City of Tucson
Transit Connections Focus Group

Strengthening Tucson’s Frequent Transit Network

October 4, 2018 Meeting
9-11am  TDOT, 201 N Stone, 4th Floor Conf. Room
Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Review: Meeting Agenda & Discussion
3. Presentation: Transit Connections Values
4. Presentation: Recommendations Progress Update
5. Project Team Presentations, Q&A, and Discussion: Transit Funding; Park Tucson Budget
   - What opportunities exist to develop transit-supportive policies?
   - Are there ideas for raising money, and/or funding transit using sources other than raising fares?
   - Is there anything that we haven’t thought of?
6. Report Back
Review: Meeting Agenda & Discussion

Jan Waukon, Facilitator
Transit Connections
Values Base

Jenn Toothaker, Project Manager
Transit Connections Recommendations – Value Base

Shared at July 19, 2018 Meeting

Presented as an option for connecting these elements to all of the recommendations and strategies/tactics

---

Transit Connections Focus Group
Strengthening Tucson’s Frequent Transit Network through Integrated Transportation Planning including Active Transportation, First-/Last-Mile Connections, and Parking Connections
www.tucsonaz.gov/transit/transit-connections

Draft Transit Connections Recommendations Value Base
The Transit Connections Recommendations are based on four values that are foundational to the success of the Frequent Transit Network. The intent is for the Recommendations to each reflect at least one of the four values. Space is provided for you to comment on the description of the values and other ideas or suggestions you have about them.

Safely: Creating a transit environment that is safe and perceived as safe regardless of whether you are using transit, connecting to transit or waiting to use transit.
Comments:

Legibility: The transit system allows the public to easily and successfully find their destination enabling individuals to:
- Understand where they are with respect to other key locations
- Orient themselves in an appropriate direction with little misunderstanding or stress
- Discover new places and services.
Comments:

Accessibility: Transit is easy to get to regardless of ability or mode of connection. Transit connects the community to neighborhoods, community services, and commerce.
Comments:

Equity: Mobility is a fundamental human right and everyone deserves to have safe, reliable and affordable transportation options regardless of age, income, race, ethnicity or disability.
Comments:
Transit Connections Recommendations – Value Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Base</th>
<th>Complete Streets Guiding Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legibility</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Vitality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Connections Recommendations: Progress Update

Jenn Toothaker, Project Manager
8/8/17 Mayor and Council Direction

Return with List of Recommended Actionable Items that:

• Builds from the Transit Vision (the Frequent Transit Network) developed with transit expert Jarrett Walker
• Considers pedestrian and bicycle connections with high-use bus routes
• Identifies strategies for how to increase ridership
• Recommends locations of bus rapid transit (BRT) and modern streetcar routes
• **Considers how parking revenues can support the Transit Vision**, and
• Considers ways to expedite implementing pilot programs (e.g. future bus routes)
Recommendations Progress to Date

- Project Team has been reviewing the Recommendations list with all the additional comments
  - What is already underway, or will be? (Planning processes, projects, day-to-day opportunities)
  - What are things that can be undertaken in next 3-5 years? Or longer?
- Identifying/organizing the Recommendations list as a way to document these connections
- Recommendations report will begin to be drafted
Meetings Outline & Progress to Date

Preliminary List of Actionable Recommendations

#1 Kick-off
#2 Tour
#3 Best Practices
#4 Goals & Recomm.
#5 Revise Goals & Recomm. & Values
#6 BCCs
#7 Budgets & Opportunities
#8 Draft Recomm. Report

You are Here
Presentations: Project Team Presentations, Q&A, and Discussion

TDOT and Regional Funding Sources for Transit
Alternative Transit Management Models
Agency and Service Delivery Options

Regional Transit Operating Expenditures by Jurisdiction

City of Tucson
- General Fund
- RTA IGA Funds
- FTA Grants

RTA
- RTA Transit Funds
- MOE Pass Through Funds

Pima County
- General Fund

Town of Marana
- General Fund

Town of Oro Valley
- General Fund

Sun Tran
- Sun Van
- Sun Express
- Sun Link

Sun Shuttle
- RTA SNT
- Ajo DAR
- OV DAR

OV DAR Senior Services

MOE (Maintenance of Effort)
Regional Transit Expenses by Mode

- Sun Shuttle Fixed Rte & DAR
  - $8,800,000
  - 9.9%

- Sun Van
  - $15,785,230
  - 17.8%

- Sun Link
  - $3,821,344
  - 4.3%

- Sun Tran
  - $60,069,713
  - 67.9%
Regional Transit Ridership by Mode

- **Sun Link**: 899,854 riders (5.4%)
- **Sun Van**: 518,423 riders (3.1%)
- **Sun Shuttle (Fixed Route Only)**: 114,522 riders (0.7%)
- **Sun Tran**: 15,205,419 riders (90.8%)
Sun Tran Operating Revenue FY 2018

- **Passenger Revenue**: $10,932,773 (18.2%)
- **RTA**: $6,550,059 (10.9%)
- **FTA Grant Funding Preventative Maintenance**: $4,640,000 (7.7%)
- **Other IGA**: $606,737 (1.0%)
- **Pima County IGA**: $3,192,238 (5.3%)
- **Other**: $1,131,603 (1.9%)
- **Advertising**: $539,885 (0.9%)

**General Fund (Prelim)**: $32,476,418 (54.1%)
Sun Tran Operating Expenses FY 2018

- Wages, Salaries & Benefits: $41,115,251, 68.4%
- Vehicle Maintenance: $5,124,655, 8.5%
- Fuel: $5,275,614, 8.8%
- Legal & Other Professional Services: $4,787,804, 8.0%
- Insurance: $1,794,414, 3.0%
- Other: $1,971,975, 3%

Total Operating Expenses: $61,491,831
Peer Comparison
Operating Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Per Passenger Trip</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>$3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>$3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>$3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>$4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>$4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>$4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>$5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousand Palms</td>
<td>$5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>$6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>$6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>$9.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Per Revenue Mile</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>$6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>$6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>$6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>$7.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>$7.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>$7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>$7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>$7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousand Palms</td>
<td>$7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>$8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>$9.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>$10.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Low cost per passenger** - related to the stronger than average ridership

**Low cost per mile** indicates good fiscal management.
**Peer Comparison**

**Fares**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Average Fare</th>
<th>Farebox Recovery (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>$1.11</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>$0.98</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>$0.88</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>$0.86</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>$0.80</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>$0.73</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>$0.71</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>$0.69</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>$0.67</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousand Palms</td>
<td>$0.66</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>$0.59</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>$0.33</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Low average Fare** – Evidence of city’s commitment to low fares

**Farebox recovery** - middle of the pack even with low fares…a combination of fiscal restraint and higher ridership
### Peer Comparison

**Passenger Trips & Vehicle Miles**

**Passenger Trips Per Revenue Hour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Passengers per Revenue Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>32.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>28.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>26.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>25.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>22.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>20.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>20.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousand Palms</td>
<td>19.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>17.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>17.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>12.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vehicle Miles per Capita**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Vehicle Miles per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>14.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>13.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>11.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>10.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousand Palms</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Passengers per Revenue Hour** shows strong ridership

**Miles Per Capita** – Indicates high level of service for population
Presentations: Project Team Presentations, Q&A, and Discussion

Park Tucson Budget
Park Tucson Budget and Transit-supportive Parking Policies

Transit Connections Focus Group

October 4, 2018
Mayor and Council Directive to Transit Connections Focus Group:

“Consider how Parking Revenues can support the Transit Vision”
An Outline for Approaching this Directive

1. What is Park Tucson’s budgetary capacity for redirecting a portion of revenues to transit, given current and forecasted revenues and obligations?

2. Consider how additional parking revenues might be generated through Parking Policy changes.

3. What non-fiscal Transit-friendly Parking Policies could be enacted?
1. What is Park Tucson’s budgetary capacity for redirecting a portion of revenues to transit, given current and forecasted revenues and obligations?

**Park Tucson Fund:**

- Park Tucson operates within a “special fund” of the COT General Fund (Fund 005). Park Tucson is expected to cover expenses of running its programs with only self-generated revenue. The Park Tucson Fund Balance is carried over from fiscal year to year and is intended to safeguard the General Fund from having to subsidize any parking operations.

- The Fund Balance ideally contains sufficient funds to cover 90 days of operating reserves to protect the General Fund and Park Tucson from an extraordinary loss of revenue or significant expense; this calculated reserve is currently around $1.4M. The Fund 005 balance at the end of FY2018 was $1,580,627.

- Park Tucson revenues have increased during a period of economic expansion.
1. What is Park Tucson’s budgetary capacity for redirecting a portion of revenues to transit, given current and forecasted revenues and obligations?

Revenues and Expenses:

- Revenues have increased over the last five years, due to increased development and business activity in the city center, and due to improved capture of potential revenue opportunities. Revenue in FY2018 was $5,915,952.
- Over that time, Park Tucson has invested in:
  - Parking Access & Revenue Control Systems: garages, meters
  - Enforcement: hardware and software, enabled PT to take on citation collections function
  - Physical maintenance of off-street facilities
  - Security systems
  - LED lighting for all garages
- Operating expenses have been 70-75% of revenues since 2014.
- Metered parking is a more efficient way of generating excess parking revenues than structured parking, but structured parking is needed to accommodate density and replace surface lots.
Park Tucson Expenditures by Type, FY2018

- Debt Service: 32%
- Administration & Overhead: 26%
- Facility Maintenance & Utilities: 9%
- Security: 12%
- Meters: 5%
- Enforcement: 3%
- General Fund Contribution: 3%
Debt Service

• A significant part of Park Tucson’s financial obligations, totaling 32% of revenue in FY2018 ($1,872,063).

• Pennington Street Garage, Centro Garage are the two largest components of debt service.

• Also, LED lighting for garages and an old debt issuance for parking meters.

• Debt service peaked in FY2018 and will decline slowly until FY2024, after which it will drop more dramatically.
# PARK TUCSON DEBT (PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST) BY YEAR, TO MATURITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Centro Garage</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pennington Street Garage</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>LED Lighting Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Parking Meters (Duncan)*</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total All Debt</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$585,505.72</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1,039,077.98</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$222,467.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$25,011.82</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1,872,062.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$585,871.32</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$1,038,754.98</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$128,431.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$25,911.82</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$1,778,969.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$585,537.16</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$957,206.98</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$134,440.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$20,951.82</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1,698,136.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$584,523.06</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$846,890.98</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$140,626.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$151.82</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$1,572,192.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$747,804.02</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$811,500.58</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$147,342.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$281.52</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$1,706,928.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$750,276.62</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$808,904.96</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$154,259.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$276.32</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$1,713,717.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$751,120.66</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$757,871.28</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$152,320.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$400.84</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$1,661,713.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$745,413.60</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$87,133.02</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$159,295.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$390.46</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$992,232.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$748,111.70</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$91,417.56</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$175,191.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$636.90</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$1,015,357.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$748,150.00</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$70,671.26</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$89,416.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$1,000.06</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$909,238.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$749,830.00</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$69,388.10</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$981.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$820.96</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$820,199.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$749,380.00</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$749,380.00</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$749,380.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$746,800.00</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$746,800.00</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$746,800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$747,090.00</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$747,090.00</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$747,090.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $17,984,019.81

*Duncan meters were financed in 1999, but IPS smart meters were paid for in cash, have no debt. Some Duncan meters are still in use.*
1. What is Park Tucson’s budgetary capacity for redirecting a portion of revenues to transit, given current and forecasted revenues and obligations?

Park Tucson provides financial support for the following non-parking programs:

– Payment of ~$200,000/year to General Fund from citations collected
– In-kind staff support for Sun Link: ticket vending machine collections, card restocking
– Neighborhood Reinvestment Program
New Parking Structures

Park Tucson fund may be tasked to cover the debt service for one or more future parking garages to support economic development (and likely replacing surface parking):

– 4th Avenue Business District
– West Side/Mercado District
– Tucson Convention Center
– Ronstadt Transit Center redevelopment
– Other areas
1. What is Park Tucson’s budgetary capacity for redirecting a portion of revenues to transit, given current and forecasted revenues and obligations?

The potential for providing significant funding from parking revenues for transit is limited, without considering changes to parking policies that can generate more parking revenue or changes to the market.
2. Consider how additional parking revenues might be generated through Parking Policy changes.

- Extend the geography of managed/paid parking
- Extend the days/times when parking is charged
- Increase parking rates
Extend the geography of managed/paid parking

- Metered parking on-street in the Mercado District (consider park-and-ride aspect of that area as the west end of Sun Link)
  - Projected revenue: $125,000 per year
- Restrict parking in peripheral areas of Downtown and other commercial districts (through meters, permit-only, time restrictions). Eliminate pockets of free on-street parking. Revenue impact: limited
Extend the days/times when parking is charged

• Metered on-street parking
  – Currently Monday to Friday, 8am to 5pm
  – Option: Extend into weekday evenings
  – Option: Extend to Saturdays
  – Revenue Potential: $400K - $500K net per year if weekdays extended to 9pm and Saturdays added
  – Consider loss of customers to other areas of city w/apparently “free” parking

• Off-street surface lots
  – Charge at all surface lots evenings/weekends
  – Revenue Potential: limited with current land uses

• Charge at Library Garage on weekends (other garages are charged 24/7)
  – Revenue Potential: limited with current land uses
Increase Parking Rates

- **Off-street Permits for Commuters**
  - Limited by Market; COT owns just 30% of off-street parking, cannot unilaterally set rates

- **On-street Permits for Commuters/Students**
  - Have increased over the years based on market conditions
  - FY2018 Revenue: $117,375
  - City transferring several streets to UA >>> fewer spaces to sell >>> revenue will decline

- **On-street Permits for Residents**
  - Increased from $2.50/year in 2010, now $48/$60/$72 per year
  - Strong resistance to a rate increase likely

- **Daily Visitor Parking**
  - Hourly/Flat rates at Garages/Lots
    - Could increase marginally, esp. weekend nights
    - FY2018 Revenue: $1,374,645
  - Meter Rate, currently $1.00/hour in all areas
    - Average revenue per meter varies by business district and within districts
      - Main Gate/University perimeter is highest, 4th Avenue the lowest
    - Revenue Potential: ~$400K/year if raised universally to $1.50/hour
3. **What non-fiscal Transit-friendly Parking Policies could be enacted?**

- Assignment of parking revenue to support transit could be limited in the foreseeable future, especially if one or more new garages is built at Park Tucson expense.
- However, some parking policies could be adopted for the city center and city-wide that could support transit.
3. **What non-fiscal Transit-friendly Parking Policies could be enacted?**

- Aforementioned policies that would generate incremental additional revenue would also encourage transit use rather than single-occupant vehicle use
- Development-related policies to discourage provision of excess parking
  - Encourage developers to provide less parking, more support for transit
    - Extend the “no minimum” or reduced minimum parking requirements to areas of city outside Infill Incentive District
    - Establish maximum parking limits on new development city-wide
    - Encourage developers to provide park-and-ride facilities
  - Use of IID/IPP process to encourage transit use rather than parking
    - Encourage low parking ratios
    - Recently approved Individual Parking Plan for Union on 6th required developer subsidy of 50% of tenant transit passes, parking fees to be unbundled from rent, and use of excess parking at The District if new on-site parking was insufficient
  - Encourage more partnerships with employers to promote ridership
3. What non-fiscal Transit-friendly Parking Policies could be enacted?

Reduce/end public subsidies for parking

- Downtown Allowance for City employees working Downtown; $25/month.
  - Can be used to offset cost of parking or transit. Considered an employee benefit.
  - Costs General Fund $230,520 in FY2018
  - Elimination of the Allowance may increase transit ridership among City employees, but would reduce the amount of parking revenue available to support parking or transit

- Reduce use of parking incentives when recruiting new businesses to city center. Include transit in incentive packages.
  - Multi-jurisdictional cooperation needed
  - Hexagon Mining example
3. **What non-fiscal Transit-friendly Parking Policies could be enacted?**

- Promote car-pooling in public parking facilities (premium locations for car-pools) >>> reduces need for parking capacity

- What other ideas does the Focus Group have?
Discussion Questions:

• What opportunities exist to develop transit-supportive policies?

• Are there ideas for raising money, and/or funding transit using sources other than raising fares?

• Is there anything that we haven’t thought of?
Adjourn

Next Meeting:
Nov. 1
9-11am
TDOT 4th Floor Conf Room

Meeting Topic: Review Draft Recommendations Report
Thank you!