

Parking Advisory Council Meeting
October 20, 2006
2:00 p.m.
A&F Conference Room

MINUTES

Members Present: Everett Malcolm, (Chair), Jeff Durfee, Dennis Holler, Chip Klostermeyer, Nick Peres, A. J. Souto, Diane Tanner, Corey Trent, Mike Trotter and Marco Urbano.

Members Absent: John Simms (Alternate).

Others Present: John Dean (UPD), Kimberly LaBell (Student), Ashley Manuel (Student), John Sharp (Parking Violation Appeal Board), Vince Smyth (Auxiliary Services), Judy Vaesa (Parking Violation Appeal Board) and Jenny Wahby (Student).

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Chair Everett Malcolm.

1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the 09/29/06 meeting were approved as recorded.

2. Presentation by Parking Violations Appeal Board

On behalf of the Parking Violations Appeal Board, John Sharp (member) presented a recommendation for the Council's consideration. He explained that a violator who receives a ticket has two basic options: (1) pay the fine immediately, or (2) appeal the ticket.

Two Boards review citations: (1) for student violations, and (2) for faculty, staff and visitors. John Sharp and Judy Vaesa who have served for several years on the Board reviewing appeals for faculty, staff and visitors have noticed that many appeals come through that have no basis. This causes substantial burden for the Boards to hear baseless appeals. They recommend an incentive for violators to pay their parking tickets immediately by giving \$10 off the cost of the ticket.

Recommendation: Give a discount to violators who pay parking tickets immediately. The length of time could be 7 days, more or less, whatever the Council thinks is adequate. The discount could be to simply list the fine amount as x with the notice that tickets paid within 7 days will be \$10 less. Example: If fines are raised to \$35 next year, a violator who pays their ticket within the time allowed, without appealing, will only have to pay \$25.

The rights of violators to appeal will not be diminished by this process as this is the same process used throughout Florida for non-criminal traffic citations. Appeals that have merit can still be granted by the Appeals Committee in whole or in part depending on the nature of the appeal.

Everett Malcolm asked if there have been conversations with the Board who hears student appeals since we have to be consistent across Boards. John Sharp said he has talked with Corey Trent who serves as student representative and this would be a University policy.

Cory Trent asked for Vince Smyth's opinion regarding the recommendation. Vince Smyth said that there would be an operational problem doing this with the present software. Parking Services is considering switching to another system, but it would mean waiting for that new system to be implemented. At this time, he doesn't know if or when new software will be implemented. The other issue that he mentioned is that if revenue is reduced from tickets it would have to be picked up from somewhere else.

Since such a large number of people file an appeal, it was discussed whether there should be established grounds for appealing. It was mentioned that it would be too hard to list all possible violations.

The Council did not wish to create an operational issue. There was discussion on adding a \$10 fee if the appeal is lost. The question was asked if this could be handled operationally. Vince Smyth said that it could be. The question was asked whether the Appeal Board has the ability to impose this fee. It was determined that this would be part of Parking Services policy.

Motion: Chip Klostermeyer made a motion that a \$10 fee be added to the cost of the violation if the appeal is lost. The motion was seconded, and passed unanimously.

It was emphasized that this would need to be clearly stated on the on-line appeal form. Vince Smyth mentioned that this is a recommendation going to administration, and if approved could require a regulation change which could take some time.

3. Discussion on Permit Categories, Number of Spaces for each Category and Sales Ratio for 2007-08

Everett Malcolm said that there will not be an additional meeting on October 27 since there was no time when the entire Council could meet. After today's meeting, he asked that the information be taken back to peers for review and discussion. The meeting on November 17 will be a voting meeting.

Chip Klostermeyer and Diane Tanner, Faculty Association representatives, presented a proposal for the Council to review. The following points regarding the proposal were made:

- There would be a zero percent rate increase in the individual categories through 2010-11.
- The main change is in segregating parking for Housing amounting to 1,968 spaces. The permit cost would be raised to \$269, the same as the 1st floor garage spaces. Parking in the Residential area would be pretty much guaranteed 1 to 1. Those who prefer not to pay the higher rate could purchase a permit in a general or discount lot. In 2007-08, 2,625 students are expected to need parking in Housing.
- Lots 14 and 18 would be changed from discount to general.
- Lot 19T would be discount.
- AOL was not included since this is still uncertain.
- The available parking spaces at UC would be increased from 33 to 100.
- Everett Malcolm noted that parking on the 3rd and 4th floors would be included in the Residential parking spaces. He said it would be a challenge to get that approved by administration. There is a covered walkway from the 3rd

floor to the Fine Arts. One of the reasons it was built was for patrons coming to the FA events and to provide easy access for music students bringing instruments into the building. He suggested using only the 4th floor in the garage for Housing and look for a different area for additional parking.

- There was discussion on using the 2nd and 4th floor, but the majority thought it would be confusing.
- Concern was expressed over the cost of \$269 for Residents. Everett Malcolm said that they would have other options. It was mentioned that all the spaces might not sell. Vince Smyth said they could be reallocated for a different category.
- One Council member asked Vince Smyth's opinion on residential parking. He said that it would have to be clearly stated that the spaces are not individually assigned. People would need to understand that in some instances the parking would not be right beside the student's residence. Although it is a significant increase, people would be getting parking that is more of less 1 to 1, and there should be recognition for that.
- Everett Malcolm asked if the Council is comfortable with the proposed Residential parking. Several members expressed that they are not comfortable with residential students parking on the 3rd floor garage. Cory Trent expressed concern that it would be challenging to get approval by administration for residential students to park on the 3rd floor.
- Vince Smyth said that he needs more time to go through the proposal, but mentioned that he does not see the demand to date for the number of designated spaces mentioned in the proposal. There are 120 spaces in different lots and 180 permits were sold this year to faculty and staff. At this time, there are two people on the waiting list. Diane Tanner said that she anticipates the sale of designated permits to increase as lots close for new construction.
- It was mentioned that designated parking should be open at some point to whoever wants to buy them.
- Chip Klostermeyer welcomed any improvements to the proposal and emphasized that the proposal was intended to be a starting point for dialogue.
- Everett Malcolm said that after the Parking Council was established, it took several years to get a designated category. At that time, SGA representatives did not want to be in the mix of designated parking with faculty and staff.
- The proposal shows a category of designated permits for Adjunct Faculty from 5 to 9 pm. It was questioned that this is unrealistic to put time restraints on spaces for enforcement. Chip Klostermeyer said that adjunct faculty members are underpaid, and circle the lot after working elsewhere and many times are late for class. The lot counts show that many designated spaces are empty during the evening.
- Vince Smyth commented that one thing to remember is that next year the intent is to have a shuttle from lot 18 and AOL, if we get AOL.

The Council also reviewed the proposal received from Housing Operations and Residence Life. The proposal was similar to the proposal presented by Chip Klostermeyer and Diane Tanner. Points listed in that proposal were taken into consideration during discussions.

Vince Smyth mentioned that at this point the Council needs to be aware of the financial aspect, but should be more concerned that the desired plan will work for the number of available spaces.

The question was asked if the 2nd and 3rd floors of the parking garage should be at a higher premium. Vince Smyth said that from an operational standpoint it would make more sense to keep those areas the same as the core.

Jeff Durfee asked if the Council was in general basic agreement on the following:

1. Lots 14 and 18 - general parking
2. Lot 19A - discount parking
3. Core of Campus - whatever parking is left in the Core will be at a higher premium and available to everyone; this would include parking in garages.
4. Daily Pass - will park somewhere other than core of Campus

He further said there are two remaining parking issues to consider: (1) residential and (2) adjunct faculty. The Council agreed.

Everett Malcolm asked Diane Tanner to take the consensus from today's meeting, made modifications to the spreadsheet proposal, and email to members. He asked that information be shared with constituencies. At the November 17 meeting, a vote will be taken.

4. Other Business

There was no other business.

5. Future Meetings

- November 17
- December 8

Time and place for all meetings will be:

2:00 to 3:30 p.m. in the A&F Conference Room (Building 1, Room 2000)

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Recorded by Paulette Sweeton