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Introduction:

As one of two main divisions of University Transportation Services, the UTS parking operation is committed to providing a safe and orderly parking program for travelers to and around the University of New Hampshire, engaging a number of procedures and policies designed to provide access to the various parking constituencies to the parking infrastructure. Constituencies include students, employees, parents, visitors, prospective students, attendees to public events, contractors, vendors, trade and service providers, among others. Elements of the parking program include permitting, wayfinding, communication, special event coordination, construction & special circumstance accommodation, metered parking, enforcement and collections.

Specific among these, this analysis will examine statistics drawn from enforcement officer operations, parking ticket issuances, revenue, collections and appeals, as well as the recently-added Pay & Display metered parking program—items broadly categorized as “field operations”. We look back on the past 3-5 years of information and identify trends, areas of strength and opportunities for improvement.

Statistics under review were mined from our parking management database, from BSC and internal personnel/budget data, as well as vendor-supplied data from our Pay & Display system.
PART I: Citations, Issuances:

The following table exhibits a trend in the total number of tickets issued within a fiscal year:

![Table A: Total Tickets Issued](chart)

The following table exhibits trends in issuances of major groupings of violation categories:

- No valid permit/Failure to display
- Expired meter/Time Zone (Note that Pay & Display came online in early FY’15)
- Winter Parking Ban (Note that FY’16 WPB started late & ended early)
- Off Paved Surface/Not in Authorized Space/Over the line

![Table B: Trends in Major Violation Categories](chart)
PART II: Citations, Receivables & Collections

The following table exhibits trends in the collection of citation revenue of tickets issued within a fiscal year. The first measure is the amount collected at the conclusion of the fiscal year that the citations were issued. The second measure shows the amount collected at conclusion of the following fiscal year, e.g. the FY’12 “year later” measure shows the collection value on FY’12 tickets as of the conclusion of FY’13. (Note that the FY’16 “year later” value will be taken on July 1, 2017). The third measure shows the total receivable value of all tickets if 100% had been collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collected within FY</th>
<th>Collected, By Year Later</th>
<th>Total Receivable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>FY14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>FY16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table exhibits trends in the collection rate (% of tickets paid). The first measure shows rate at the conclusion of the fiscal year that the citations were issued. The second measure shows the rate at the conclusion of the following fiscal year, e.g. the FY’12 “year later” measure shows the collection rate of FY’12 tickets at the conclusion of FY’13. (Note that FY’16 “year later” rate will be taken on July 1, 2017.)
PART III: Citations, Appeals

The following table exhibits the trend in the percentage of citations written within a fiscal year are submitted for appeal. To some extent, appeals and their adjudication is an indication of enforcement accuracy.

Table E: % of Tickets appealed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table exhibits the trend in the percentage of appealed tickets that are accepted or reduced. Note that prior to FY’14, reductions were not measured and/or represented a statistically insignificant portion of accepted appeals.

Table F: % Appeals Accepted or Reduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Appeals accepted</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Appeals reduced</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part IV, Revenue Share, Fines & Permits

The following tables demonstrate the proportional fiscal year revenue derived from collected citation fines and annual permit sales, by percentage and dollar amounts. Unlike citation measurements in Part II, citation fine revenue in this section is not limited to citations written within the same fiscal year they were eventually paid, but on any ticket written in any current or prior year (but paid in the noted fiscal year). Also, these values reflect revenue from fines & permits only, but exclude other revenue sources such as meters, day permits, special events, and so on.

Table G-1: Fines & Permits Revenue Share, Percentage

Table G-2: Fines & Permits Revenue Share, Dollars
PART V, Pay & Display Meter Use

Seventeen Cale Pay & Display parking meters were installed in August of 2014, with an additional four meters following in 2015. In most situations, these meters replaced pay-on-entry (Mill Road and Edgewood Visitor Lots) or traditional meter-head parking spaces. In some cases metered parking was established where none had been before. So far there has not been a complete year with all 21 meters in operation the full twelve month calendar year measuring period. Therefore the following tables reflect general measures and trends so far into the pay & display meter program. In cases where multiple meters occupy the same parking lot (e.g. three meters in Mill Road Visitor Lot) the measures have been combined into one location total. Note also that these measures are taken for the calendar year, not the fiscal year, and that both 2014 and 2016 are partial-year measurements.

The following table exhibits the total number of purchase transactions taking place across all Pay & Display meter locations, as well as the total dollar value of those transactions.

![Table H: Pay & Display Transaction and Revenue Totals](image)

The following table exhibits the average time purchased across all meter locations:

![Table I: Avg. Time Purchased (hrs)](image)
The following table exhibits the number of purchase transactions taking place at each meter location during each of the calendar year periods.

![Table J: Pay & Display Transactions by location](image)

The following table exhibits revenue taken at each meter location during each of the calendar year periods.

![Table K: Pay & Display Revenue by location](image)
The following table exhibit the number of transactions performed across all meters, broken out by payment type (coin versus credit card), and total combined, as well as percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase Count - Coin</th>
<th>Purchase Count - Card</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table L-1: Pay & Display Payment Method, Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table L-2: Pay & Display Payment Method, Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% By Coin | % by Card

The following table exhibits the average purchase amount made across all meters, broken out by payment type (coin versus credit card) and total combined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Purchase Amount - Coin</th>
<th>Average Purchase Amount - Card</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table M: Avg. Purchase Amount by Payment Method.
Part VI: Trend in Special Event Revenue

The following table exhibits a trend in revenue collected from special event requests. This includes revenue from parking space/permit requests, reservation fees, sign fees, attendant fees, and “coupon codes”. Coupon Codes are provided to a requesting department to generate parking permits at Pay & Display station to park at the associated lot, and do not require pre-printed permits nor a greeting attendant at a lot. This method of permitting was introduced shortly after the launch of the Pay & Display stations in FY’14.

![Table N: Special Event Revenue](image)

Part VII: Trend in Vehicle Use

The following table exhibits the annual miles put on the parking operations vehicles. Starting in FY’15, enforcement operations adopted a “zone enforcement” scheme which among other things limited the amount of time required to be in cars driving across campus. As a result we’ve seen a decline in mileage.

![Table O: Operations Vehicle Miles](image)
Part VIII: Labor & Production

The following table exhibits a cross reference between parking enforcement labor cost and the issuance of citations. Overall we have seen an increase in productivity and efficiency despite decreasing labor costs.

Summary

The data drawn in this overview examination of parking field operations has shed light on the efficacy of traditional procedures, new practices, innovation and technology, and managerial determination to realize streamlining and efficiency. With a few examples of “down years” in evidence, for the most part the examination period has trended towards improvements on all of the aspects scrutinized (most particularly, our revenues have gone up).

This type of overview examination is intended to be a basis for ongoing comparative analysis. While positively trending statistics affirm operational successes to this point, by no means does this signal an end to the quest for improvement through planning and innovation.