildings for a furlough. Associate Vice President Berthelsen responded that this is the first time it has been done on the Twin Cities campus, but it has been done on the Duluth campus and Pennsylvania State has also done it. Professor Gregory Cibuzar asked about the cost savings associated with the winter closure. Associate Vice President Berthelsen stated that 99% of the savings is from not paying salaries. There is predicted energy savings of \$160,000. But, the energy savings is not sufficient to drive the closure.

Transportation Services Update – Bob Baker, Executive Director Parking and Transportation Services

Mr. Baker used a power point presentation to update the committee on parking and transportation services and the impact of the Central Corridor Light Rail Transit (CCLRT) project. He indicated Parking and Transportation Services has evolved to include, bike transportation, sidewalks and fleet services in addition to transportation. Mr. Baker stated that Parking and Transportation Services is committed to establishing, maintaining and improving a comprehensive transportation system that reduces congestion, eases accessibility, and enhances a friendly university community. Next, Mr. Baker noted several “quick facts.” There are eight parking garages, eight parking ramps, 132 surface lots and 6,700 bike racks at the university. He also noted several facts about the population served by Parking and Transportation.

- Students (Fall 2009): 51,659
- Full-time Staff and Faculty (active status, Fall 2009) 16948
- Estimated visitors (per day): 15,000
- Total (per day): Approximately 80,000.

He went on to state that the number of events on campus is continually increasing, and 53% of the people (students, staff and faculty) travel in single occupancy vehicles. 24% take the bus, and 8% bike. He also noted some facts about parking. There are 20,443 parking spaces, and 5.2 million cars parked on campus in 2009-10. Specialty parking and parking reservations are a large part of this number.

With regard to transit, he stated the campus shuttle service includes the campus Connector, and East Bank, Washington Ave. Bridge, St. Paul Circulators, and the Night/Weekend Connector. The total annual ridership is four million. The annual cost of this service is approximately \$.97 per passenger.

Parking and Transportation Services is self-supporting with no legislative funding. A portion of the Student Transportation fee is allocated to support the on-campus transit system and U-Pass Program. All costs- operating, indirect and capital are evenly spread throughout the parking system. If central funding is used to subsidize parking costs less money will be available for academic purposes. As low -cost surface lot spaces disappear and are replaced with higher cost structural facilities, additional revenues must be generated to balance the budget. Parking revenues are used to support transit and other transportation alternatives. Parking rates are based on facility types and their associated costs. Lot spaces are the least expensive and garage spaces the most expensive. Public parking rates are influenced by the market factors such as facility type, location, and demand. Currently, the contract parking waiting list is shrinking. There are, however, some ramps with no wait. Mr. Baker stated this shows the waiting lists are a result of preference rather than need.

Mr. Baker next discussed Parking and Transportation Service's income and expenditures for FY 2010. The FY 2010 budgeted income for Parking and transportation Services is \$35,780,344. Contract Parking accounts for 38% of it, and transient and meter parking accounts for 30%. The largest increase in revenue is from parking for football games. On the expenditure side, total expenditures are \$34,960,993 for FY 2010. The largest expenditures are for debt service (37.7%), transit (19.3%), and payroll (15.9%).

Professor Kevin Upton asked if the parking rate liquidated the capital debt incurred from the parking ramps or if there is a subsidy. Mr. Baker responded that there is not a subsidy. The revenue must cover the debt. Mr. Upton noted that this is a hurdle Parking and Transportation must overcome in order to build a new garage.

David Crane asked whether services would be provided for electric vehicles. Mr. Baker stated Parking and Transportation is looking into it. However, the infrastructure is expensive and it would not be cost effective for the University to pursue. The cost of installation would be an eight or ten year pay back period. Mr. Baker noted he believes most people will charge their vehicles at home, but the University may install infrastructure for electrical vehicles at a few locations.

Next, Mr. Baker discussed the CCLRT project. He showed the committee a map of the CCLRT line and stations. He then discussed the sources of CCLRT construction

funds, and noted that it is the largest public works project in the history of Minnesota. The contribution percentages are as follows:

- Federal government 50% (\$479 million)
- State government 9% (\$92 million)
- County Transit Improvement Board 30% (\$284 million)
- Ramsey County 7% (\$66 Million)
- Hennepin County 3% (\$28 million)
- City of St. Paul < 1% (5 million)

Mr. Baker then showed slides of what the on campus stations may look like. He noted the East Bank Station is the largest on the 11-mile project. The area between Union and Harvard Streets has 80 research labs and there has been a lot of effort to protect this area and to develop it as a transit/pedestrian mall. Mr. Baker next showed a cross section of the transit/pedestrian mall indicating that there will be a bike lane on the outside of the light rail lane, and that light rail trains and buses will share a lane. Existing utility lines will be buried, trees will be planted, and the concrete will be colored to highlight the pedestrian areas. Benches and tables will also be provided in the center pedestrian mall. Cars will share the road with the train until Walnut Street.

Mr. Baker then discussed the changes made with advanced traffic improvements.

- Left turn lane installed on 17th street with new signal light,
- Harvard Street was changed to accommodate the future physics building,
- A new segment of Beacon Street was constructed to provide access to the Washington Street parking garage, and sections of Beacon were converted to two-way streets,
- The Fulton Street and East River Road intersection was redesigned.

Ms. King asked how the Weisman Loop would work for drivers going up East River Road. Mr. Baker responded that they would have to take a right onto Delaware Street behind the student union. They cannot go up to Washington. Jeremy Todd asked if there would be a turn-around on Church Street. Lorelee Wederstrom indicated there is concern about the turn-around, and the planning for this area is not complete. One suggestion is that traffic traveling East on Delaware be delivery or patient access only.

Mr. Baker next discussed the scope of the work occurring between May 2011 and August 2013. In this time there must be:

- Utility relocations,
- Underground systems elements (including train power systems and pole foundations),
- Bridge construction,
- Retaining walls,
- Traffic maintenance during construction,

- Stations,
- Curb& gutter, sidewalks, roadways,
- Traffic signals, striping and signage,
- Track, and
- Landscaping.

The biggest impact of the light rail work will be on Washington Avenue. In May 2011, Traffic over the Washington Avenue Bridge will be reduced to one lane in each direction. The systems testing will occur in 2013.

Next, Mr. Baker discussed the map showing access routes to the University following the installation of the CCLRT. He discussed the multiple routes for accessing the University following the closure of Washington Avenue to cars.

He also presented a map detailing the delivery routes and loading areas. He stated there are four subcommittees, (1) construction, (2) access, (3) research, and (4) communications working on the access issues. They are considering central receiving and delivery options to reduce the volume of delivery traffic on the campus. Some of the issues involved in creating a central receiving and delivery center include having a facility to accommodate this, paying for it, and whether the delivery companies would agree to it. Mr. Baker asked for the committee's input on the proposal. Professor Stephan Roos asked for clarification. Mr. Baker stated there would be a central storage point off campus that would receive all deliveries. Then the University would repack the deliveries into University trucks and deliver them to the requesting department. Ms. King asked how much of a delay this would cause in receiving deliveries. Mr. Baker stated it would be a few hours. Mr. Todd noted this could have an impact on the Office of Classroom Management when they have large deliveries such a 1000 chairs, but he could see the benefit of eliminating congestion on the campus. Mr. Baker responded that 90% of deliveries are handcart deliveries. Bernadette Corley Troge noted that the Walter Library dock was missing on the slide, and stated creating a central receiving center could result in increased cost of \$98,000 to the University Libraries. Mr. Baker noted that the large deliveries such as those for the Bookstore and food service would still come to their ramps.

Mr. Baker next discussed a map showing potential parking inventory reduction. He noted that the following parking lots would be lost due to potential construction.

Lot	Reason for Loss
C-12	Rec Sports Expansion
North star	Cardio/Cancer Research
C-58	Basketball Practice Facility
C-79	Ambulatory Care Clinic

C-51	Greek Village Housing
------	-----------------------

Overall there would be a loss of 1,200 spaces. Mr. Baker stated this might cause an increase in parking costs.

He then discussed the effect of the CCLRT on parking inventory. He stated that the total current parking inventory is 15,548 spaces. There would be potential construction related reductions of 1,176 and potential CCLRT parking impact of - 467 spaces for a net loss of 709 spaces. Mr. Baker stated he does not believe there is too much parking inventory.

A committee member asked how the rerouting of traffic for CCLRT would work with the Mayo Garage traffic, and if the patient traffic would be pushed behind Coffman Union. Mr. Baker stated the turn-around area would be reviewed and priorities for access would be evaluated. Another question was asked about crossing for delivery across Church Street at Washington Avenue. Mr. Baker responded that emergency vehicle access must be accommodated, but the access committee is still wrestling with this issue. Professor Roos asked about solutions for the loss of parking spaces. Mr. Baker said a multi-modal transportation center is being considered on the site of the Minnesota lot. Professor Roos commented that it seemed the surface lot spaces were being undervalued because of the value of the underlying land. Mr. Baker responded that under the cost model, the rate reflect the cost to build and operate spaces. He noted the cost of building a surface lot is about \$5000 per space. The open ramp costs 20,000 to 30,000 per space and the garages cost \$40,000 per space. He noted the parking rates have not increased in the last two years, largely due to football parking revenue.

Ms. King asked whether the CCLRT project would end if federal funding falls through. Mr. Baker responded, "yes" the State could not afford to fund the project without federal assistance. Ms. King thanked Mr. Baker for his presentation.

Hearing no further business, Ms. King adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay
University Senate Office