

1 **Parking Ratepayer's Board**
2 **February 23, 2009**
3 **Minutes**

4
5 **Members Present:** Rick Church, Marguerite Bouraad-Nash, Vickie Scott, Sandra Featherson,
6 Kate Deutsch and J.P. Primeau

7 **Members Absent:** Victoria Wing, Dan Givens and Charlie Arreola

8 **Staff Present:** Robert Defendini, Bob Silsbee and Leslie Mancebo

9
10 **I. Roll Call**

11
12 The meeting was called to order at 1:15pm in the Vice Chancellors' Conference Room in room
13 4125 Cheadle Hall.

14
15 **II. Introduction of Guests**

16
17 Beverly Bavaro, Chair of the Transportation Alternatives Board

18 Dolly Smith, Department of Chemical Engineering

19
20 **III. Approval of Minutes**

21
22 The Minutes from the January 30, 2009 were approved unanimously.

23
24 **IV. Announcements from the Chair**

25
26 Chair Church noted that he did not have any items prepared to announce. He did welcome
27 Transportation Alternatives Board Chair, Beverly Bavaro to the meeting.

28
29 Marguerite Bouraad-Nash noted that following the last meeting she went to see the project in
30 Parking Lot 23 that was described on the budget handed out in the last meeting as a "roadway" to
31 determine whether or not the renovations that were done were part of the road or the parking lot.

32 Marguerite determined that the project was adjacent to the parking lot and should not have been
33 funded from the Parking Operations Budget.

34
35 Robert Defendini explained that the project location was deemed as part of the parking lot because
36 there is parking on both sides of the project and the modification were made to make it more clear
37 and safe for parking lot users to navigate to their parking spaces, either in Parking Lot 23 or the
38 short term parking spaces adjacent to the Children's Center. Robert Defendini also noted that there
39 is a small amount of through traffic to the Faculty Club and that historically, when there were large
40 parking lots on either side of this, "roadway," before the Student Resource Building was
41 constructed, it was clearer that it is a part of the parking lot.

42
43 Chair Church asked Robert Defendini if he would be willing to walk around the project area in
44 Parking Lot 23 with Marguerite and any other interested committee members to clarify any
45 questions that she has. Robert Defendini agreed to do so.

46
47 **V. Definitions of the projects listed on the Financial Summary of the Parking Operations**
48 **Budget distributed at the January 30th meeting**

49
50 A modified copy of the Parking Financial Summary portion of the budget was handed out and
51 Robert Defendini mentioned that the changes made to this sheet may not answer all of the

52 questions that the Board may have; they are project names generated independently by Facilities
53 Management.

54
55 Chair Church reiterated the importance of Transportation and Parking Services being watchful over
56 the Parking Operations Budget and the projects that Facilities Management assigns to be funded
57 by the Parking Operations Budget. Chair Church noted that in the past some inappropriate projects
58 were paid for out of the Parking Operations Budget and now there must be greater vigilance in
59 understanding what each project is and why the Ratepayers are paying for it.

60
61 Marguerite Bouraad-Nash requested a description of each of the FM projects on the Parking
62 Operations Budget and an explanation for why each project is paid for by Parking.

63
64 Bob Silsbee offered to follow-up with the information that he can find for each project.

65
66 Robert Defendini offered to define the projects that he is familiar with:

- 67 • FM 166-23 Mesa Parking Alkali Silica Reaction Evaluation is an evaluation to determine the
68 cause of concrete deterioration in the Mesa Parking Structure that was first noticed in
69 November 2008. Ray Aronson is managing this project and is working with an outside
70 contractor on the evaluation. Mr. Aronson has yet to report back about the conclusion of the
71 evaluation. The Mesa Parking Structure may still be under warranty and the builder may be
72 held responsible for the current damage and mitigation of future damage.
- 73 • FM Install Window (0B0754) is a project that Robert Defenidni requested to increase
74 ventilation in one of the two bathrooms in the Parking Services trailer. The window was
75 installed and has proven effective.
- 76 • FM 166-26 Lot 23 Roadway has already been discussed and was designed to improve a
77 confusing entrance to Parking Lot 23 and the Children’s Center Parking. Robert will follow
78 up with a tour of the project with Marguerite Bouraad-Nash and other interested parties.

79 Chair Church requested that a complete modified budget be distributed and that staff follow up with
80 project descriptions for the next meeting. Leslie Mancebo agreed to distribute the budget via email.

81
82 **VI. Discussion of safety in parking lots**

83
84 Marguerite Bouraad-Nash explained that she requested this item for the agenda because she was
85 almost in a collision with another car while the other car was excessively speeding in a parking lot.
86 She noticed that there are a number of cars speeding in parking lots, especially just before classes
87 begin. Marguerite Bouraad-Nash also reported that she has noticed that many of the “STOP”
88 messages painted on the ground have worn down over the years and are less prominent than they
89 once were.

90
91 Sandra Featherson asked if there is any accident data in the parking lots on campus, possibly
92 available through the Police Department or through the Risk Management unit of Business
93 Services. Robert Defendini responded that TPS does not have record of the accidents in the
94 parking lots, and presumes that many of them go unreported altogether.

95
96 Robert Defendini noted the measures that have been considered or implemented in the past to
97 slow drivers down in the parking lots and structures:

- 98 • There is currently a coating on the ground in the parking structures that increases the
99 sound of wheels squeaking when vehicles round corners to give the impression that the
100 vehicle is traveling faster than it is.

- 101 • Speed bumps were considered for the parking structures and were not chosen because
102 there are many cars that bottom out while driving over the speed bumps and the parking
103 structures would have more height limitations for tall vehicles.
- 104 • The placement of Bott's Dots has been considered as an alternative to speed bumps to
105 make drivers more aware of their high speeds. The dots are less expensive. With the
106 current condition of the pavement in the Mesa Parking structure there may be adverse
107 effects of placing dots and the project would require more evaluation before
108 implementation.
- 109 • Another measure that could be taken throughout campus would be to work with the Police
110 Department to have an increased presence in the parking lots to slow drivers down for fear
111 of being ticketed. This measure has been taken in the past and works while the police are
112 present, and stops working when drivers notice the police are not longer patrolling the lots.

113 Kate Deutsch asked if the speed limit is posted in the parking lots and structures. Robert
114 Defendini responded that the speed limit is posted at the entrance to the parking structures and
115 not throughout the lots and structures.

116 The Board discussed the benefits and downfalls of various methods that could be used to slow
117 drivers down. The ideas that were most immediately feasible for exploration and/or
118 implementation were:

- 119 • More obvious speed limit signs and/or electronic "your current speed is..." signs
- 120 • Pedestrian crossing signs to raise awareness of pedestrian walking to and from their
121 vehicles
- 122 • Speed bumps just before the entrance to the parking structures to slow drivers down
123 before they enter the structure.
- 124 • Encourage the Police Department to occasionally patrol all of the parking lots and
125 structures to reinforce that there are real consequences to speeding other than the
126 chance that an accident could happen.

127 TPS staff will follow up with more information about cost and plausibility of implementing each of
128 these measures alone or in combination and will begin with the least expensive action.

129

130 **VII. Planning for joint meeting with the Transportation Alternatives Board**

131

132 Marguerite Bouraad-Nash asked for enforcement data that shows how many Parking
133 Representatives there are and how many tickets they write.

134

135 Robert Defendini clarified that since the January 2009 PRB meeting some enforcement staffing
136 changes have been made. Daytime and Nighttime supervisors have recently been hired, one
137 nighttime representative is transitioning to daytime shifts. After the shift change is complete there
138 will be two open nighttime and one open daytime enforcement positions. The daytime position will
139 not be filled at this time. Robert Defendini also pointed out that the supervisors will be available to
140 write tickets and provide the Police Department with traffic control assistance, when it is needed, in
141 addition to their supervisory duties. Director Defendini also noted that the nighttime personnel are
142 now responsible for patrolling all of the parking lots, including those owned by housing until 2am.
143 These staffing changes are part of the plan to increase enforcement revenue.

144

145 J.P. Primeau asked how the increase in citation fines will affect the Fines and Forfeitures budget

146 Robert Defendini explained that the increased revenue from the raised parking fines is expected to
147 be approximately \$70,000-80,000 per year. A major factor that has an unanticipated negative
148 impact is the increased State Court fee that is paid to the State for every citation that is paid to
149 TPS. This Court fee has unexpectedly risen from \$7.50 per paid citation to \$9.50 per paid citation
150 so the new revenue that TPS expected from the increased citation fee may decrease by
151 approximately \$40,000 per year.
152

153 Chair Church asked Robert Defendini if the decrease in revenue to the Fines and Forfeitures
154 budget is caused by a lack of enforcement.
155

156 Robert Defendini responded that before the recent staffing changes a lack of enforcement, due to
157 lack of personnel, was affecting the Fines and Forfeitures revenue. Many gaps that were identified
158 in enforcement have been filled and the budget should show an increase in revenue due to greater
159 enforcement. Another factor that recently decreased some revenue to the Fines and Forfeitures
160 budget is the transition to a more “customer friendly” mission of TPS in that warnings are given
161 under some circumstances and more appeals are granted to first time offenders than in years past.
162

163 **VIII. Future Agenda Items**

164
165 The following items were requested for the next meeting:
166

- 167 • A detailed report on each of the FM projects listed on the Parking Operations Budget,
168 with an update on the outcome of the Mesa Parking Structure ASR Evaluation, possibly
169 from Ray Aronson
- 170 • A presentation on the feasibility of the measures discussed to stop speeding in the
171 parking lots and structures.
- 172 • Chair Church will follow up regarding the recommendation made to Chancellor Yang
173 following a motion passed at the December 8, 2008 meeting regarding reserved parking
174 lots or portions of lots.
175

176 **IX. Public Comment**

177
178 Dolly Smith came to follow-up on a comment that she made at the October 24, 2008 meeting. At
179 that time she noted that vehicles of construction workers on campus were regularly parking on the
180 grass and walkways around the engineering buildings. She reported that she has since noticed
181 that the construction vehicles are all parked inside fenced in areas.
182

183 Beverly Bavaro noted that she finds it helpful when Chair Church attends the Transportation
184 Alternatives Program meeting and that she will strive to attend PRB meetings in the future. She
185 also reported that she sees the possible benefits of the TAB and PRB meeting together because
186 there are a number of issues that are of concern to both boards and it will be mutually beneficial to
187 work together rather than create yet another Chancellor’s advisory committee.
188

189
190 *Meeting adjourned at 2:30pm*