

**The College of William and Mary**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Assembly Meeting**  
**October 29, 2002**

Faculty Assembly **President Robert Archibald** opened the special meeting of the Faculty Assembly at 3:32 p.m. Members present: Robert Archibald, Jonathan Arries, Debbie Bebout, Liz Canuel, Bob Diaz, Dot Finnegan, Alan Fuchs, Keith Griffioen, Bill Hawthorne, Lu Ann Homza, John Lee, Ron Rosenberg, Larry Ventis, Wanda Wallace.

**I. Resolution for Suzann Matthews**

Since the last meeting of the Faculty Assembly, Board of Visitor **Suzann Matthews** donated \$150,000 to the College to replace the Summer Research Grant money, which had been cut due to the budget crisis. **President Bob Archibald** read a Faculty Assembly resolution thanking Ms. Matthews. The Resolution was proposed for adoption by Prof. Wanda Wallace and seconded by Prof. Bob Diaz. The Assembly unanimously adopted the Resolution (see appendix A).

**Provost Gillian Cell** noted that the Faculty Assembly should also thank the **Liaison Committee** and **Prof. Scott Nelson** for the effective presentation that the latter made on behalf of the Faculty at the September BOV meeting. Prof. Archibald thanked both on behalf of the Assembly.

**II. Parking Issues**

**Prof. Archibald** introduced today's special meeting topic by noting that the parking petition circulating among the Faculty has gathered 260+ signatures. The Faculty Assembly Executive Committee asked Vice President Anna Martin and Associate Vice President and Director of Auxiliary Services Charles Maimone if they would respond in person to a list of questions concerning the proposed parking garage and parking fees. They accepted the invitation.

**Vice President Martin** began her presentation by providing a summary of recent historical events related to parking. In 1999, an oversight committee for parking was established. Its charge included maintaining pedestrian areas on campus, reducing street parking, and managing and adding parking spaces. It became clear that the parking problem could not be solved with merely compressing spaces to create more. In 2000, a Parking Deck Committee succeeded the other group to wrestle with the shortage of 500 spaces. The Committee ruled out a new paved lot and began investigating sites for a three-level parking deck. Several sites were rejected for various reasons and the Adair tennis courts were selected. A Parking Advisory Committee was established in March 2002 to make recommendations about policies concerning parking fees to Ms. Martin. This committee has not arrived at recommendations as of yet.

Vice President Martin then began to answer the questions previously submitted to her by Prof. Archibald on behalf of Faculty Assembly.

- 1. Our understanding is that the cost of the parking deck is now estimated to be 10.8 million dollars. What caused the increase in the cost of the project (from 7.3 million dollars to 10.8 million dollars)?*

Vice President Martin explained that the 7.3 million dollar figure is the pre-planning cost of the deck. She then provided square footage of the garage (117,000 sq ft) and the additional expenses related to the project with the campus police and parking offices added.

Parking Deck	\$8,437,000++
--------------	---------------

155,000 sq ft	Deck (@ \$32 per sq ft)
1,800 sq ft	Parking Office (@ \$92 per sq ft)
<u>5,600</u> sq ft	Campus Police (@ \$92 per sq ft)
162,400 sq ft	

++ includes design, construction, inspection, contingency, and technology costs.

Adair Court Replacement	\$ 624,000
Zable Lot Reconfiguration	<u>609,000</u>
	\$1,233,000

<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 9,670,000**</b>
-----------------	-----------------------

\*\* direct cost with the \$7,343,000 in the original submission

Debt Issuance Cost	\$ 193,000
Mandatory 10% Reserve	<u>967,000</u>
	\$1,160,000

<b>Total</b>	<b>\$10,830,000</b>
--------------	---------------------

When the following expenses are added to the original 7.3 million dollars, the project cost increases to 10.8 million dollars: relocating Adair tennis courts, Zable lot reconfiguration, debt insurance, mandatory 10% reserve, technology costs, utilities, and the parking office and police station.

Ms. Martin indicated that she would be able to provide the Assembly members with a detailed breakdown of the project costs, but could not go into more detail at this meeting. The Zable lot reconfiguration will decrease the parking spaces available by 100 (from 198). The reduction in spaces in the Zable lot is not related to the Millennium Gate. Apparently, the Zable project is related to aesthetics alone.

When asked who holds the reserve funds, Ms. Martin said that the College does, but she did not know if the College earned the interest on the money.

2. *Parking fees have increased dramatically, from \$50 to \$120. Has the extra \$70 per sticker been placed in some account that will be used to defray costs of the new parking deck?*

With regard to the parking fee increase, Vice President Martin indicated that the first \$10 of the increase goes (along with the original \$50) to the operation and maintenance of the parking system. The extra money above that goes to the fund balance. By the fiscal year 2004, the College is estimated to have a reserve of \$600,000. The Reserve will be used to offset the debt service in the first and second years so that fees will not have to rise so dramatically.

3. *The parking deck will also house a new headquarters for the campus police. What portion of the cost of the structure are for the new police headquarters? Will these costs have to be recovered from parking fees?*

The inclusion of these projects was justified in terms of police presence, security, and information to visitors in addition to the number of hours that the parking office is open during the week. The offices are planned as buildings attached to the garage rather than a part of the footprint of the garage. When broken out of the entire project, building a new police headquarters is a small part of the expenses. Members questioned the need for both the police and parking offices to be relocated and the appropriateness of folding these expenses into the project and therefore into the parking fee charged rather than expensing them in the E&G budget. Both services have space currently. Vice President Martin indicated that these new locations would provide better space and will facilitate a quicker response time for the campus police. Members did not question the logic of providing better space for these services; the financing of the projects is the question.

4. *Are there any other projects included in the 10.8 million dollar figure? We would like a complete list of the projects funded and their costs.*

Vice President Martin indicated that the Adair tennis courts and the Zable parking lot reconfiguration were included as discussed above.

5. *The parking “problem” at William and Mary seems to have eased after the parking sticker fees have increased. Do we really need 500 extra spaces?*

Vice President Martin indicated that 6,000 parking stickers are issued each year and the complaints have not decreased in terms of parking problems. The 1999 analysis of parking demonstrated that 699 spaces were needed. The parking inventory at the time of the study was 4243 spaces for 6,000 decals issued.

Members pointed out that the project is built on three or four-year old data and that the occupancy rate (measured at 11am) was based on averages, not ranges. Additional answers should be investigated, such as changing the residential student parking policies, zoned parking assignments, and the maximization of efficient utilization through repainting spaces. Parking may well be a management problem and not require spending 10 million dollars for a negligible return.

6. *Some projects will destroy parking spaces. Building a parking deck and charging fees for its construction means that one of the costs of these projects (e.g., the new business school, the millennium gate) is being borne by the fee payers. Shouldn't these projects have to pay for the parking places they have destroyed?*

Vice President Martin indicated that the construction of the Millennium Gate and the reconfiguration of the Zable Lot can be separated; they are not one project. Members questioned the wisdom of the parking garage project since the College would only realize a net of 82 spaces due to the losses (Common Glory parking lot when the Business School is built and the Zable lot beautification project). Several questions/suggestions emerged:

- a. Why should not the projects that destroy parking spaces pay for the project? For example, why shouldn't the Business School add parking spaces into its building project, perhaps underneath the building since it would eliminate Common Glory—the price of buying the parking lot.
- b. If no functional reason exists to reconfigure the Zable lot and the Millennium Gate will not reduce the number of slot, why engage in this project at this point in time?
- c. Why not fold the parking garage into the College's Campaign or into the Business School fund-raising?
- d. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences are rethinking the General Education activity requirement. The College might want to revisit the need to relocate the tennis courts as a result.
- e. Some faculty expressed a concern about the relocation plans for the tennis courts in terms of conservation damage.

7. *The parking deck will be used by people who attend events at the Lake Matoaka Amphitheater. Are there plans to charge these people for parking, hence reducing the parking fees that faculty, staff, and students have to pay?*

Yes, fees will be charged, but the amount gained will not be significant.

8. *The new dorm that is under construction to replace the Dillard complex will affect parking. Currently some cars on campus are the cars of sophomores who live in Dillard. Has the reduction in automobiles on campus resulting from the new dorm been factored into the plans for the parking deck?*

The number of cars that would be brought back onto campus needs to be determined. However, at present, the sophomores number 123 of the students at Dillard; sophomores are not allowed to have cars on campus. The 1999 parking study showed that some decal holders will shift to day students, some to residents who will be permitted to park on campus, and some with no car privileges. The impact is negligible.

Representatives offered several suggestions: the parking spaces on campus could be redesigned (narrowed); parking zones could be established (higher prices for closer spaces); and on-campus students could be assigned to park in auxiliary lots. Members asked if the deck could not be put on hold and for the administration to come back to the faculty with a plan that made more sense, given today's economic environment.

9. *We understand that the plans for parking fees have been made on the assumption that the project will be financed with 20-year bonds. Wouldn't it be sensible to finance a structure such as a parking deck over a longer time period?*

Ms. Martin explained that the Commonwealth actually borrows the money for a bond; the College does not. The Commonwealth would bundle our project with others. Therefore, the length of time for which the bond is issued is not up to us.

The Vice President was asked if the Board of Visitors knows about the jump from seven million to ten million. They have been informed.

Another representative asked if the administration could rethink these projects, to look at what the college community would be doing to itself with the dramatic increases in parking fees. "This is not the time to be thinking about aesthetics. We are losing our adjunct faculty; we should not be thinking of moving tennis courts. It is time for triage."

The Vice President was asked what will occur after this meeting. She and Provost Cell would take the comments back to the rest of the administration as the basis of more conversations. The Provost joined the Vice President in assuring the Assembly that they both had heard the concerns of the group and that they would share the concerns with the President and the Vice Presidents. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dorothy E. Finnegan, Secretary

## Appendix

### Resolution for Suzann Matthews

Be it resolved that the Faculty Assembly of the College of William & Mary expresses its gratitude to Suzann Wilson Matthews for her generous gift to the faculty summer research grant program. This gift is much more than an expression of generosity; it is much more than a recognition of the importance of faculty research to quality education, as important as such research is. This gift is most importantly a guarantee that future William and Mary students might enjoy the same excellence in education that has established this College's reputation. Ms. Matthews has helped minimize the damage of a weak economy at a time when faculty and students most need the help of our alumni and donors. She has ensured that our faculty, and particularly our junior faculty, will have the opportunity to continue to generate new knowledge. And in doing so, she has secured important opportunities for some of our best students to begin their own research with faculty mentors in the summer program. In short, she has invested her confidence in the very core of the William and Mary education, and this faculty is deeply grateful.