

Transportation & Parking Committee (TPC)
26 October 2016 Minutes
Perry Street Garage Conference Room

Present:

Mac Babb, Jeri Baker, John Bartos, Virgilio Centeno, Bo Frazier, Debbie Greer, Austin Hannon, Bruce Harper, Andi Ogler, Ryan Speer, Tami Watson

Members excused:

Annabelle Fuselier

AGENDA

Announcement of approval of September 2016 minutes

Meeting minutes were approved by e-mail.

Parking and Transportation update:

Jeri gave an update about permit pricing as requested during the September meeting. She is still working with the Budget Office so there is nothing official but they are looking at the potential of having a Drillfield permit that is 2 or 3 times more expensive than the current faculty/staff permit and a student permit that is 1.5 or 2 times the price of the current student permits for the parking in the Perry Street area. The Budget Office is still reviewing proposals and there is no current information from them yet.

Jeri gave an update on the number of people that have taken advantage of the Chicken Hill parking. There are 77 faculty/staff remote permits at this time.

A question was raised about the pricing for student permits and what areas that might encompass and Jeri explained that no final decision has been made for students or faculty/staff permits. Jeri requested feedback and comments/concerns. It was noted that the Graduate Student Assembly has this item for their meeting on October 27, 2016.

The discussion moves to questions from constituent groups.

Virginia Tech Police Department update:

No report at this time

Constituent reports:

A. Discussion of permit pricing proposal

A question was raised by Bruce who is a 30-year employee with free parking. If I were in that position of wanting to park on the Drillfield how would that work? Jeri explained that if the cost were \$300 for a regular permit and the Drillfield permit was \$900 the price would be the delta of the two so the price would be \$600 if you wanted to take

advantage.

Debbie Greer had questions from constituents of Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs (CAPFA). Questions from CAPFA follow.

1. What is the planning related to the pilot program? Have safety issues been discussed? Will there be buses because if you are having people park farther away there needs to be a way to bus them into campus depending on where pilot program allocates spaces.

Jeri reiterated that this applies to 70 spaces and the assumption is that those spaces 70 people that this affects are easily absorbed in the Perry Street Garage, on the other side of the Drillfield, in the part of the Drillfield near Williams and Davidson. The safety concerns should be addressed by Mac Babb. VT is an extremely safe campus because the VT Police Department does an outstanding job of keeping the campus safe. There is proper lighting and maintenance but I will bring this up with others if they feel it is.

2. What about meetings that visitors/employees have to attend in Burruss? Where are they going to park?

There are spaces in the Williams lot and they are working well. We do daily lot counts every two hours and the finding is that spaces are available and if people are coming to meetings in Burruss this is a place that they can look. In addition, there are the three 15 minute spaces in front of Burruss. There will be two additional 45-minute meter spaces. The pilot will only affect spaces designates as faculty/staff. All other spaces remain the same.

3. What about the housekeepers they generally arrive at 5:00 am and they cannot afford this kind of pricing? Where are they going to park and is there any kind of consideration for that role?
4. What about capacity? Laura Neff-Henderson mentioned in the CAPFA there are always 1200 spots available daily but the issue is in knowing the location.
5. What is the justification for the pricing? Where does that come from and were other universities looked at. Where does that philosophy come from and where are we going with this?

When the Parking and Transportation Plan looked at where VT was in terms of pricing for faculty/staff and student permits we are on the lower end. There was not a specific model used to find the price. The price is justified based on the access that you receive for the guaranteed space or proximity. For this exact model I cannot speak to the justification I do know that the model is based on making future adjustments to pricing.

6. Can additional carpooling be added if this is the plan?

We are always looking for areas where we can add more carpool spaces. This idea is a great benefit for those who utilize it.

7. Will there be monitoring or issuance of tickets due to the structure of overselling

tickets and how do visitors fit into this proposal?

We have a dedicated person for the 15 minute spaces in the Williamson lot and that area is under close patrol. Jeri explained that Bo is working on visitor permits (they are currently free) and they are looking at and trying to address this so that there is benefit for paying permit holders.

A question about looking at salary and whether or not employees are getting raises. We shouldn't justify it by how other schools are charging.

Jeri explained that the master plan only looked at the price of parking. The plan looked at a wide range of schools both public and private. Parking does need money because for the last 2 budget years and the FY 18 year we will have to dip into reserves to pay the bills because the Budget Office has not allowed us to raise permit prices to where they need to be. Parking owes \$2.5 million on Perry Street and \$900,000 on North End.

When parking lots are being replaced by buildings are you involved in the process. Is there communication? What about money paid back to Parking for space disruption?

For the last 8-10 years the University has understood that when they take parking places there needs to be a plan for replacement or compensation so that in the future they can replace those spaces. The parking replacement plan pay approximately \$3000 per lost space. Most projects that have taken place have paid into a parking replacement plan which is a reserve account. The cost is more when replacing spaces with garages. The cost is about \$18,000 – \$25,000 per space. Replacement fees do not cover the cost if the space is a garage.

Drone Park

The Provost has a plan to implement a drone autonomous vehicle park on campus in support of inventing the future. One of the proposed places is the Duckpond overflow lot. The lot has 275 spaces. The current function of the lot is storage for construction vehicles, rescue squad vehicles, rowing club. If this proposal is moved forward, the parking would have to be replaced but this project would probably not be included in the \$3000 per space replacement.

How much more reserve funds do you have in light of dipping into them for the last 3 years? When will the price of permits increase? How long will the reserves last with the current structure in place?

The price of the permits increased this year by \$12 and the increase will probably be \$12-\$15 for next year. An idea instead of increasing permit prices is to charge for camps and events in the summer. Approval is pending. The current reserves will probably last 5 years.

Do you have a 10 or 15-year plan on permit increases?

Permit prices are not projected that far in advance. The budget only covers 3 years.

How much was the suggested increase for permits?

Jeri will get the numbers and share at the next committee meeting.

Why is Parking 100% auxiliary funded?

It is a state statute

Do you get anything from Athletics?

We charge Athletics for the space that they use and work during football games. How much are you charging them? Athletics is charged \$6 per space and they charge customers \$20 per space. Can that price go up? We are working on that with the idea of charging 50% of what they charge over time. How many spaces are you talking about? 8950 roughly

Who gets the money from the North End Center? Parking Services

Ryan provided comments from the Library Faculty Association. The main theme is that it is being perceived as unfair in terms of equity. One suggestion was to price based on a percentage of the employees' salary. Uniformly there was negative feedback from the association. Comments also mentioned not knowing about the availability of short-term parking. De-identified comments will be sent to Jeri. Jeri gave information on the location of short-term parking.

When the Multi Modal is built there will be 800 – 1000 spaces displaced. The preferred area for student parking is proposed to be 1.5 – 2 times more expensive and this would guarantee their parking place.

With this being a pilot program is there a metrics being established to gauge success or if they will go back to the original structure? What are the criteria?

We talked about that with Dr. Wilson and he is measuring the pedestrian and vehicle conflict reduction on the Drillfield. The biggest metric would be total number of the spaces sold and are the complaints received from this pilot are at a manageable level or at a level that the University will not support.

How will space be differentiated when 3000 people want space in a 1000-person lot. It would probably be by lottery with monitoring for compliance.

Questions and answers:

A survey was distributed to solicit feedback on the Bike Share Program.

A. Bike share program

Austin discussed information about what SGA is doing and their processes. Mentioned was SGA legislation to give \$5000 towards a bike share program and supports a \$0.50 increase to the annual transportation fee. A vote is to be held soon. If passed a proposal will be submitted to the green RFP the amount is to be determined.

Jeri shared that the proposal of asking for \$0.50 is huge due to the Budget Office's concern with using student fees to fund a bike share. SGA would have to make the position that student have buy because of funding source differences.

Debbie – I think the Green RFP is a perfect place to put it

There was discussion on bikes being left on campus and handling (aka bike clean up). Bo is working with this area and a request for supplemental funds has been made and ways to improve the process are being investigated.

Next meeting:

The committee will reconvene on November 21, 2016

Adjourn

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was Jeri made and seconded by Debbie.

Respectfully submitted,

Annabelle Fuselier
Recorder