APPENDIX D

Results from the Open House
Please tell us which of the recommendations you feel should be given priority.

1. Parking - pick your top three recommendations:
   - Combine Synergies of Parking and TDM Goals (Parking department to work closely with TDM department)
   - Increase Parking Fees
   - Reform Parking Policy - Integrate TDM Objectives
   - Streamline Parking Data Collection and Enforcement
   - Prioritise Convenient Parking Spaces
   - Control Use of Complimentary Parking Passes
   - Negotiate with Saanich to Implement a Parking Spillover “Hotline”
   - Improve Parking and Transportation Information
   - Peak Period Transportation and Parking Management
   - Introduce “High Tech”, Payment System
   - Introduce Fees for Night Parking

Is there a recommendation we have not included that you would like us to consider?

2. Transit - pick your top two recommendations:
   - Increase Service
   - UPass for Staff and Faculty
   - Improve Amenities
   - Improve Information
   - Special Event Buses
   - Integrate Transit Route Information with Housing Services

Is there a recommendation we have not included that you would like us to consider?

3. Cycling - pick your top two recommendations:
   - Install Covered Parking
   - Provide Secure Parking
   - Increase After-trip Facilities
   - Laundry and Dry Cleaning Service
   - Bike Routes to Campus
   - Support a Student Run “Bike Kitchen”
   - Re-introduce Public Bike System

Is there a recommendation we have not included that you would like us to consider?
4. CarShare – pick your top one recommendation:
   - Ridematching service
   - Preferential Parking
   - Reduced Parking Prices for Carpools and Vanpools
   - Reduce Barriers to Qualification

Is there a recommendation we have not included that you would like us to consider?

5. Pedestrian – pick your top one recommendation:
   - Safer Crossings on Ring Road
   - Traffic Calming on Ring Road
   - Improve Pedestrian Routes to Campus

Is there a recommendation we have not included that you would like us to consider?

6. Promotion, Education and Supporting Options
   - pick your top three recommendations:
     - Ongoing programming and awareness campaign to build a "culture" of green commuting.
     - Increase Housing Opportunities
     - Guaranteed Ride Home Service
     - Maximize Fleet Vehicle utilisation
     - Establish/Support a Car-Cooperative
     - Integrate Merchants Discounts
     - Stagger Class Start Times
     - Reconfigure Ring Road & Accesses
     - Trip Reduction Strategies – satellite campuses, e-learning

Is there a recommendation we have not included that you would like us to consider?

7. Do you generally support the recommendations that have come from this study? Please tell us why or why not.

Thank you very much for taking the time to fill out the survey!
## RESULTS FROM THE OPEN HOUSE – SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

### COMMENTS WRITTEN ON THE COMMENTS BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contradiction: Key recommendation increase transit service on one board but on another board: “Transit funds frozen - no increase in service” The issue is important: if bus pass ups rise, the U Pass will become unacceptable then look at the increase in SOVs</td>
<td>Targets will presumably be in the implementation plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Whole process seems predicated on past/present trends. It SHOULD focus on what we want (say 2015) and what must we do to get there. Backcasting.</td>
<td>The data clearly states a decrease in traffic volumes in absolute numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>One poster states that there has been a decrease in car traffic since 1992 This may be as a % but not as total numbers of vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Should include options for motorcycles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What about use of shuttle bus to an off-site parking lot in a central area (eg: Royal Oak area)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time to stop letting the problems dictate the solutions. I’d like to see this report get submitted under the context of the way the campus planning Review Committee makes recommendations for change. Unless change happens at a higher level, the possibilities for this campus, including TDM will remain low-level, cost lots and be piece-meal; This link between TDM and other campus initiatives need to be formalized in a proper planning context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Increase parking fees and funnel it back into public transportation or community bikes (like blue bikes we had)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Try to reduce car access during daytime. Allow free parking, as is, after 6:00 pm for late class/library/computer lab etc. use this evening access is especially valuable as a safety measures (eg: female students)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Reduce parking spaces – perhaps make use of underground spaces or parkade(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The UPass is GREAT. YES, include faculty and staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>To ensure ongoing integration of TDM, into all aspect of planning and administration, there does need to be a central TDM coordinating body or individual. FTE or P/T or even contract outside expertise. The coordination also needs to be ongoing with the surrounding municipality and neighbourhoods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMENTS EXTRACTED FROM THE SURVEYS

**Question 1: Parking**

12 | No first year students can drive to campus |
13 | TRY to avoid raising parking fees. We must drive from Shawnigan Lake – we don’t have a choice. Fees are too high. |
14 | Set up a database of parking lot users. Charge accordingly to need to use a car – eg: those on convenient bus routes should pay more for parking than those with out bus service. |
15 | Satellite parking lots for carpooling or for shuttle bus |
16 | Charge 3 times as much for SOV, 2 times for 2 person cars, normal rate for 3 person cars and 50% off for 4 person cars |
17 | Increase parking rates to market rates. Should equal or exceed transit fees/rates. |

**Question 2: Transit**

18 | Don’t forget Park and Ride |
19 | Lobby Federal (not likely Provincial) for more service |
20 | Consider the effect of more buses on residential streets |
21 | Double deckers are efficient but they are unpleasant to use. Aisles too narrow, steps etc. |
22 | Different type of transit - LRT |
23 | Really work hard to lobby Transit to increase service |
24 | Can the transit UPass concept be refashioned to enhance carshare use? |

**Question 3: Bikes**

25 | Educate/mentor students on bike safety |
26 | Make cycling easy and safe |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Full end of trip facilities will result in increase of cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Question 4. Carshare: No Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Credit for walking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Develop walkable greenways network with neighbouring municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Question 5. Pedestrian: No Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>TDM needs to feature prominently in future campus planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Shuttle bus linking major transit points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Support transit and bike riders the money they save UVic on parking costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Question 6. Do you generally support this study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Not really, most of these ideas cost money and add up quickly. Vehicle traffic is fine the way it is. Other universities have a much bigger problem. Do not build more parking spots or student housing. These two ideas just invite more cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Yes – get the implementation plan going – build on the momentum generated so far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Yes – Process has been good and the ideas mostly feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Yes – but unsure what market driven prices mean. No free parking anytime might focus us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>The whole community at large needs to work on decreasing auto traffic and speeding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Seems good so far. Hope your implementation process will get the job done!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Don’t access 2% growth/year as the norm. Put a limit on the # of FTEs allowed – could mean more competition for student grades for acceptance to UVic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Uvic TDM is a positive effort. However, the process MUST be an integral part of the regional transportation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Reward users of alternative modes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Parking shortages will only occur if a 2% growth rate is accepted. JUST SAY NO!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Yes! We need this to finally move forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Yes. Idea who’s time has come. UVic needs to be a good corporate citizen and show some leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Good Start. Need to establish goals – increased modes, decrease SOV, cap on parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I see that it is a positive step that the University should attempt to address these issues before they become unbearable. Also, I think it’s the U’s responsibility to be innovative and a leader for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Comment TDM for its info and ideas BUT the Draft Report, we’d like to see more urgently worded recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>There must be a real solid commitment by UVic’s administration and planners to get fully behind these initiatives and to task their most creative people to achieve results according to the needs. That have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Be bold, engage, those with good ideas. Produce results on schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Yes – but I worry that they might die or diminish at the hands of UVic’s bureaucracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yes I do. They are well thought out and I can see them benefiting me directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Yes – we really need to reduce the commuting traffic to UVic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yes BUT! For most residents near UVic, traffic comfort levels were surpassed well over 10 years ago. Strategies that make marked reductions in car traffic are needed. This strategy MAY maintain levels, but expected growth will create a further nightmare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>This is so needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prioritisation of Parking Options

Top 3 Recommendations:  
- Combine Parking and TDM  
- Increase Fees  
- Reform Policy-Integrate TDM

Prioritised Transit Options

Top 2 Recommendations:  
- UPass for Staff & Faculty  
- Increase Service

Prioritised Cycling Options

Top 2 Recommendations:  
- Bike Routes to Campus  
- Install Covered Parking
Prioritised CarShare Options

- Reduce Barriers to Qualification 36%
- Reduced Parking Prices for Car & Van Pools 28%
- Ride matching Service 32%
- Preferential Parking 4%

Top Recommendation: Reduce Barriers to Qualification

Prioritised Pedestrian Options

- Improve Pedestrian Routes to Campus 32%
- Safer Crossing on Ring Road 28%
- Traffic Calming on Ring Road 40%

Top Recommendation: Traffic Calming on Ring Road

Prioritisation of Supporting Options

- Reconfigure Ring Road & Accesses 6%
- Stagger Class Times 19%
- Maximize Fleet Vehicles 0%
- Absolute Trip Reduction - Satellite campuses 22%
- Ongoing Programming 23%
- Increase Housing Opportunities 9%
- Guaranteed Ride Home Service 11%
- Merchants Discounts 5%
- Support Car Cooperative 7%

Top 3 Recommendations: * Ongoing Programming
* Absolute Trip Reduction
* Stagger Class Times