

## Report – Transportation and Parking Subcommittee

The Transportation and Parking Subcommittee (TPS) met December 2, 2010 with the following members in attendance: Scott Prosser, Paul Donoghue, Len Paris, and guest presenters Alex McIsaac and Sonia Borg.

The meeting agenda comprised: 1) an update report on the current status of the parking ancillary from Alex McIsaac, Manager, Parking and Transportation Services, 2) a review of the preliminary budget from Sonia Borg, Assistant Director Ancillary & Student Services and 3) other business.

The current status of the parking space inventory as at November 2010 is a total of 2,374 spaces available. There is the potential for a few more spaces opening up as the construction equipment is removed from some areas. It was reported that the ancillary anticipates having 2,448 spaces available by September 2011.

There will be a price increase of 3% that was part of the multi-year plan earlier communicated that was put in place so that significant increases would not be necessary to cover the cost of the new parking deck. There was discussion around the parking enforcement. Fines are not seen as a source of revenue but more to ensure parking compliance. At UTM the city issues and gets the revenue from fines. It was noted that UTM is in a better position than St. George where they must pay for the enforcement however they do not receive revenue from the fines. Discussion centered on privately enforcing parking and it was agreed it would be an administrative burden. If there are accidents in the parking lot, Campus Police write up the reports but then it is the individual's responsibility to file through the city. The role of campus police was discussed. L. Paris advised that Campus Police are more active in assisting with towing, safety and fraudulent permits and only writes about 5% of the fines.

Discussion was tabled around angled parking to accommodate more vehicles in less space. A. McIsaac shared the experience at St. George where this layout may cause more accidents since most of the drivers are less experienced and the angled layout results in narrower spaces and laneways. It was mentioned that this concern may be mitigated through education and signage. It was suggested that this option could be looked at in advance with the possibility of implementation as lots need to be repaved. It was agreed that developing this type of study now, during a quieter period when the current parking facilities exceed the demand, was ideal. S. Prosser suggested that one lot could be used as a pilot study to gather data. P. Donoghue suggested looking at this with the area of Lot 1 near the Instructional Centre. He noted that two layouts could be generated, one with angled and the other with traditional parking, prior to remedial work being done on that site.

A question was raised about the total cost for the parking deck construction and how that cost was being recovered if the fees were only being increased by 3%. P. Donoghue advised the members that the parking deck cost was \$6.9M and that the cost was taken into consideration when the multi-year plan was devised specifically so that

rates would not dramatically increase upon its completion. He further noted that building a deck was chosen over an enclosed parking garage to limit the cost but also because it allows for similar future parking expansion over other existing lots which the intention of continuing to preserve the natural environment.

An inquiry was raised about the cost of parking for the public that uses the Athletic Centre. A. McIsaac advised members that presently individuals with public annual memberships to the Athletic Center pay \$50 annually for a parking permit in Lot 8. The parking activity of this group is monitored and indicates that most of their parking usage is evenings and weekends. A member commented that the rate seemed very low. It was suggested that the fee be reviewed for potential increase. It was noted that there may be push back from the Athletic Center if the fee is raised. It was explained that the low fee was put in place when the Center was new and now that it is successful, an increase should not have the same negative consequences.

A question was raised about utilizing environmental surfaces for future parking construction. It was explained that this option has been thoroughly investigated and is extremely expensive. It would increase construction costs and ongoing maintenance by more than triple and is not currently an option.

P. Donoghue noted that there was nothing new to report in transportation. He commented that the students voted overwhelmingly for retaining the UPass as well as expanding it to include the summer months and making it available to part-time students. He noted that this initiative should work to further soften the demand for parking. It was noted that it is planned to keep the carpool spots and it that they were placed in predominate spots in the hopes of motivating more users. He further reported that the sidewalk is almost finished and that roadway safety continues to be looked at. Traffic consultants have pointed out dangerous points in the road way, including the sweeping curve between the North Building and the Instructional Centre. A layout that would have squared-off that corner and resulted in a 'T' intersection with three-way stop signs has been developed. However, due to the strong concerns expressed by the Grounds Monitoring Committee and the complications that arose around a Chestnut tree, there was not sufficient time to reach a final decision. The revised layout has been put on hold. In the meantime the plan is to install more speed bumps while continuing to look at alternatives.

It was agreed that the preliminary budget did not need to be reviewed as the members had attended the presentation by C. Capewell at the November 29, 2010 meeting of the Resource Planning and Priorities Committee.

Professor Scott Prosser, TPS Chair.