To: City of Bend Citywide Transportation Advisory Committee & CTAC Funding Work Group
Attn: Susanna Julber, Karen Swirsky, and Eric King
From: Steve Porter and Michelle Porter
Date: September 5, 2019

Public Comment:

Transportation System Funding: Paid Parking Case Studies & Financials

Dear Bend Citywide Transportation Advisory Committee & CTAC Funding Work Group:

We previously submitted written comments on parking reforms in Bend and gave a public lecture on transportation economics that encompassed parking. We later received questions about whether paid parking can, in fact, generate revenue in excess of costs.

The answer is yes, as shown by myriad case studies. Our earlier replies to these questions outlined several points of proof, including financial results from paid parking in California and Colorado.

Here, we organize those responses in our conventional public comment format, with added notes and citations. We outline paid parking success in Old Pasadena, California, which is discussed in our earlier public comments. We then trace the financial experiences of San Diego, California; Aspen, Colorado; Boulder, Colorado; Nevada City, California; and Oxford, Mississippi. These case studies are not exhaustive. But they represent a diversity of places and paid parking applications that, despite their dissimilarities, return significant net income in all cases.

Our findings are clear. *Paid parking generates substantial revenue in excess of implementation and operating costs. It also generates broader economic and social benefits as well as transportation system efficiencies.*

Among our case studies, we find Aspen's example most instructive. The Funding Work Group may wish to inspect that city's parking policies for adoption in Bend. Aspen's "Smarking" program generates millions of dollars of annual net income for transportation and, simultaneously, manages the total quantum of system funding needed.

We conclude this comment by outlining plausible parking net income ranges for Bend on the basis of case study evidence. Parking-related net income of about $10 million per year represents a useful benchmark estimate.

We request that the Funding Work Group revisit the use of paid parking and related parking reforms as both funding tools and demand-management mechanisms for Bend's transportation system.

Performance Parking & Related Parking Reforms

Our earlier public comment outlined three parking reforms popularized by urban economist Donald Shoup:

1) Implement "performance parking." Under performance parking, meter prices adjust with demand to target 85% block-hour occupancy rates. Aspen, Colorado's "Smarking" program is one incarnation of this type of metered parking. Boulder's parking pricing is another.
2) Eliminate code-enforced parking minimums for private development, and replace code minimums with maximums, without changing any of the numbers.
3) Institute "parking benefit districts." Parking benefit districts ensure the places responsible for hosting paid parking are fairly remunerated. Districts may use the funds to beautify and improve the area, which helps tenants/residents as well as parking users, in a virtuous cycle. Old Pasadena provides an example.

We have already detailed the economic logic and evidence supporting these reforms. We also previously linked Bend's current parking practices with local business harms and affordable housing problems, and we showed that, in areas of Bend where existing parking demand is high, implementation of paid parking can generate greater overall revenue than property taxes. We finally described proven approaches for ensuring political palatability of instituting the above parking reforms. We will not revisit those points here, but we encourage the Funding Work Group to review our earlier work on parking as well as the vast research on these topics by Donald Shoup.[1]

The following sections of this comment focus on financial case study proofs that paid parking generates significant revenue in excess of costs. From this we show that paid parking represents a useful source of transportation system funding. As possible, we describe how different cities with paid parking programs spend parking revenue, including Aspen's strategic uses of funds to promote non-automotive transportation.

We emphasize at the outset that paid parking is efficient on several bases because it directly links transportation system usage with transportation system funding. It does so "correctively" by attaching fees to usage costs and negative externalities.[2] Paid parking is thus economically efficient and socially fair.

Moreover, paid parking has been shown to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMTs), increase non-automotive transportation usage, and reduce the total costs incurred by transportation systems - thereby decreasing total funding requirements.

---

[1] Porter, "Parking Policy Reforms to Promote Transportation System Improvements" (August 20, 2018).

[2] Because of its myriad benefits, many cities either have recently implemented performance parking or are investigating doing so. One instructive document relating to study of implementing performance parking comes from New Orleans, which outlines other cities' experiences, including model ordinances for implementation: "Study on Parking Benefit Districts and Opportunities for New Orleans," Louisiana Urban Land Institute (2012).

1. Old Pasadena, California

We will limit our discussion of Old Pasadena's paid parking to a sketch of financial results achieved within a few years of the program's inception. The following passage is from Donald Shoup:

> Old Pasadena's 690 parking meters yielded $1.2 million *net* parking revenue (after all collection costs) to fund additional public services in FY 2001. The revenue thus amounts to $1,712 per meter per year. [Funds were spent as follows:] $448,000 goes to repay the $5 million borrowed to improve the sidewalks and alleys… $694,000 was spent to increase public services in Old Pasadena… [This latter figure includes funds for] additional foot patrols and two horseback officers on weekend evenings [and] $426,000…for added sidewalk and street maintenance and for marketing (maps, brochures, and advertisements in local newspapers).
>
> Drivers who park in Old Pasadena finance all these public services, at no cost to the businesses, property owners, or taxpayers. Old Pasadena has done well in comparison with the rest of Pasadena. Its sales tax revenue increased rapidly after parking meters were installed in 1993, and is now higher than in the other retail districts of the city.[3]

Echoing these positive themes, Old Pasadena's former mayor Rick Cole reported that, "in the five years after the Parking Meter Zone [i.e., the Old Pasadena parking benefit district] was established, **property tax revenue tripled**, and **sales tax revenues quadrupled**" (emphasis added).[4]

Thus, incremental income associated with paid parking derives not only *directly* from meters but also *indirectly* from enhanced local economic activity. To ignore this complementarity is to shortchange the financial benefit of metered parking. Nonetheless, as the Shoup quote demonstrates, even if indirect financial returns are ignored, paid parking still generates significant revenue in excess of costs, a point proven since no later than 2001.[5]

2. San Diego, California

San Diego's parking program highlights just how lucrative metered parking is, as it has generated, in a sense, *too much free cash flow*.

As of mid-year 2017 it was reported that there are "millions of dollars (still) parked in San Diego parking benefit districts," even after concerted efforts were made to spend nearly $18 million of excess cash generated by parking

---

[3] Kolozsvari, D. and D. Shoup, "Turning Small Change Into Big Changes," *Access* No. 23 (Fall 2003).

[4] Geeting, J., "Ideas Worth Stealing: Parking Benefit Districts," *WHYY* (March 28, 2016).

[5] The financial figures cited are nearly 20 years old. This is the point. There should be no controversy over whether paid parking programs generate revenue exceeding costs since it has been done and publicized since the turn of the century. The figures also show that, within a few years of implementation of metered parking and the parking benefit district, significant financial benefits already were accruing in Old Pasadena.

meters.[6] This result is a byproduct of a law classifying San Diego parking meter revenue as a "fee" rather than a "tax" and thus limiting how funds retained by the San Diego parking benefit districts can be spent. Specifically, the funds can only be spent on "things that alleviate the parking situation in [each] neighborhood."[7] This is a legal misstep that Bend would do well to avoid in its own implementation of parking benefit districts and paid parking.

Setting the legal peculiarity aside, the issue reveals that San Diego's parking meters generate millions of dollars in funds that exceed any conceivable parking-related spending; system revenue exceeds yearly operational costs by a margin measured in seven figures.

San Diego's parking meter revenue is divided between the city's general fund, which receives 55% of proceeds, and the various parking benefit districts, which retain the remaining 45%. It is from that 45% share that the millions of dollars in excess revenue have derived.

San Diego's parking benefit districts "collect about $2.8 million a year from motorists," indicating that the overall revenue haul from the program is about $6.2 million per year. One of the parking benefit districts is downtown San Diego. Its 45% share of locally-generated meter revenue is about $2.0 million annually, indicating that the downtown district alone generates about $4.4 million in total parking meter revenue each year.[8] The vast majority of San Diego's parking revenue is retained after paying parking-related operational costs.[9]

3. Aspen, Colorado

Aspen, Colorado, has a small population of about 7,000,[10] but, like Bend, experiences significant seasonal tourism. Because of seasonal variation in parking demand and a desire to reduce vehicle trips, the city deployed a paid parking system known as "Smarking."[11] Aspen's Smarking program relies largely upon "pay and display" parking meters, each of which generated average revenue of about $15,000 as of 2015.[12]

---

[6] Bowen, A., "Millions of Dollars (Still) Parked in San Diego Parking Benefit Districts," *KPBS* (April 11, 2017). McDonald, J., "Parking Groups Sit on $17.8 Million," *The San Diego Union Tribune* (December 14, 2014).

[7] Bowen, A., "Millions of Dollars (Still) Parked in San Diego Parking Benefit Districts," *KPBS* (April 11, 2017).

[8] McDonald, J., "Parking Groups Sit on $17.8 Million," *The San Diego Union Tribune* (December 14, 2014).

[9] Detailed financial figures for San Diego's paid parking programs are not accessible to us because of the way in which the funds are accounted for. One reporting problem is that the groups responsible for parking benefit district funds do not generate regular comprehensive reports. Nevertheless, the presence of large retained earnings surpluses demonstrates the parking program's generation of significant annual net income. Indeed, retained earnings figures reported in news coverage imply that virtually all of the parking benefits' districts realized revenue accrue as net income.

[10] United States Census Bureau, "Population and Housing Unit Estimates Tables" (accessed August 2019).

[11] Bouganim, R., "Smarking Enables City of Aspen, CO to Increase Parking Revenue 26%," Govtech Fund (April 22, 2018). U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, "Contemporary Approaches to Parking Pricing: A Primer" (May 2012).

[12] Abraham, C., "Aspen Parking Revenue Surges Despite Scam," *Aspen Daily News* (January 4, 2015).

The city's comprehensive paid parking system also secures revenue through pay-by-phone meters, all-day parking passes, construction parking passes, business vehicle parking permits (which allow local business employees to park in residential areas), lodge parking permits, special parking permits (for event organizers, moving trucks, etc.), as well as a handful of short-term meters that allow 15-minute maximum parking duration. Table 1 sets forth Aspen's overall parking revenue by source for 2014, a year for which a detailed accounting is available.[13]

TABLE 1: ASPEN 2014 PARKING REVENUE

Source	2014 Revenue ($)	2014 Revenue (%)
Pay-and-Display Meters	$1,700,000	45.0%
Construction Parking	$583,570	15.4%
Parking Tickets	$671,568	17.8%
Pay-by-Phone Meters	$450,000	11.9%
All-Day Parking Passes	$149,173	3.9%
Business Vehicle Permits	$77,084	2.0%
Lodge Parking Permits	$28,970	0.8%
Special Parking Permits	$35,686	0.9%
Towing Fines	$45,145	1.2%
Short-Term Meters	$34,150	0.9%
Other	$3,400	0.1%
Total	**$3,778,746**	**100.0%**

Most parking funds are spent on strategic projects, particularly those aimed at reducing automotive travel. For instance, Smarking funded "Aspen's 'Drive-Less Program' [that] offered willing participants a variety of incentives including bike-share passes, bike tune ups, and bus passes in exchange for a pledge to drive less. Over 800 residents [i.e., more than 11% of the city's total population] took advantage of the program."[14]

---

[13] Pay and Display revenue figures are adjusted for a meter glitch that accepted zero-balance debit cards, costing the city about $56,000 in monthly revenue. Abraham, C., "Aspen Parking Revenue Surges Despite Scam," *Aspen Daily News* (January 4, 2015). U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, "Contemporary Approaches to Parking Pricing: A Primer" (May 2012).

[14] The City of Aspen Smarking Case Studies.

Parking income collected by the City of Aspen "contributes to providing a number of transportation alternatives including free transit routes, carpool permit provision and more," a practice that has contributed to Aspen's *reduction* in VMTs over a 20 year period.[15] As early as 2004, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) highlighted Aspen in its publication entitled "Mitigating Traffic Congestion: The Role of Demand-Side Strategies." The FHWA summarized Aspen's parking program as follows: "Money generated from the paid parking program directly benefits demand-side strategies. Traffic volumes have not exceeded 1993 volumes."[16] A later document observed that "Aspen's annual VMT did not increase from 2004 to 2014."[17] Taken together, these statements indicate that Aspen's vehicle usage volumes have not grown in over two decades, at least in part because of paid parking. Indeed, in 2004, Aspen's VMTs were slightly above 155 million, but by 2014 had fallen to 147 million.[18]

Other metrics of success associated with Smarking are an increase in carpooling by 10% and an increase in downtown Aspen summertime sales taxes by 17%.[19]

In mid-year 2018, Aspen implemented three key changes to its Smarking program:

1) Variable Time of Day Pricing (peak season parking is $6/hour from 11a.m. to 3p.m., and $4/hour otherwise; off season pricing is $4/hour from 11a.m. to 3p.m., and $2 otherwise);
2) Elongated Peak Season (peak season was formerly defined as June-August and December-March; the summertime peak season was elongated to include September); and
3) Changed Pricing Structure (previously the pricing structure was tiered so per-hour meter rates escalated as the parking duration increased, with the goal being to encourage turnover; on the basis of data analysis, the tiered pricing structure was eliminated).[20]

We reviewed Aspen's annual financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2018. The city conducts a full accounting of its parking operations on a generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) basis. In 2018, total parking revenue was $5,261,705, of which $2,785,172 was retained as net income (53% income margin). Similar revenue and net income figures were realized in 2017.

Significant expenses associated with Aspen's parking programs are "personnel services" and "general operations," each costing approximately $1.2 million. It appears much of the expense associated with Aspen's parking

---

[15] City of Aspen Website, "FAQs: Where does Parking Meter & Ticket revenue goes?" [sic] (accessed August 2019).

[16] U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration Office of Operations, "Mitigating Traffic Congestion: The Role of Demand-Side Strategies" (October 2004).

[17] Charlier Associates, Inc., "Aspen VMT Model" (August 2015).

[18] The City of Aspen, "2014 Aspen Community-Wide Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Inventory" (July 2015).

[19] Abraham, C., "Aspen Parking Revenue Surges Despite Scam," *Aspen Daily News* (January 4, 2015). The City of Aspen Smarking Case Studies.

[20] Jones, C., "Just When You Thought Parking in Aspen Couldn't Get Any Better…" *Medium* (June 28, 2018).

operations is attributable to its various permits and passes, which are labor-intensive and require physical facilities for administration. If Aspen were to rely more heavily on parking meters, revenue would be lower, but expenses would fall by an even greater proportion, thereby increasing each revenue dollar's income contribution.[21]

We find the experience of Aspen, Colorado, to be particularly interesting and relevant to Bend. We encourage the Funding Work Group to further investigate Aspen's parking programs and strategy, including perhaps recommending that the City of Bend contact Govtech Fund, the firm with which Aspen partnered on its Smarking program. The same firm has more recently partnered with cities including Santa Monica, California; Walnut Creek, California; New Haven, Connecticut; and Miami, Florida.[22]

4. Boulder, Colorado

Boulder's paid parking revenues substantially exceed implementation and operating costs, leaving the surplus for strategic investment. The city uses paid parking as a critical economic development tool as well as a source of revenue to pay for non-automotive transportation, echoing the approach of Aspen.

Boulder implemented the Central Area General Improvement District (CAGID), the nation's first parking benefit district, in 1970. The district's parking revenue was to be "used as an economic development tool for downtown Boulder, paying for pedestrian street improvements in the area and helping create a vibrant destination for visitors."[23] According to the FHWA, Boulder city planners recognized by 1970 that, "in order to offer abundant free parking, as suburban developers did, they would have to redevelop in a suburban style [and] the city would essentially erode land values and become 'suburban' itself. Instead, the city established the first parking benefit district, charging for parking, coordinating on-street and off-street fees, and using the revenue to enhance other transportation modes."[24]

Parking pricing as of 2011 reflected dynamic "performance parking" under which meters and garage parking spaces would "assess variable pricing at 25-cent increments every 12 minutes. This pricing system helps to manage congestion and parking demand while enhancing downtown access for pedestrians, transit commuters and motorists. In 2011, parking revenues amounted to more than $5 million for CAGID. CAGID parking meter revenues have enhanced transit and the pedestrian environment in downtown Boulder."

---

[21] City of Aspen 2018 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report For Year Ending December 31, 2018, p. F7.

[22] Bouganim, R., "Smarking Enables City of Aspen, CO to Increase Parking Revenue 26%," Govtech Fund (April 22, 2018). See, for example: Appel, A., "Pilot OK'd for New Parking Meter Pricing Plan," New Haven Independent (July 12, 2018).

[23] Nichols, C., "Parking as Economic Development Tool in Boulder," *Smart Cities Dive* (2012).

[24] U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, "Contemporary Approaches to Parking Pricing: A Primer" (May 2012).

Much parking revenue is spent to support non-automotive transportation. This is a strategic investment since non-automotive transportation imposes lower costs on the transportation system than vehicle usage, thereby lowering total system funding requirements. “Some parking meter revenues are dedicated to the Eco-Pass Program of the Regional Transportation District, the Denver-Boulder area transit agency. The program provides workers with public transportation alternatives to driving alone. Close to 6,000 downtown employees annually receive free unlimited-ride transit passes. [Boulder invested parking revenue in] the BCycle bike share program. Parking meters also funded streetscaping improvements for the downtown Pearl Street Mall and the enhancement of public Wi-Fi facilities.”

Boulder’s parking program was recognized as “an important business-booster for the area.” “Downtown Boulder’s efforts to transform parking spaces from simple automobile depositories into effective engines for economic development have paid off. It has become a national model for effective transportation practice.”[25] As with Aspen, we believe the Funding Work Group may wish to consider applying Boulder’s parking policies in Bend, both for revenue generation and transportation system demand management.

5. Nevada City, California

Nevada City has a population of about 3,000,[26] though it serves as a tourist destination for skiing and other activities in the area around Tahoe.[27] In an effort to raise additional revenue for spending on various municipal needs, including wildfire mitigation, the city added parking meters and instituted $1/hour parking rates this year.

City officials expect the new parking system to generate about $560,000 per year for the city. At the time of implementation, the city earmarked “20 percent of the new annual revenue - about $100,000 a year - to pay for fire mitigation to remove fire-feeding brush and undergrowth as well as an emergency siren atop the roof of city hall to sound the alarm in an emergency.”

Such arrangement would not be possible without substantial parking revenue in excess of costs. Because of the small scale of Nevada City, this example illustrates that even a modestly-sized and modestly-priced paid parking program can generate significant annual net income.

The city has couched the parking program and the net income it generates as supportive of disaster readiness: “‘These meters can actually help us,’ [councilwoman Erin] Minett said at the June meeting. ‘I hope you all feel really good that when you’re putting money in there that you’re helping us fight fires.’”[28]

---

[25] Nichols, C., “Parking as Economic Development Tool in Boulder,” *Smart Cities Dive* (2012).

[26] United States Census Bureau, “Population and Housing Unit Estimates Tables” (accessed August 2019).

[27] Wikipedia, “Nevada City, California” (accessed August 2019).

[28] Smith, D., “Nevada City Has a Plan to Stay Safe from Wildfire and It Starts at the Parking Meter,” *The Sacramento Bee* (July 19, 2019).

6. Oxford, Mississippi

In Oxford, Mississippi (population 24,528),[29] parking meters were installed in the downtown's central "Square." The Square encompasses four streets and one plaza, where it had been observed that, "when there were no parking meters on the Square, Square business owners and employees arrived early and parked…leaving few empty spaces for customers. …[A 2-hour limit] didn't solve the problem because people who worked around the Square still parked on the streets and moved their vehicles every two hours to avoid fines. …ticket revenue was not even close to cover [the cost of enforcement] services… Parking meters were the answer…Square employees quickly noticed an increase in customers."[30]

Average monthly revenue rose from $60,622 in 2015, the year of installation, to $88,473 as of mid-year 2018. In May 2018, "meters took in $91,913," and "expenses for May were $17,000, leaving a gain of about $75K."

In the 12 months ended September 30, 2018, Oxford's downtown Square "parking meters brought in $867,533," of which was "left $712,147 profit for the year" (82% income margin).[31] The city's parking department retained $1.6 million in net earnings through three years of operation.[32]

Oxford's parking meter pricing schedule is as follows: $0.05 for 2 minutes of parking; $0.10 for 4 minutes; $0.25 for 12 minutes; and $1.25 for 1 hour.[33]

Significantly, the latest U.S. census data indicate household median income for Oxford, Mississippi, is $36,561, whereas in Bend, Oregon, the figure is $60,563, or about 66% higher.[34]

While we do not believe Oxford's approach to metered parking is instructive for Bend, we note that, even when the scale of a paid parking system is small, parking prices are low, and local household incomes are substantially below those found in Bend, paid parking nevertheless generates substantial revenue in excess of costs.

---

[29] United States Census Bureau, "Population and Housing Unit Estimates Tables" (accessed August 2019).

[30] Dolejnic, "Oxford Leaders Continue to Create Square Parking Solutions," *Oxford Stories* (April 19, 2018).

[31] Schnugg, A., "Oxford Square Parking Meters Bring in $800K," hottytoddy.com (October 8, 2018).

[32] IPS Group Industry News, "Monthly Parking Meter Revenue Almost Doubles Since 2015," (June 4, 2018). We estimate Oxford's total count of parking meters to be approximately 200.

[33] The City of Oxford Website, "Downtown Parking" (accessed August 2019).

[34] United States Census Bureau, American FactFinder, "Selected Economic Characteristics, 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; 2017" (accessed August 2019).

Paid Parking Income in Bend

The case studies outlined here are not exhaustive. But they convey the point that paid parking is a reliable and significant source of revenue that greatly exceeds system implementation, maintenance, and administration costs. The examples also can be used to point toward parking net income capacity in Bend. While a complete evaluation of Bend's paid parking income capabilities is beyond the scope of this comment, we can make several observations that provide loosely indicative income ranges for Bend.

First, using Aspen as a guide, we observe that its 2014 VMTs were approximately 147 million and that Aspen's VMTs have been stable or declining for over two decades. We estimate that Aspen's current VMTs are not more than 150 million. We have previously estimated Bend's current VMTs at about 610 million.[35] As of 2018, Aspen generated parking-related net income of $2.8 million. Scaling that figure up in accordance with VMTs implies a figure of about $11.4 million in annual parking-related income potential in Bend.[36]

Second, Nevada City, California, expects $560,000 in new revenue from its parking program. Scaling by population (because VMT data are not available), that figure implies $18.2 million in parking revenue capacity in Bend. Applying Aspen's recorded 2018 net income margin of 53% gives an indicated annual net income value of about $9.6 million. If the observed net income margin of 82% from Oxford, Mississippi, is applied, indicated annual net income is $14.9 million.

Third, we observe that Oxford, Mississippi, despite its program's emphasis on low parking prices (which begin at a nickel), generates about $712,000 in parking net income per year. Scaling that value by population (because VMT data are unavailable) and to account for Bend's median household income advantage implies income capacity in Bend of about $4.6 million per year. We note that Oxford does not charge for parking on Sundays, holidays, and University of Mississippi college football game days. Altogether, these would include many of the highest-demand parking days of the year. We estimate that these exclusions collectively encompass about 80 days annually (i.e., 52 Sundays per year, 20 holidays, and 8 home college football games). Assuming Bend would not impose such self-defeating restrictions on its own parking program, we can gross up the restricted Oxford revenue figure to a conservatively estimated $5.9 million net income capacity for Bend.

Altogether, we can infer that a modest metered parking program in Bend would not likely generate below $6 million per year in net income. If a robust performance parking program similar to that found in Aspen were implemented, Bend could expect parking net income in the range of $10 million per year.

---

[35] Porter, "Evidence Demonstrating the Efficiency, Safety & Economic Benefits of 20mph Speed Limits" (July 13, 2018).

[36] Aspen's median household income is about 6% higher than Bend's. We view this difference as immaterial, but even if it is directly accounted for, the resulting figure is $10.7 million.

These figures ignore follow-on effects from paid parking that increase property taxes and overall economic activity, both of which would generate increased city revenue.

We emphasize that these income calculations are intended to be loosely indicative. Further study is needed. We note, however, that the Funding Work Group believes Bend's residents have the financial capacity to pay for $200 million to $400 million (or more) in bonds;[37] it may be inferred that there is likewise financial capacity for residents, as well as tourists, to generate in the range of $10 million per year in parking net income. Moreover, the Funding Work Group identified the prepared food and beverage sales tax as a funding tool for the transportation system, and estimated that tax would raise about $10.4 million annually.[38] We view paid parking as similar to the prepared food and beverage tax from a household budget perspective, particularly since both apply to residents and tourists.

From a case-study benchmarking perspective as well as a local household budget allowance frame, therefore, an indicated value of $10 million net parking income per year appears eminently plausible. This is particularly the case if a robust performance parking strategy is implemented as an alternative to the proposed prepared food and beverage sales tax.

Thank you for your consideration.

Steve Porter

Michelle Porter

[37] CTAC Meeting #12, "2040 Transportation System Plan Project & Program Evaluation and Preliminary Priorities" (August 22, 2019).

[38] "Initial Funding Assessment" (October 31, 2018), pp. 99-100. "Funding Work Group #5 Memo" (July 17, 2019).

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Steve Porter

Steve is a recognized authority on economic analysis and valuation. He has provided expert testimony in high-stakes commercial litigation on topics including economics, valuation, statistics, econometrics, market definition, consumer choice, business strategy, and pricing, among others. He has consulted with Fortune 500 corporations on intellectual property licensing, asset transactions, and valuation issues, and he has conducted economic impact analyses, including work performed on behalf of the Los Angeles Superior Court. His articles have published in the *Journal of Legal Economics*, *les Nouvelles*, the *Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal*, the *Journal of the Patent and Trademark Office Society*, and *Intellectual Asset Management*, among others. He also is co-author of *IP Strategy, Valuation, and Damages* (LexisNexis), a treatise on intellectual property economics. Some of his work has been cited as authoritative in filings submitted to the Supreme Court and the Federal Trade Commission, and he has been quoted by and featured in the editorials section of the *Wall Street Journal*. He has been an invited speaker before the Chicago Bar Association, the Attorney General's Office of the State of Arizona, and various law firms and corporations, where he has lectured on topics ranging from economic analysis and valuation to econometrics and game theory. He is a recipient of the William J. McKinstry Award in economics, the *Wall Street Journal* Scholar Award, the Micronomics Economic Research Award, and the IE Fund Leadership Scholar Award. He served as a teaching assistant in economics at the Dolibois European Center in Luxembourg, an ad hoc referee for the *Journal of Forensic Economics*, and as Co-Chair and an Executive Committee Member of Young Professionals Advisory Council at the Farmer School of Business. He graduated *summa cum laude* and with University Honors from Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, completing dual majors in economics and marketing. He received his MBA, with honors conferred by the Dean and Board of Academic Affairs, from IE Business School in Madrid, Spain, graduating 5th in a class of more than 400. He holds the Series 65 securities license.

Michelle Porter

Michelle is an expert in valuation, economic analysis, and quantitative methods. She has been engaged by Fortune 500 companies, SMEs, U.S. and international government entities, and leading law firms to provide expertise in high-stakes commercial litigations, negotiations, and asset transactions. Her consulting work has encompassed advisory roles in industries including pharmaceuticals, medical devices, banking, telecommunications, consumer goods, software, and transportation technologies, among many others. Michelle is co-author of the book entitled *IP Strategy, Valuation, and Damages* (LexisNexis). Her articles have appeared in *les Nouvelles*, *Intellectual Asset Management*, *Intellectual Property Magazine*, *Smart Business, Los Angeles Daily Journal*, *The Recorder,* and *China Intellectual Property*, and she has been quoted by *Forbes*. Michelle has spoken before such groups as the Intellectual Property Law Committee of the Chicago Bar Association, Google, and Motorola Mobility. Her work has been recognized with the Accenture International Consulting Competition Top Honors Award, the IE Women Leaders Scholarship Award, the *les Nouvelles* Best Article Award, and the Micronomics Economic Research Award. In addition, Michelle has served as an advisor to the Forte Foundation's MBALaunch for Women, President of the IE Business School Southern California Alumni Association, Co-Chair and Executive Committee Member of Young Professionals Advisory Council at the Farmer School of Business, and an instructor in microeconomics. Michelle graduated *cum laude* from Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, majoring in economics. She received her MBA from IE Business School in Madrid, Spain.