

PARKING AT THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

INTRODUCTION

The guiding principles of the College's 1987 Master plan stated that:

“the pedestrian character of the campus core should be promoted and emphasized. The proposed corridors or avenues should assume a significant role in linking sub-campus areas, lending order for future development, and ensuring a vital and safe fabric for student-faculty interaction.”

The 2003 Campus Design Guidelines Report reaffirms and expands on those principles, calling for a pedestrian-oriented campus and defining pathways to achieve it.

In 1999 the College conducted a parking demand study which documented a shortfall of some 500 spaces on campus. The initial response to this demand is the construction of the 500 space parking deck located on the Adair tennis court site. Construction of the deck will require an increase in the parking fees which, while not out of line with other institutions, are significant on this campus. Prior to this time, members of the College community were accustomed to low cost, convenient parking, adjacent to their ultimate destinations. That expectation still exists today.

Finally, the College is about to undertake a construction program the likes of which have not been seen since the late 1960s and early 70s. Over the next decade we will construct, expand and/or renovate some 15 to 20 buildings, many of them in close proximity to south campus along the Jamestown Road corridor. This has created concern not only in the College community, but in the adjacent neighborhoods as well, about the impact on parking. With the exception of the Business School placement on the Common Glory lot, this construction will not eliminate current parking spaces. The long term goals of the 2003 design guidelines, however, might eventually lead to the closure of some roadways and the parking spaces they hold.

All of these factors combine to present a challenge to the current way in which we operate the College's parking program. This paper takes a fresh look at parking on the campus and suggests solutions that achieve our goals while providing parking to faculty, staff and students which meets their needs and mitigates the impact on the surrounding community. Through a combination of policy changes, enforcement practices and additional space, it is possible to meet campus parking needs and provide relief to the local community.

CURRENT PROGRAM

The College operates its parking program as an auxiliary enterprise. There are multiple lots of varying sizes which, along with street parking, provide 4,289 parking spaces on the main campus. (Attachment 1). These spaces are used by faculty, staff, resident students, day students, visitors, guests of special events and College vehicles.

In 1993, as required by law, all program-related costs, operations, maintenance and construction, became funded through fees or other private sources of funding. Thus, the Parking Services operation is a self-supporting enterprise which performs the following major functions: vehicle registration, decal sales, enforcement, motorist assistance and fine collection. It also funds all maintenance and construction costs.

Current Policies and Procedures

Over the years the College has developed policies and procedures governing the use of parking. Parking is available to all faculty and staff. Students employed part-time by the College are treated as students, not staff. While juniors and seniors are permitted to bring cars to campus, freshman and sophomores are not with some exceptions. Sophomores who are assigned to live in the Dillard complex may have a car. There are approximately 160 sophomores who are granted this privilege each year.

Currently no distinction is made between "Social" Juniors and "Academic" Juniors.

A social junior is a student who has been on campus for four semesters. An academic junior is a student who has completed the academic requirements for a freshman and sophomore.

With the growth in advanced placement credits and the strong academic standing of William and Mary students, approximately 200 social sophomores are academic juniors and may bring a car to campus. Prior to the advent of Banner, it was only possible to track students by their academic standing not their social standing. Banner enables us to track both.

Additionally, approximately 100 freshmen and sophomore students are granted exceptions annually. To receive an exception, they must document the need for a vehicle due to a disability, to support an off-campus job of at least 10 hours a week, or for approved volunteer service.

Spaces are designated in five general categories: faculty/staff, day student, resident student, visitor, and service vehicle. The spaces designated for faculty and staff are restricted to that use on Monday through Friday, 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Students may park in those areas outside these hours. Other exceptions include:

- approximately 270 sophomore and juniors living at the Dillard Complex who may park in the Common Glory Lot (a day student lot) due to the distance from the main campus,

- approximately 350 resident students residing in the Ludwell Complex who may park in the Common Glory Lot until 9:00am Monday through Friday, and

- approximately 240 students residing in the Graduate Complex who may park in the Common Glory Lot during weekdays.

There are a number of spaces that are specifically reserved for individuals based on their duties and responsibilities. These spaces include those reserved for the Provost, Associate Provosts, Vice Presidents, Deans, Residence Life Area Directors and Student Health Center

employees. The restrictions for these spaces are 7 days a week, 24 hours a day based on the fact that emergencies and weekend/holiday work often require their attention.

Parking Fees

Parking Fees for the last 10 years have been as follows:

1993-94	\$50	1998-99	\$60
1994-95	\$52	1999-00	\$60
1995-96	\$52	2000-01	\$90
1996-97	\$52	2001-02	\$90
1997-98	\$52	2002-03	\$120

In 2000 the College began to increase the parking fee in anticipation of constructing a parking deck. The incremental funds have been collected and held in reserve to support the debt service on the bonds for the deck. As of July 1, 2003, \$570,000 has been collected for this purpose.

In 2003, the College established a tiered pricing structure based on salary. The linchpin of the structure is Tier 3. The fee for Tier 3 in 2003 is \$135.

PARKING FEE STRUCTURE

FACULTY AND STAFF

TIER 1* EARNING LESS THAN	\$20,000	50% OF TIER 3
TIER 2 EARNING BETWEEN	\$20,001 and \$40,000	75% OF TIER 3
TIER 3 EARNING BETWEEN	\$40,001 AND \$100,000	100% OF TIER 3
TIER 4 EARNING MORE THAN	\$100,000	125% OF TIER 3
VIMS GLOUCESTER CAMPUS		66% OF TIER 3

* TIER 1 INCLUDES HOURLY AND PART-TIME EMPLOYEES

STUDENTS

TIER 3	RESIDENT AND DAY STUDENTS	100% OF TIER 3
TIER 1	PELL GRANT STUDENTS	50% OF TIER 3
TIER 1	EVENING STUDENTS	50% OF TIER 3

GENERAL PURCHASE

TIER 4	ALL OTHER	125%	OF
			TIER 3

To fund the debt service on the Adair parking deck over the next 20 years, the parking fee is projected to rise through the 2007-08 academic year.

<u>Tier</u>	<u>2003-2004</u>	<u>2007-2008</u>
1	\$70	\$140
2	\$100	\$210
3	\$135	\$280
4	\$170	\$350

To put this in perspective, the College today is well below what many Virginia schools charge for parking. For example, the University of Virginia charges \$35 per month or \$420 per year. VCU charges \$54 per month or \$658 per year. ODU and JMU have tiered systems.

ODU has four tiers:

<\$20,000	-\$126
\$20,000-\$39,999	-\$163
\$40,000-\$59,000	-\$201
\$60,000+	-\$239

JMU has six tiers:

<\$2500	-\$0
\$2500-\$19,999	-\$72
\$20,000-\$39,000	-\$144
\$40,000-\$59,000	-216
\$60,000-\$79,000	-\$288
\$80,000 +	-\$360

The cost of constructing, operating and maintaining parking systems does not vary to a significant degree among these institutions given that they are on state-owned property. There were predictions that the increase in the fee on campus would decrease the number of decals sold. To date, there is no evidence of a decline in sales.

Parking Demand

Faced with increasing complaints about insufficient parking, the College formed a Parking Oversight Committee in 1999 and commissioned a parking study. The objectives of the study were to:

- maintain pedestrian orientation of the campus,
- improve the availability of parking,
- reduce parking on adjacent residential and commercial streets, and
- manage the parking program in a manner that makes the best use of existing conditions and adds spaces when and where they are needed.

The study found that there was significant and documented demand for parking by faculty, staff and students which resulted in excessive vehicular traffic and parking in the interior. More importantly, the issue could not be resolved by suppressing demand. The study also concluded that ideal locations for additional parking facilities were intersections of campus and offsite roads. Finally, the study quantified the shortage at 480 spaces.

A building committee was established in 2000 to select a site for a parking facility that could accommodate 500 spaces. The committee, with the assistance of a consultant, concluded that this could not be achieved via a paved lot without encroaching on conservation areas and that a deck would be required. The Adair site was selected in 2001 principally because it could hold the requisite number of spaces and was located in close proximity to new campus where the greatest demand for parking exists.

The selection was further supported by the selection of a site adjacent to Adair to house the new business school. Complicating the selection was the fact that the business school site selection would result in a loss of some 300 spaces on the Common Glory Parking Lot, reducing the net gain created by the deck.

In addition to the daily needs of the College population, large scale special events such as athletic events, conferences, public events rental of William and Mary Hall, Admissions Open Houses and popular events at the University Center present parking demands beyond

the current supply. As a result, visitors are frustrated by the lack of parking, employees and students are asked to relocate and individuals choose to park in areas that create hazardous conditions or cause damage to the grounds.

To accommodate this demand, invited guests for athletic events are permitted to park along the Crim Dell, football and basketball attendees are permitted to park on both sides of Compton Drive and meeting attendees at the Alumni Center are permitted to park on both sides of Alumni Drive and along the right side of Gooch Drive. Meetings and conferences in the University Center have required allowing parking on the practice football field.

Developments not foreseen in 1999 will have an impact on parking and pedestrian and traffic patterns. The construction activity that will take place on campus over the next decade will have a decided effect on these patterns. College response to shifting demand will require careful planning as well as flexibility.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Two major issues face the College: first, a reassessment of demand in light of the 2003 campus design report, and a determination of how best to meet that demand in a way that minimizes negative impacts on the College and the Williamsburg community as a whole; and, second, managing the disruption caused by the construction activity. It is appropriate to answer these questions for the near and long term.

Reassessing Demand

What is the unmet demand for parking in the near term under the following assumptions:

- stable or marginal growth in the student population;
- construction of the Adair deck, the dorms on Barksdale field, and the business school on Common Glory; and,
- changes to the parking policies?

In the near term, the loss of spaces on Landrum Drive or the Morton lot are not included as it is highly improbable that they will occur in the next 10 to 15 years.

Capacity is determined by the number of spaces and the demand for those spaces. Industry standards define maximum capacity as 85% of the total available spaces in proximity to any destination. The College can affect capacity in two ways: either increase the number of spaces to meet the demand or change the policy to deflate demand. The actions the College takes over the next several years can affect both.

Near Term Capacity

<u>Date</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Effect</u>	<u>Net</u>
Fall 2004	Restrict to social juniors	-200 demand	
Fall 2005	Open Adair Deck	+500 spaces	
Fall 2006	Close Dillard, Open Barksdale	-160 demand	
Net increase in capacity			+860

Mid-Term Capacity

<u>Date</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Effect</u>	
Unknown	Open Business school	-240 spaces*	+620

Far-Term Capacity

<u>Date</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Effect</u>	
2017	Close Landrum Drive	-38 spaces	+582

*assumes 75 spaces constructed on the Business School site.

These figures would suggest that for the near term and mid-term, the College would not need to construct additional lots. The College has the capacity to meet demand even when the business school is constructed.

Why then does the perception of a problem, particularly on the part of the community persist? The answer lies in proximity. On any given day, there are approximately 100 spaces available on the William and Mary Hall lot. The culture of the current community is one based on convenient parking adjacent to ultimate destinations. Thus, staff or students park in neighborhoods adjacent to academic and residential buildings rather than park in the William and Mary Hall lot and walk to their destination. Additionally, there is a growing population of students who rent houses in the community.

Compounding the problem are freshman and sophomore students who bring vehicles to Williamsburg, but who are not eligible to park on campus. The College has been told repeatedly that it is not within its legal authority to tell students they may not bring a car to Williamsburg or the surrounding area. A student, therefore, who is able to find a street or a driveway in which to store a car is not violating College policy unless that car is brought onto the campus.

There is a gap between our enforcement policy and our enforcement practices. The chance of getting a ticket on campus after 5:00 p.m. during the week or on weekends because a car doesn't have a decal is rare. Strict enforcement results in ticketing too many visitors who are on campus legitimately to attend events. Thus, conceivably, a freshman or sophomore could park on campus in the evenings during the week or on the weekend without incurring penalties. The penalties for parking in the neighborhoods during the week may be as little as a \$10 fine once a week.

MANAGING DEMAND

Bluntly stated, the College has a proximity problem not a capacity problem. Therefore, it is not possible to solve the proximity problem by increasing the number of spaces alone. New policies and culture change must also occur. If we attempt to solve the proximity problem solely through new construction, it might well have an unintended effect. For example, if the College were to construct a satellite lot for students and not change policies or enforcement measures, a possible result would be to drive more students into the neighborhoods.

Construct or Lease satellite spaces

Attachment B discusses the advantages and disadvantages of potential sites for additional parking facilities on and off campus. Inducements must be offered to encourage use of these facilities. Such inducements might include: reduced parking fees, permitting freshman and sophomores to warehouse cars during the week, excellent security, frequent transportation to and from the lot evenings and weekends, and strict enforcement of parking regulations both on and off campus.

There are significant costs to developing satellite lots. Therefore, the College should carefully consider the number of spaces required. That number will depend on the policies and procedures the College is willing to put into place to manage the parking program.

Flat lot construction averages approximately \$1,000 per space and deck construction is at a minimum \$9,000 to \$10,000 per space. In addition to the cost of construction, there will be costs to address security requirements and expand the transportation network to bring individuals to the interior of the campus.

Regardless of whether a surface lot is constructed off-campus or whether an existing off-campus/satellite is used, there will be additional costs associated with ensuring that the proper level of security is provided. Colleges and Universities operating satellite parking recommend, at a minimum: fencing and controlled access (staffed and/or unstaffed) depending on site conditions; patrolling by Campus Police; and a transportation system that provides

frequent service.

Experience with the current College student population indicates minimal bus ridership. Students do use the bus service. However, the majority of these students are those located at the Dillard Complex (who will be brought back to campus in 2006) or campus students traveling to local shopping centers. The inducements must be strong enough to overcome the resistance to using public transportation.

Lot usage is also a determinate cost. If, for example, the satellite lot is used as a low-priced option for faculty and staff or day students, it may only be necessary to provide frequent transportation service during particular times of the work week. However, if resident students use the lot, security and transportation requirements would be determined by access. Is the lot intended to be a warehousing lot that limits student access only to weekends or would students have access 24 hours a day/ seven days a week? Depending on lot usage, frequent headways, in the neighborhood of the 5 to 10 minute range, would be required. Although the Williamsburg Area Transport is operational, it will require increased investment on the part of the College to put these services in place.

The College must also be sensitive to the elasticity of the parking fee and guard against the fee becoming a disincentive. The fee will continue to rise until 2007-2008 to pay for the Adair deck. Any additional construction would need to be funded either through additional increases in parking fees or general fees.

Near and Mid-Term Policy Changes

Limit parking privileges to social juniors and seniors, and tighten up on exemptions for freshman and sophomores. With free student access to the regional public transportation system, the College could choose to tighten up these exemptions to reduce the number of exceptions made by 25-50%. Taking these measures in isolation would only serve to invite more renegade cars in the City at large. Enforcement becomes critical if these policies are

put into place.

The College could also consider geographic pricing, essentially charging more for those decals that have privileges closer to the core of campus and less for those that are on the periphery. This concept works most effectively when it is combined with satellite parking or on larger campuses where interior parking is limited and walking distances are more than 15 minutes. The William and Mary campus is not that large.

The most remote lot on main campus is the William and Mary Hall lot. In 1993 the College attempted to change parking behaviors when James Blair Hall was undergoing renovation and a substantial amount of interior parking was lost to construction. Decals for the William and Mary Hall Lot were offered at no cost and not one person elected to take the decal. On the other hand, for some staff and students, the William and Mary Hall lot has desired proximity, making it difficult to devise a fair and equitable fee structure.

The College could also implement a fee structure that increases revenue from other sources to mitigate the cost of the average decal. One option would be to offer a limited number of “reserved at all times” spaces to those who were willing to pay even a higher price for this privilege. ODU has such a program. A reserved space is offered for \$450 a year, and there is a waiting list for those spaces.

The College collects event parking fees on a very small scale. The Athletic Department collects money from football parking during home games and will begin collecting parking fees for its home basketball games in 2003/2004. It is anticipated that parking fees may be collected when special event patrons use the new parking deck, scheduled for completion in 2005. While the anticipated revenue from these sources is minimal, the act of collecting them addresses an issue of fairness to those who pay for decals and a sense that all users are contributors. It would help to mitigate the cost of operation and maintenance.

The Christopher Wren Association has 1200 members who are given parking privileges at the William and Mary Hall lot at no charge. Members may purchase a decal for use in other lots. When classes are in session, they invariably create parking challenges in the vicinity of William and Mary Hall and the Plant Lot which cause decal paying College employees to seek parking at more distant locations. The College should consider charging a minimal fee for this association's use of parking.

Enforcement

The keys to success of the parking program are in inducement and enforcement. The College could build one or more satellite lots, but without effective carrots and sticks, the students will not use them. We must work with the City on enforcement. Together, our enforcement policies would provide a powerful tool. There should be parallel and increasing fines for repeat offenders both on and off campus and information sharing regarding those offenders. The City's rental policies and residential parking zones should be strictly enforced.

If satellite parking is constructed, students should find it difficult to evade its use through lax enforcement. The College can tighten up its current enforcement on evenings and weekends.

It would add some cost to the budget, and methods should be devised to minimize the inconvenience to visitors.

Long Term Policy Changes

In the out years, if and when the 2003 campus design guidelines come to fruition, the proximity issue will be exacerbated as interior parking along current roads would be eliminated. The College may need to establish stricter policies that set priorities for parking on main campus and in lots peripheral to the campus. For example, all student parking might be restricted to the perimeter while faculty, staff and visitors would park on campus. Or, if satellite parking and a good transportation system exist, fees for both students and staff could be reduced in those lots, reducing demand on the central campus.

If the College finds in the next 15 to 20 years that it must build academic buildings on existing parking lots, plans should be made in advance to identify preferred peripheral or satellite parking locations to replace these lost spaces.

The College's Parking Advisory Committee (PAC) consists of faculty, staff and student representatives. Its role is to make recommendations to the Vice President for Administration on policies and procedures. The Committee addresses such issues as parking fee plans and the allocation and reallocation of spaces. This Committee should continue to be used to discuss changes to policies and procedures and to provide long term recommendations on the issues of proximity, convenience and control.

Managing During Construction

The joint College and City traffic study will provide recommendations on how to manage traffic and parking during the next decade of construction. The first issue to be addressed is managing parking and traffic during the period when the Adair deck has opened but the Common Glory lot has not yet closed. The deck will be operational in the fall of 2005. There is as of yet no date scheduled for the closure of Common Glory.

The construction projects slated for the Jamestown Road corridor, other than the business school, will not reduce the number of parking spaces available. More importantly, these projects, once completed, will not generate additional demand. In fact they will decrease demand. The construction of the dorms on Barksdale field will reduce demand by 160 spaces. The purpose of the renovation and expansion of the academic buildings on south campus is to meet long standing needs not future needs. The renovation of the amphitheatre and the increased activity associated with it can be handled through the use of the Adair and Morton lots as most activity will occur during non-class periods.

There will be ample parking. The issue is traffic management. The College will be

in a better position to develop solutions once the traffic study is complete.

The College should also examine a variety of traffic calming options to help slow traffic and enhance landscaping for aesthetic improvements. Examples include entry islands, a raised island in the center of a two-way street that identifies the entrance to different sectors; neckdowns or curb extensions, often used to narrow roadways and shorten pedestrian crossings; medians, raised islands in the center of the roadway with one-way traffic on each side and raised crosswalks to help control speed and alert drivers to pedestrians. The College's ability to implement these measures is dependent on available land and funding.

CONCLUSION

The guiding principles of the College's Master Plan endorse a pedestrian core that ensures a vital and safe fabric for student-faculty interaction. There is current demand for increased parking capacity on campus. There are an increasing number of College-related cars parking in adjacent neighborhoods. The construction program on which the College is about to embark will have an impact on parking and traffic management for the next decade on campus and in the neighborhoods along Jamestown Road.

With the construction of the new deck, the College will have ample parking spaces on campus. The problem is not one of capacity, but of proximity. Members of the College community have come to expect low cost, convenient parking, adjacent to their ultimate destinations. Therefore, the solution does not lie simply in constructing more spaces whether they be on site or off site. The College must take steps to change that expectation through a combination of additional facilities and changes to policies and procedures which provide incentives to use its parking facilities and penalties for those whose elect to park improperly in the neighborhoods or on campus. For its part, the City must ensure the enforcement of parking regulations as well as rental property regulations. A key element to a successful solution is the cooperation between the College and the City with regard to enforcement.

In the near and mid-term the College must manage traffic resulting from the construction of the parking deck and generated by construction activity. With the exception of the new Business school, the anticipated construction along the Jamestown corridor will not decrease the number of spaces available nor add to the demand for spaces. The joint traffic study with the City will provide critical information that will allow us to develop a traffic management scheme. Over the long term, the College will need to evaluate the impact of the siting of new buildings on parking capacity and traffic management.

One last note. Parking issues are always contentious on a college campus. The College has available to it the tools necessary to overcome much of the problem. Working together, we can solve the problem for the College and our neighboring community.