

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Minutes from the Stakeholder and Steering Committee Meetings**

60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65  
 66  
 67  
 68  
 69  
 70  
 71  
 72  
 73  
 74  
 75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82  
 83  
 84  
 85  
 86  
 87  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100

*UVIC TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STUDY  
APPENDICES*

## **Steering Committee Minutes**





**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

Date: **Tuesday, March 12, 2002**

Time: **9:00 am to 10:30 am**

Location: **Saunders Building, Meeting Room 121**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0 Introductions and Welcome
- 2.0 Review and Approval of Agenda
- 3.0 Discussion of Project
  - 3.1 Project Description (attached)
  - 3.2 Project Justification (attached)
  - 3.3 Project Definition (attached)
    - 3.3.1 UVic Transportation Demand Management Steering Committee Terms of Reference (attached)
    - 3.3.2 UVic Stakeholders Advisory Committee on Transportation Demand Management Terms of Reference (attached)
  - 3.4 Phase I Timelines (attached)
- 4.0 Select Committee Chair
- 5.0 Review Request for Proposal for Transportation Demand Management Consultant (attached)
- 6.0 Other Business
- 7.0 Next Meeting

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

Date: **Tuesday, March 12, 2002**

Time: **9:00 am to 10:30 am**

Location: **Saunders Building, Meeting Room 121**

Present: G.A. Robson, Executive Director, Facilities Management, UVic  
M. Segger, Director, Community Relations, UVic  
L. Howse, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic  
L. Roberts, Manager, Transportation Planning, Regional Planning  
Services, CRD  
G. Dash, Transportation and Parking Coordinator, Campus Security  
Services, UVic (Representing B. Johnston)

Absent: C. Foord, Marketing and Communications Manager, BC Transit

**1.0 Introductions and Welcome**

**2.0 Review and Approval of Agenda**

Agenda approved.

**3.0 Discussion of Project**

**3.1 Project Description**

**3.2 Project Justification**

G.A. Robson stated that the University is growing at a rate of 2.5% per year and is currently developing a campus plan that looks at 50% growth at the University over the next 15 years. If parking resources mirror that growth it will be wall to wall parking at the University. The University is looking to minimize the expansion of parking facilities.

G.A. Robson further discussed the uncertainty of Saanich relaxing the parking requirements for new buildings.

L. Roberts stated that many regions have had success in reducing parking requirements in their respective regions after implementing an effective TDM Strategy.

G.A. Robson discussed a parking inventory that was conducted at the time the Business and Economics Building was developed. At that time the University was in excess of 300 stalls based on the Saanich by-law. Since then we have lost some parking stalls (40 stalls for the Phytotron). Upcoming construction of the DPI Building, the Continuing Studies Building and the new Housing Project will likely consume the rest of the excess.

M. Segger stated that new buildings do not necessarily mean we are increasing the transportation demand.

G. Dash stated that during peak times Lots 2, 3, 4 and 1 are always full, however, lot 10 is usually only 60% full.

G. Dash stated that the new Housing Project may in fact increase parking requirements as those students who normally take the bus to school may now live on campus and need a parking spot for their car.

G. Dash also stated that the University is holding more and more conferences at the University and that further increases parking demand.

M. Segger requested clarification of the project plan that states that, "The Transportation Demand Management Strategy should obtain a minimum of 50 percent of the resources(cash/in-kind) from the University and other interested stakeholders."

L. Howse clarified that we will be applying for funding under the Transport Canada MOST program and that statement reflects a requirement under the MOST program.

L. Roberts asked what our contingency plan was if the University did not receive funding under the MOST program.

G.A. Robson stated that the University has put aside money to fund the development of the TDM Strategy and that the University is not relying heavily on the funding from the MOST program.

### **3.3 Project Definition**

#### **3.3.1 UVic Transportation Demand Management Steering Committee Terms of Reference**

**ACTION:** Lynn to revise Section 6.0 Terms of Office to reflect the revised timelines for the project.

#### **3.3.2 UVic Stakeholders Advisory Committee on Transportation Demand Management Terms of Reference**

G.A. Robson recommended that this committee meet as a large group but also that members of this committee be provided with the opportunity to meet with the TDM consultant on a one on one basis.

L. Roberts suggested having the consultant host workshops with this committee and task attendees to come up with a solution.

#### **4.0 Select Chair**

L. Howse was selected as Chair to the TDM Steering Committee.

#### **5.0 Review Request for Proposal for TDM Consultant**

L. Roberts stated that identifying goals, barriers etc should be the deliverables of the TDM Consultant.

**ACTION:** Larry to send Lynn a copy of the CRD's RFP for a TDM Consultant and a list of stakeholders.

L. Roberts suggested putting a ceiling price in the RFP.

**ACTION:** Lynn to investigate whether or not we can put a ceiling price in the RFP and what that ceiling price would be.

**ACTION:** Lynn to review CRD's RFP and revise the TDM Consultant RFP. The revised RFP should then be emailed to Committee members before being posted.

L. Roberts discussed a CRD project on transportation origin destination.

**ACTION:** L. Roberts to send Lynn a copy of the results of CRD's origin destination project.

#### **6.0 Other Business**

M. Segger asked what information should he provide to the Municipalities regarding the status of UVic's TDM Strategy.

G.A. Robson suggested that M. Segger report to the Municipalities that the TDM Steering Committee has met and provide them with a copy of the Terms of Reference. It was also decided that the project timelines should also be passed out once they have been firmed up by the consultant.

Committee members discussed the possibility of inviting representatives from Saanich and Oak Bay to join the Steering Committee.

**ACTION:** M. Segger to speak to the Mayors of Oak Bay and Saanich about whether or not we should have representatives from Saanich and Oak Bay on the Steering Committee and discuss possible candidates.

**7.0 Next Meeting**

**ACTION:** L. Howse to forward possible meeting dates from the week of April 22 – 26.

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date:           Tuesday, May 1, 2002**

**Time:           2:00 pm to 4:00 pm**

**Location:   Saunders Building, Conference Room 104**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0   Introductions and Welcome
- 2.0   Review and Approval of Agenda
- 3.0   Discussion of Project
- 4.0   Review and Evaluate Proposals for Transportation Demand Management  
      Consultant
- 5.0   Select Transportation Demand Management Consultant
- 6.0   Other Business
- 7.0   Next Meeting



**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

Date: **Tuesday, May 1, 2002**

Time: **2:00 pm to 4:00 pm**

Location: **Saunders Building, Conference Room 104**

Present: G.A. Robson, Executive Director, Facilities Management, UVic  
C. Foord, Marketing and Communications Manager, BC Transit  
L. Howse, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic  
L. Roberts, Manager, Transportation Planning, Regional Planning  
Services, CRD  
S. Pitt, Director of Engineering Services, District of Oak Bay  
C. Doyle, Manager of Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, District  
of Saanich

Absent: M. Segger, Director, Community Relations, UVic  
B. Johnston, Operations Support Manager, Campus Security Services

**1.0 Introductions and Welcome**

**2.0 Review and Approval of Agenda**

Agenda approved.

**3.0 Discussion of Project**

C. Doyle requested clarification on the motivation for the University to engage in developing a TDM Strategy and questioned if the motivation was the DPI project.

G.A. Robson clarified that the motivation for the University to develop a TDM Strategy is to actually further the efforts of the Transportation Task Force in 1993 and has been on the list of "things to do" for sometime. It has not been DPI project.

**4.0 Review and Evaluate Proposals for Transportation Demand Management Consultant**

All committee members reviewed and evaluated the proposals from *rj + associates* and *GMK 2000*. Below are the results:

**ri + associates**

**Company Profile and Experience**

- ◆ Primary Consultant a P. Eng. although most of his experience is with traffic management as opposed to transportation demand management (TDM).
- ◆ Most TDM experience came from UBC Trek Office, whose experience may be drawn upon as colleagues as opposed to paid consultants.
- ◆ Proposal was well written.

**Score: 35/40**

**Written Response**

- ◆ Suggested changes to the proposed project plan seemed appropriate.
- ◆ Many of the ideas (and associated costs to the University) seemed inappropriate and exceeded the scope of the project.
- ◆ Organization chart for TDM plan deemed to have inappropriate reporting lines.
- ◆ Good emphasis on public consultation.

**Score: 30/40**

**Cost**

- ◆ \$10,000 greater than expected range

**Score: 18/20**

**Total Score: 83/100**

**GMK 2000**

**Company Profile and Experience**

- ◆ TDM experience is strong. Have assisted many other institutions with developing and implementing a TDM program.
- ◆ Todd Litman and Richard Drdul very knowledgeable on TDM issues.
- ◆ Primary Consultant is not a P. Eng.

**Score: 38/40**

**Written Response**

- ◆ Suggested changes to the proposed project plan seemed appropriate.
- ◆ Good emphasis on providing cost benefit analysis for proposed TDM strategies.
- ◆ Good emphasis on public consultation.



- ◆ Focus groups to be chaired by R. Drdul.
- ◆ Concerns raised about focusing on self-financing TDM strategies.

**Score: 38/40**

**Cost**

- ◆ \$10,000 greater than expected range, however, it is expressed as an option.

**Score: 20/20**

**Total Score: 96/100**

**5.0 Select Transportation Demand Management Consultant**

It was recommended unanimously that the contract be awarded to GMK 2000.

**6.0 Other Business**

L. Roberts discussed CRD Transportation Survey and stated that the results relevant to the University would be made available to the consultant.

**7.0 Next Meeting**

**ACTION:** L. Howse to send out proposed meeting dates for the end of May.

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

Date:           **Tuesday, May 28, 2002**

Time:           **10:00 am to 12:00 pm**

Location:       **Saunders Building, Conference Room 104**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0   Introduction of Consultant Team
- 2.0   Consultant Presentation on TDM
- 3.0   Discussion of First Phase of Work
  - 3.1   MOST Proposal (attached)
  - 3.2   UVic Stakeholders Advisory Committee Meeting  
      - date, time and agenda
- 4.0   Establishment of TDM Strategy Targets and Goals
- 5.0   Other Business
- 6.0   Next Meeting

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date:** Tuesday, May 28, 2002

**Time:** 10:00 am to 12:00 pm

**Location:** Saunders Building, Conference Room 104

**Present:** G.A. Robson, Executive Director, Facilities Management, UVic  
C. Foord, Marketing and Communications Manager, BC Transit  
L. Howse, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic  
S. Pitt, Director of Engineering Services, District of Oak Bay  
C. Doyle, Manager of Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, District of Saanich  
M. Segger, Director, Community Relations, UVic  
B. Johnston, Operations Support Manager, Campus Security Services  
M. Skene, Boulevard Transportation Group

**Absent:** L. Roberts, Manager, Transportation Planning, Regional Planning Services, CRD

**1.0 Introduction of Consultant Team**

**2.0 Consultant Presentation on TDM**

**3.0 Discussion of First Phase of Work**

**3.1 MOST Proposal**

No significant comments. Ready for submission.

**3.2 UVic Stakeholders Advisory Committee Meeting**

Letters of invitation sent out. First meeting to be scheduled by the end of June. Lynn to work with Mike on Agenda.

**4.0 Establishment of TDM Strategy Targets and Goals**

Will wait until after we hear from the Stakeholders as to their expectations.

## **5.0 Other Business**

### **Roundtable discussion on Steering Committee Expectations**

C. Foord – UPass a good starting point. We need to measure and document change. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Encourage municipalities to look at parking bylaws.

C. Doyle – We need to discourage off campus parking. Reduce traffic generated by the university through the neighbourhoods. Ensure the University is doing the right thing.

S. Pitt – Move people out of SOV. Reduce off campus parking.

B. Johnston – Manage future parking needs. Reduce SOV mode of transportation not other modes such as cycling.

M. Segger – To mitigate community concerns associated with the potential growth of the University and transportation.

G.A. Robson – Parking bylaw relaxation from municipalities.

L. Howse – Ensure a collaborative effort from everyone involved. Innovative TDM solutions through partnerships.

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date:           Tuesday, September 24, 2002**

**Time:           10:00 am to 12:00 pm**

**Location:   Saunders Building, Boardroom 104**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0   Discuss MOST Application
- 2.0   Review UVic TDM Working Paper (attached)
- 3.0   Discuss Focus Group Sessions
- 4.0   Review Project Schedule
- 5.0   Other Business
  - 5.1   Presentation by ICBC, Safer City, Program Manager
- 6.0   Next Meeting

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

Date: **Tuesday, Sept 24, 2002**

Time: **10:00 am to 12:00 am**

Location: **Board Room, Saunders Building**

Present: G.A. Robson, Executive Director, Facilities Management, UVic  
L. Howse, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic  
M. Skene, Boulevard Transportation Group  
L. Roberts, Manager, Transportation Planning, Regional Planning Services, CRD  
C. Foord, Marketing and Communications Manager, BC Transit  
C. Doyle, Manager of Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, District of Saanich  
B. Johnston, Operations Support Manager, Campus Security Services  
S. Hallatt, Boulevard Transportation Group

Absent: S. Pitt, Director of Engineering Services, District of Oak Bay  
M. Segger, Director, Community Relations, UVic

**1.0 Discuss MOST Application**

Received letter from Transport Canada which indicated that our proposal had been declined.

S. Hallatt contacted David McIssac from MOST to ask why it had been declined and he responded that it was a good proposal there was just a lot of competition and not much money available. David also indicated that more money might be available in two weeks that may be suitable for our project.

The deadline to resubmit our proposal for the second pool of money is December 1, 2002.

## **2.0 Review UVic TDM Working Paper**

### **Comments**

- First two sentences in the parking section do not correlate.
- Include parking rate graph that would illustrate what would happen to the parking demand if we dramatically increased parking rates now.
- Should include a comparison of parking rates for other universities as well as downtown Victoria.
- Walking contours off in the report.
- Page 4 states most residents have cars. Should read most campus residents.
- Change title on map to population density.
- Check monthly rate for parking.

### **General Discussion**

- If needed, class utilization schedules could be provided.
- This year we have increased parking rates by 10% and there has been no difference in the number of permits sold.
- Saanich Councilors will be concerned about how an increase in parking rates will contribute to overflow parking in nearby neighbourhoods.
- There used to be a two-year waitlist to get into UVic Parkade. Now there is no waitlist and reserve-parking sales are way down and general parking sales are up.
- Best way to deal with overflow parking in nearby neighbourhoods is to outline how it will be mitigated.
- What is more of an issue is that people are parking on the streets not that the cars are blocking residential parking.
- Should look at putting signs up on one side of the street one year and then the other side the next year.
- Need to improve bus routes on shorter routes.
- Transit funding is an issue. This year BC Transit had to cut service back by 2%.
- Now BC Transit has automatic counters so there is much better statistical data.
- Question was asked when would we be getting some firm recommendations. The reply was after focus groups.
- C. Foord to provide information on transportation survey.
- Need to make modes of transportation flexible and work together.
- % parking fee increase to go to alternative modes.
- Use vehicles for messaging about alternative modes of transportation.
- Need to look at what other municipalities require in the way of parking.

## **3.0 Discuss Focus Group Sessions**

We have planned, for the beginning of November, to have 6 focus groups - three student, one staff, one faculty and one stakeholder.

## **4.0 Review Project Schedule**

M. Skene to revise project schedule.



Important to review parking issue for February so that changes can be implemented for next school year.

## **5.0 Other Business**

### **5.1 Presentation by ICBC, Safer City, Program Manager**

At the last meeting we had a presentation from the ICBC, Safer City, Program Manager who was interested in participating on the Steering Committee.

It was decided that Boulevard Transportation provided sufficient safety experience for this project.

## **6.0 Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be in the beginning of December.



**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date: Thursday August 1, 2002**

**Time: 10:00 am to 12:00 pm**

**Location: Saunders Building, Boardroom 104**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0 Discuss MOST Application
- 2.0 Review UVic TDM Working Paper (attached)
- 3.0 Discuss Focus Group Sessions
- 4.0 Review Project Schedule
- 5.0 Other Business
  - 5.1 Presentation by ICBC, Safer City, Program Manager
- 6.0 Next Meeting

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date:** Thursday, Aug 1, 2002

**Time:** 10:00 am to 11:30 am

**Location:** Saunders Building, Meeting Room 121

**Present:** G.A. Robson, Executive Director, Facilities Management, UVic  
L. Howse, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic  
S. Pitt, Director of Engineering Services, District of Oak Bay  
M. Skene, Boulevard Transportation Group

**Absent:** L. Roberts, Manager, Transportation Planning, Regional Planning  
Services, CRD  
C. Foord, Marketing and Communications Manager, BC Transit  
C. Doyle, Manager of Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, District  
of Saanich  
M. Segger, Director, Community Relations, UVic  
B. Johnston, Operations Support Manager, Campus Security Services

**1.0 Status to Date**

M. Skene gave an update as to the project status and stated that they were not as far ahead as they had hoped. They are awaiting information from Saanich.

**Action:** L. Howse to write a letter to Hugh McKay (in Colin's absence) requesting information.

Mike presented graphs showing the commute times for bikes, automobiles and transit to and from the University. Also presented graph showing population density of staff and faculty in the Greater Victoria Region.

**Action:** M. Skene and L. Howse to work together to get student postal codes.

M. Skene discussed the need to review parking data and projects.

**Action:** M. Skene to contact Gord Dash UVic Parking Coordinator to review data.

M. Skene reviewed the modal splits and the goal to reduce SOV commuting to campus by 10%.

G.A. Robson asked when it is expected that the goal will be achieved.

M. Skene responded that it depends on what TDM programs are implemented. For example, tripling the parking rates would achieve a much quicker result than increasing it by \$10/year.

G.A. Robson stated that we need aggressive timeframes in order to get a parking relaxation for upcoming buildings.

**Action:** L. Howse to give M. Skene information on upcoming buildings that may require more parking stalls according to Saanich Bylaws.

G.A. Robson further stated that we should look at growth by year to determine what shift in the modal split is required to have a no net increase in parking stalls. He also stated that we need to inform the stakeholders and human resources prior to the focus group sessions of some of the issues that may come up associated with parking fees.

**Action:** L. Howse to speak to P. Sanderson, Executive Director, Human Resources.

L. Howse asked M. Skene who he had in mind for the focus groups.

M. Skene responded with students, faculty and staff union groups.

G.A. Robson asked if the focus groups would also include the community associations.

L. Howse responded that we would meet with community groups to provide information and receive their comments, however, it is the TDM is not focused on trying to influence their travel behaviours.

M. Skene brought up the issue on Henderson Road. The North Henderson Community associated is very concerned about increased traffic, however, Oak Bay has deemed this assigned this street a major arterial. How do we address this issue?

G.A. Robson stated that in reality UVic only accounts for a small portion of the commuting public in Saanich and Oak Bay. What about the larger portion of the commuting public? How are they being encouraged to choose an alternative mode of transportation?

All in attendance were satisfied with the status of the project.

## **2.0 Report on Stakeholders Advisory Committee Meeting**

G.A. Robson stated that the Stakeholders Advisory Committee meeting could have come off a little better. More excitement is needed.

L. Howse responded that in future meetings we will be rolling up our sleeves and getting the stakeholders more involved.

### **3.0 Schedule**

Consultants will be working over the next two months to gather and analyze data collected.

A report will be written for the end of September to summarize history and existing conditions, forecast trends and identify challenges and opportunities.

### **4.0 Other Business**

#### **4.1 Presentation by ICBC, Safer City, Program Manager**

Kelvin Roberts made a presentation to be a part of the Steering Committee to add another pair of eyes and provide expertise in the area of safety.

L. Howse responded that the committee would discuss his offer and get back to him after the next meeting.

### **5.0 Next Meeting**

To be set for the end of September.

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date:           Tuesday, September 24, 2002**

**Time:           10:00 am to 12:00 pm**

**Location:     Saunders Building, Boardroom 104**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0   Discuss MOST Application
- 2.0   Review UVic TDM Working Paper (attached)
- 3.0   Discuss Focus Group Sessions
- 4.0   Review Project Schedule
- 5.0   Other Business
  - 5.1   Presentation by ICBC, Safer City, Program Manager
- 6.0   Next Meeting

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

Date: **Tuesday, Sept 24, 2002**

Time: **10:00 am to 12:00 am**

Location: **Board Room, Saunders Building**

Present: G.A. Robson, Executive Director, Facilities Management, UVic  
L. Howse, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic  
M. Skene, Boulevard Transportation Group  
L. Roberts, Manager, Transportation Planning, Regional Planning Services, CRD  
C. Foord, Marketing and Communications Manager, BC Transit  
C. Doyle, Manager of Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, District of Saanich  
B. Johnston, Operations Support Manager, Campus Security Services  
S. Hallatt, Boulevard Transportation Group

Absent: S. Pitt, Director of Engineering Services, District of Oak Bay  
M. Segger, Director, Community Relations, UVic

**1.0 Discuss MOST Application**

Received letter from Transport Canada which indicated that our proposal had been declined.

S. Hallatt contacted David McIssac from MOST to ask why it had been declined and he responded that it was a good proposal there was just a lot of competition and not much money available. David also indicated that more money might be available in two weeks that may be suitable for our project.

The deadline to resubmit our proposal for the second pool of money is December 1, 2002.



## **2.0 Review UVic TDM Working Paper**

### **Comments**

- First two sentences in the parking section do not correlate.
- Include parking rate graph that would illustrate what would happen to the parking demand if we dramatically increased parking rates now.
- Should include a comparison of parking rates for other universities as well as downtown Victoria.
- Walking contours off in the report.
- Page 4 states most residents have cars. Should read most campus residents.
- Change title on map to population density.
- Check monthly rate for parking.

### **General Discussion**

- If needed, class utilization schedules could be provided.
- This year we have increased parking rates by 10% and there has been no difference in the number of permits sold.
- Saanich Councilors will be concerned about how an increase in parking rates will contribute to overflow parking in nearby neighbourhoods.
- There used to be a two-year waitlist to get into UVic Parkade. Now there is no waitlist and reserve-parking sales are way down and general parking sales are up.
- Best way to deal with overflow parking in nearby neighbourhoods is to outline how it will be mitigated.
- What is more of an issue is that people are parking on the streets not that the cars are blocking residential parking.
- Should look at putting signs up on one side of the street one year and then the other side the next year.
- Need to improve bus routes on shorter routes.
- Transit funding is an issue. This year BC Transit had to cut service back by 2%.
- Now BC Transit has automatic counters so there is much better statistical data.
- Question was asked when would we be getting some firm recommendations. The reply was after focus groups.
- C. Foord to provide information on transportation survey.
- Need to make modes of transportation flexible and work together.
- % parking fee increase to go to alternative modes.
- Use vehicles for messaging about alternative modes of transportation.
- Need to look at what other municipalities require in the way of parking.

## **3.0 Discuss Focus Group Sessions**

We have planned, for the beginning of November, to have 6 focus groups - three student, one staff, one faculty and one stakeholder.

## **4.0 Review Project Schedule**

M. Skene to revise project schedule.

Important to review parking issue for February so that changes can be implemented for next school year.

## **5.0 Other Business**

### **5.1 Presentation by ICBC, Safer City, Program Manager**

At the last meeting we had a presentation from the ICBC, Safer City, Program Manager who was interested in participating on the Steering Committee.

It was decided that Boulevard Transportation provided sufficient safety experience for this project.

## **6.0 Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be in the beginning of December.



**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date:           Wednesday, December 18, 2002**

**Time:           1:00 pm to 3:00 pm**

**Location:    Saunders Building, Boardroom 104**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0   Review Focus Group Report (attached)
- 2.0   Review the "Role of Parking" report (attached)
- 3.0   Discuss TDM Options
- 4.0   Other Business
- 5.0   Next Meeting

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

Date: **Thursday, December 18, 2002**

Time: **1:00 pm to 3:00 pm**

Location: **Saunders Building, Rm 104**

Present: G.A. Robson, Executive Director, Facilities Management, UVic  
L. Howse, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic  
M. Skene, Boulevard Transportation Group  
C. Foord, Marketing and Communications Manager, BC Transit  
C. Doyle, Manager of Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, District of Saanich  
B. Johnston, Operations Support Manager, Campus Security Services  
S. Hallatt, Boulevard Transportation Group  
D. Lovell, Manager of Campus Planning, UVic  
D. Guthrie, Transportation Planner, Boulevard Transportation Group  
S. Pitt, Director of Engineering Services, District of Oak Bay

Absent: L. Roberts, Manager, Transportation Planning, Regional Planning Services, CRD

**1.0 Review Focus Group Report**

Focus Group Sessions were deemed very valuable.

Q/C: Did LRT ever come up?

A: It did in the Stakeholder Focus Group from an LRT representative.

Q/C: It should come up in the report because there are some limitations to what we (the University) can do and some sort of strategy should be developed for LRT.

Q/C: Did the students agree to increasing parking rates?

A: Yes, except on person.

Q/C: Was it a representative sample?

A: Yes. The students were randomly selected.

Q/C: Were community stakeholders random?

A: We tried to make it as random as possible but we had some difficulty so we ended up going to the community associations for representatives.

Q/C: Did you get a feel for how people felt about increasing parking fees to subsidize a new parkade?

A: Yes, there was an overwhelming response that if parking rates were increased that people definitely wanted the money to go towards supporting alternative modes of transportation. People, did however feel there should be some sort of subsidy for people who could not take alternative forms of transportation due to outstanding circumstance. People did not want parking revenue to go into the general pool they would first prefer it to go into alternative modes of transport and then into a parkade. People also felt that if we were going to increase rates we should also improve alternatives such as bus capacity and schedules.

Q/C: How does BC Transit feel about the Upass?

A: BC Transit is in favor of it. It marginally increased revenue but increased ridership by over 60%.

## **2.0 Review the "Role of Parking" report**

**See attached presentation**

Q/C: Control use of complimentary parking pass – provide a free lunch or 10 free daily parking passes.

Q/C: Spill Over – Oak Bay has their own commissionaires. Council decision not to have "Residential Parking Only" signs instead Oak Bay has time limitations.

Q/C: May have a problem with UVic security coming into the community.

Q/C: UVic closer and may be able to respond quicker.

Q/C: Can set up hotline to go straight to commissionaires?

Q/C: Does Saanich have a preference?

A: No, tickets that are issued in the Residential Parking Only" areas do not hold up in court because you would need all nearby neighbours to attest in court.

Q/C: Should we consider a permit system for residential neighbours?

Q/C: The City of Victoria regulates frontages. If you complain are you prepared to go to court.

Q/C: Saanich Council would want to know – what if? What else are we doing other than increasing parking rates.

Q/C: Municipalities need to do their part. Zoning bylaws need to be changed. “If we build it they will come.”

### **3.0 Discuss TDM Options**

To be discussed at next meeting.

### **4.0 Other Business**

Will need to have a Stakeholders meeting in January. Will review focus group report and discuss possible TDM options.

### **5.0 Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held in February.

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

Date: **Thursday, May 08, 2003**

Time: **10:00 pm to 12:00 pm**

Location: **Saunders Building, Boardroom 104**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0 Review TDM Options Presented in Final Draft Report (attached)
- 2.0 Review comments from TDM Stakeholders Committee
- 3.0 Other Business
- 4.0 Next Meeting

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

Date: **Thursday, May 08, 2003**

Time: **10:00 am to 12:00 pm**

Location: **Saunders Building, Board Room 104**

Present: G.A. Robson, Executive Director, Facilities Management, UVic  
L. Bartle, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic  
L. Roberts, Manager, Transportation Planning, Regional Planning Services, CRD  
B. Johnston, Operations Support Manager, Campus Security Services, UVic  
C. Doyle, Manager of Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, District of Saanich  
S. Hallatt, Boulevard Transportation  
M. Skene, Boulevard Transportation  
C. Foord, Marketing and Communications Manager, BC Transit

Absent: S. Pitt, Director of Engineering Services, District of Oak Bay  
M. Segger, Director, Community Relations, UVic

**1.0 Review TDM Options Presented in Final Draft Report**

**Presentation by Boulevard Transportation**

Q/C: We have to figure out the threshold – how much are people willing to pay to drive their cars?

Q/C: CRD parkade went from \$30 to \$120 and created a situation where there was no longer a demand.

Q/C: The general rule is that if you increase parking by 30% you will see 10% shift to alternative modes of transportation.

Q/C: Decision-makers need that sort of information to make decisions.

- Q/C: Not sure if that sort of information will apply to the University we may have to wait and see but it's important to find a compromise between the carrots and the sticks.
- Q/C: In the parking increase chart it should indicate what the current rate is.
- Q/C: In the areas where there is no increase on the chart should there be a gradual increase.
- Q/C: We want people to think about what mode they choose everyday by making daily more attractive.
- Q/C: In Kelowna they increased parking by 10% so that it would be equal to the cost of a monthly bus pass.
- Q/C: The cost of a monthly bus pass in Victoria is \$55/month or \$560/year.
- Q/C: When we are talking about parking increases we should talk in absolute terms as opposed to percentage increases or decreases.
- Q/C: We need to make clear on the parking increase chart that the recommended increases are over and above inflation.
- Q/C: At the Stakeholder's meeting there was some discussion on how the increases in tuition will effect the spending habits of students.
- Q/C: If parking rates are high we may attract more affluent students.
- Q/C: UBC has been quite aggressive with their TDM Strategies. Have a budget of \$1 - \$2 million/year.
- Q/C: UBC is not like UVic in that UVic is more suburban. Some council members think parking should be free.
- Q/C: Parking at UVic will need to be monitored continuously.
- Q/C: Do not mean to belabor the point but we need to get this right.
- Q/C: Have you looked at daily rates for UVic.
- Q/C: We have but there is a perception that it wouldn't be well received.
- Q/C: There is a problem with the parking rate increase chart in that at the end of it all parking is still cheap at UVic.
- Q/C: This came up in the Stakeholder's meeting as well.



- Q/C: Camosun College charges \$2/day.
- Q/C: \$2/day using a parking ticket dispenser is very inconvenient.
- Q/C: Will not be well received because it is inconvenient.
- Q/C: What about saying those who have a Upass you can no longer buy an annual pass.
- Q/C: What about a Upass for staff and faculty.
- Q/C: BC Transit shouldn't treat some employers different than others.
- Q/C: We need to provide decision makers with options.
- Q/C: The current price structure provided in the report brings about much debate.
- Q/C: Can you provide a dynamic model that you can plug in the numbers to make decisions and discuss strategy?
- Q/C: Easy to justify \$2/day because of Camosun College.
- Q/C: As a deliverable we will provide 3 options for a parking price structure and some ideas on what revenue will be generated from each option.
- Q/C: If you increase cycling to the area then revenue should be used to improve bike lanes.
- Q/C: Inconvenient parking – we don't want to frustrate people we just want to give them choice.
- Q/C: Would it be possible for the presentation to include a dynamic model to go through a number of scenarios based on probabilities?
- Q/C: How much is a smart card -\$5.
- Q/C: What about linking a card to a bus pass where you are given a card at the beginning of the year for the bus but if you use it for parking you will have to renew it sooner.
- Q/C: More onus on making daily decisions.
- Q/C: Need more prescriptive costs.
- Q/C: In favour of more simpler cards. People often lose their cards.



Q/C: On page 42 – land costs should be either taken out or qualified better.

## **2.0 Review comments from TDM Stakeholders Committee**

Addressed in review of TDM Options presented in final draft report.

## **3.0 Other Business**

Went through options to get a rough estimate of costs to be included in next draft.

## **4.0 Next Meeting**

We will meet again in June.

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

Date: **Wednesday, June 18, 2003**

Time: **2:00 pm to 4:00 pm**

Location: **Saunders Building, Conference Room 104**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0 Review comments from May 15, 2003 UVic TDM Stakeholder's Meeting
- 2.0 Review changes to parking section of the Final TDM Draft Report
- 3.0 Other Business
  - 3.1 July UVic TDM Stakeholder's Meeting/Reception
- 4.0 Next Steps

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STEERING**  
**COMMITTEE**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date:**           **Wednesday, June 18, 2003**

**Time:**           **2:00 pm to 4:00 pm**

**Location:**      **Saunders Building, Conference Room 104**

**Present:**       G.A. Robson, Executive Director, Facilities Management, UVic  
                  M. Segger, Director, Community Relations, UVic  
                  L. Howse, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic  
                  C. Foord, Marketing and Communications Manager, BC Transit  
                  S. Pitt, Director of Engineering Services, District of Oak Bay  
                  S. Hallatt, Boulevard Transportation Group  
                  B. Johnston, Operations Support Manager, Campus Security Services  
                  M. Skene, Boulevard Transportation Group  
                  H. McDonald, Director, Campus Security Services, UVic (Representing B

**Absent:**         L. Roberts, Manager, Transportation Planning, Regional Planning  
                  Services, CRD  
                  C. Doyle, Manager of Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, District  
                  of Saanich

**1.0   Review comments from May 15, 2003 UVic TDM Stakeholder's Meeting**

Q/C   Some of the comments will be included in the report. Other comments had already been discussed at the Steering Committee level and a decision was made not to include them in the report.

**2.0   Review changes to parking section of the Final TDM Draft Report**

Q/C   Increases in parking fees should be expressed in dollars and then percentages.

Q/C   Should be some discussion on where the revenue is to be used.

Q/C   Discussion on options for parking rate increases should be less detailed, put in broad concept terms. Detail could be provided in appendix.

Q/C   Camosun does not charge staff for parking but they are taxed.

- Q/C Should give more consideration to two tiered parking for students, staff and faculty.
- Q/C What about the university subsidizing a staff and faculty UPASS?
- Q/C What about paying for parking at night?
- Q/C We need to consider disabled people and shift workers who are not able to use the bus.

### **3.0 Other Business**

#### **3.1 July UVic TDM Stakeholders' Meeting/Reception**

UVic TDM Stakeholders Meeting/Reception will be held July 3, 2003 from 7:00 – 9:00 at the University Club. Steering Committee Members are encouraged to attend as there will be a wine and cheese reception from 8:00 – 9:00 as a thank-you for all that have participated.

### **4.0 Next Steps**

Will be working over the summer to tighten up the report. An open house will be held in Septmeber. Based on the feedback we will decide if we need to meet with the Steering and Stakeholder Committees after the open house. Anticipating having the final report complete and presented to the President by the end of September.

*UVIC TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STUDY  
APPENDICES*

**Stakeholder Committee Minutes**



**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date:           Wednesday, June 26, 2002**

**Time:           6:30 pm to 8:30 pm**

**Location:   Haro Room, Cadboro Commons Building,  
University of Victoria**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0   Introductions
- 2.0   Opening Comments
- 3.0   UVic TDM Strategy – What it is and what it isn't
- 4.0   Role of the Stakeholders Committee
- 5.0   Project Outline and Schedule
- 6.0   Issues and Challenges – What is important to the Stakeholders



**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date:** Wednesday, June 26, 2002

**Time:** 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm

**Location:** Haro Room, Cadboro Commons Building, University of Victoria

**Present:**

- N. Boivin, Gordon Head Residents' Association
- S. Bigelow, ICBC
- S. Warren, CUPE 951, UVic
- S. Tyler, Gordon Head Residents' Association
- E. MacNair, Eco-Research Chair
- T. Sebastian, UVic Students' Society
- D. Clode, Executive Director, Student and Ancillary Services, UVic
- I. Graeme, Camosun Community Association
- J. Holland, UVic Bicycle Users Committee
- P. Meekison, Cadboro Bay Residents Association
- P. Mack, Mt. Tolmie Community Association
- B. Trotter, Quadra/Cedar Hill Community Association and Island Transit Alliance
- A. Stewart, North Henderson Residents' Association
- R. Irvine, Councilors, District of Oak Bay
- L. Burgess, Gordon Head Residents' Association
- L. Howse, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic
- M. Skene, Boulevard Transportation Group
- G.A. Robson, Executive Director, Facilities Management, UVic (Member of the Steering Committee)
- S. Pitt, Director of Engineering Services, District of Oak Bay (Member of the Steering Committee)

**Absent:**

- K. Burns, Professional Employees Association
- J. Dopp, UVic Faculty Association
- J. Smith, UVic Graduate Student Society
- F. Chambers, CUPE 4163, UVic
- J. Luton, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition
- T. Sheldon, CRD Roundtable on the Environment
- C. Foord, Marketing and Communications Manager, BC Transit (Member of the Steering Committee)

C. Doyle, Manager of Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, District of Saanich (Member of the Steering Committee)

M. Segger, Director, Community Relations, UVic (Member of the Steering Committee)

B. Johnston, Operations Support Manager, Campus Security Services (Member of the Steering Committee)

L. Roberts, Manager, Transportation Planning, Regional Planning Services, CRD (Member of the Steering Committee)

## **1.0 Introductions**

## **2.0 Opening Comments**

### **Vice-President, Finance and Operations – J. Falk**

Thank – you for taking the time out to assist the University in developing a Transportation Demand Management Strategy.

This committee will provide an important link between the Steering Committee and various interested stakeholders within your organizations. We are excited to hear your ideas and receive your input.

The University's Strategic Plan addresses the issue of growth. The Campus Plan addresses the issue of how we will manage that growth. Continued growth will have an obvious impact on nearby neighbours and we are here today to try to address the impact of increased transportation demand.

The goal is to reduce the number of single occupant vehicles commuting to the University.

The University is initiating the process but we appreciate the various stakeholder participation and partnerships.

We will strive to find a balance. People need to get here so what is the most efficient way we can get them here.

Again, thank-you for your participation and we look forward to working with you over the next year.

**Presentation: Mike Skene – Boulevard Transportation Group (see attached file or printout)**

## **3.0 UVic TDM Strategy – What it is and what it isn't**

## **4.0 Role of the Stakeholders Committee**

## **5.0 Project Outline and Schedule**

## **6.0 Issues and Challenges – What is important to the Stakeholders**

Q/C: What is the role of Mike Skene and Boulevard Transportation Group?

A: Develop the strategy and chair this committee. The University felt that in order to do a complete strategy we needed to bring in some outside expertise.

Q/C: In your presentation there are some statistics about modal splits for UBC. Why have they not been able to dramatically reduce the number of single occupant vehicles commuting to campus?

A: They are still chipping away at it. They have implemented many incentives for choosing alternative modes of transportation but not many disincentives.

Q/C: Are we going to consider visitors to the University?

A: Yes, we will look at all travelers to the University and attempt to figure out something we could do to reduce the traffic generated by them.

Q/C: I appreciate that Mike has a lot of experience in Transportation Demand Management, however, your firm may have different ideas to the Steering Committee. Is there a chance that at some point you will be in conflict with the Steering Committee?

A: I am sure we will be able to work together on most issues. However, there will be an interesting dynamic amongst all of the stakeholders as there are many different interests represented. If necessary all views will be presented to the Steering committee unbiasedly.

Q/C: To what extent will we be able to stay at the policy level? What recommendations can we make for academics? Take the information to people not people to the information.

Q/C: We are forgetting that the automobile is a highly subsidized mode of transportation.

A: We will be looking at cost benefits that are inclusive.

Q/C: Has there been any attempt to see what has been done in Europe?

A: Most relevant to us is the US but we will also look at Europe.

Q/C: Does TDM include looking at reducing accidents?

A: Yes, we will be looking at safety.

Q/C: What is our link to the Regional Transportation Strategy?

A: L. Howse is a member of the Regional Transportation Stakeholder Committee as is L. Roberts (Member of the UVic TDM Steering Committee).

Q/C: Will you be talking with staff, students and faculty regarding their transportation choices?

A: Yes, we will be holding a number of focus group sessions.

Q/C: BC Transit is looking at an electronic bus pass that may provide lots of data.

Q/C: Will the TDM Strategy be integrated into the draft Campus Plan?

A: The Campus Plan is expected to be a living document that will evolve over time so it is anticipated that the TDM Strategy will be integrated in the Campus Plan over time.

### **Expectations**

- That the process for developing the strategy be truly consultative and collaborative.
- To come up a plan that works for everyone.
- For the University to fulfill it's obligation of leadership in trying to address responsible approaches to growth.
- To be innovative and exceed expectations. Come up with good ideas.
- Preserve the UPass. Change consciousness about whether or not you need to bring a car to campus.
- Employee group participation.
- Set an example as one of the larger employers in the CRD. Look beyond the boundaries.
- Compliment the work already done by the Bicycle Users Group.
- Instill habits in students.
- Assist in improving roads and reducing traffic.
- Reduce traffic on nearby streets.
- To review and, where necessary, change legal parameters in support of the goals.



**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

Date: **Wednesday, October 2, 2002**

Time: **7:00 – 9:00**

Location: **University Club, University of Victoria**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0 Introductions
- 2.0 Discussion of UVic TDM Progress Report
  - 2.1 Existing Conditions
  - 2.2 Trends
  - 2.3 Opportunities
- 3.0 Discussion of Focus Group Sessions
  - 3.1 What are the themes?
  - 3.2 What are the expected outcomes?
  - 3.3 Who should participate?
  - 3.4 How should participants be invited?
  - 3.5 Incentives?
- 4.0 Other Business
- 5.0 Next Meeting

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date:** Wednesday, October 2, 2002

**Time:** 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm

**Location:** University Club, University of Victoria

**Present:** S. Warren, CUPE 951, UVic  
K. Burns, Professional Employees Association  
P. Meekison, Cadboro Bay Residents Association  
J. Brownoff, Councillor, District of Sannich  
D. Bright, alternate for P. Mack, Mt. Tolmie Community Association  
F. Chambers, CUPE 4163, UVic  
A. Stewart, North Henderson Residents' Association  
I. Graeme, Camosun Community Association  
L. Burgess, Gordon Head Residents' Association  
M. Sanseverino, alternate for J. Holland, UVic Bicycle Users Committee  
L. Howse, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic  
M. Skene, Boulevard Transportation Group  
S. Hallatt, Boulevard Transportation Group

**Absent:** N. Boivin, Gordon Head Residents' Association  
S. Bigelow, ICBC  
S. Tyler, Gordon Head Residents' Association  
E. MacNair, Eco-Research Chair  
T. Sebastian, UVic Students' Society  
D. Clode, Executive Director, Student and Ancillary Services, UVic  
B. Trotter, Quadra/Cedar Hill Community Association and Island Transit Alliance  
R. Irvine, Councilors, District of Oak Bay  
J. Dopp, UVic Faculty Association  
J. Smith, UVic Graduate Student Society  
J. Luton, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition  
T. Sheldon, CRD Roundtable on the Environment Committee)

## **1.0 INTRODUCTIONS**

### **2.0 DISCUSSION OF UVIC TDM PROGRESS REPORT**

Mike Skene led the discussion noting that the report presented before the committee is an unedited first draft, and that there are some errors as well as some missing elements such as the information regarding the areas where the student population lives as well as the traffic data collection for the District of Oak Bay.

#### **2.1 Review of the Progress Report**

Highlights of each section in the report were briefly referenced:

- **Modal Split** – there was a noted change with the introduction of the transit UPass system, however the evidence suggests that drivers in single occupant vehicles were not swayed to using transit, rather cyclists moved to transit use.
- **Transit** – There remains some analysis of the transit service to UVic such as capacity of the buses arriving at the campus. There may be an opportunity to increase the short-run routes and improve efficiency of service to Gordon Head neighbourhoods for example.
- **Car Share** – Since the printing of this report, Mike Skene has met with the person on campus who is heading up a car share initiative on campus. Henry Locke reports that they have one cooperative car that is permanently parked in a stall next to the Parking and Security building. The program is run as part of the Victoria Car Share Coop ([vuv.com/carshare](http://vuv.com/carshare) for more info.)
- **Carpool** – When the system was put in place, there were 47 participants, however, 2 years ago, the loop holes and “abuses” were filled and the demand dropped to 6 participants. Parking management staff feel that the carpool strategy is not suitable for the student lifestyle, however, there are examples from other neighbourhood based campuses where carpooling is a success. More research is needed.
- **Cycling** – some information has been gathered, and more since the printing of this report, which will be integrated into the final version. Of note is that the mode share for cycling has steadily gone down.
- **Pedestrian** – No work has been done as yet, although the pedestrian network component plays an integral role in any comprehensive TDM plan.
- **Parking** – Monthly passes reportedly dropped when the Upass was introduced, however sales are back up to where they left off.
- **Data Collection** – Saanich data was already on file at the municipality and provided to Boulevard for analysis. The Oak Bay data is currently being collected by Boulevard staff at various intersections. The information could not be gathered until after the “rush” and travel habits become normalized.
- **Forecast Trends** – As development continues, parking demand will obviously increase. The goal is to accommodate growth without building more stalls. There are a number of strategies that are being explored such as what the expected impact on demand will be if parking fees are doubled, and increased incrementally thereafter. There is a graph in the report which illustrates the impacts.



Mike Skene reported that the Steering Committee has asked that the parking component of the TDM strategy be "fast tracked" to accommodate the budget approval process (takes place in January/February) so that parking fees can be increased for the 2003/04 school year.

## **2.2 Questions and Comments:**

Committee members were invited to submit comments which would be integrated into the final version of the Progress Report, slated for completion in mid October.

- A concern was raised that when the pedestrian environment is reviewed, that safety conditions (personal and traffic) be looked at.
- There were comments referencing observed errors in the document such as:
  - The legend on the walking contours is incorrect
  - A vehicle contour map was missing
    - And that the timing should include the length of time it takes to walk to the car in a parking lot
  - Information regarding the cost of travel for mode would be useful for comparison and marketing
  - Also, information regarding the cost of parking per stall would be useful.
- A question was raised regarding the allocation of where the revenue from parking is currently divided.
- A question was raised regarding how the parking revenue is currently allocated.
  - A response was given that all of the revenue goes towards transportation.
  - Approximately \$170,000 goes towards the UPass program
  - \$5,000 is directed towards the Bicycle Users Group
- Mary Sanseverino made a comment that the Bicycle User Group questioned the validity of this data collection, as they feel intuitively that cycling is on the rise generally, and they know that during Bike to Work Week, 20% of the UVic population arrives to the campus by bike. Also, a request was made to extend the contour to 30 minutes, as that is a common bike commute.
  - Action item: Boulevard to look into the data collection methodology of the Bunt Engineering reports to ensure collection and analysis has been consistent over the years.
- Sharon Warren, is, as a CUPE 951 member, on the Traffic and Parking Committee. She reported that there have been a number of initiatives to try to increase the price of parking, however, the Board of Governors has consistently turned down each proposal
- A question was raised with respect to the mode share held by pedestrians.
  - Action item: Mike to look into pedestrian counts.
- A question was raised with respect to Saanich legalizing currently illegal suites in single family dwellings.
- A comment was forwarded referencing the importance of educating the public on basic sustainability issues – not defaulting to the standard business model where true costs (environment, social) are not included in the balance sheet.

- A comment was forwarded noting the paradigm of the “carrot” versus the “stick” approach to changing habits and reminded the committee about the importance of promoting the health benefits of alternative transportation.
  - Mike Skene responded with a reference to the key “success factor” to any TDM is a long term commitment to renewing and refreshing new trip reduction strategies and on-going marketing and promotion.
- A comment was forwarded making referencing to how important it is that any strategies accommodate maximum flexibility as most people base their travel decisions on convenience.
- Examples of creative marketing were developed by students in the Polis project such as: encouraging transit use by offering free coffee, a bus lottery – strategies that make taking transit “sexy”.
- Clarification was requested on what the purpose of the Parking Committee was. Sharon said that they, among other things, review budgets and look at appeals.
- A request was put forward to make a concerted effort to have the Campus Plan looked at in more detail with respect to TDM.
  - Lynn responded by saying that although the TDM is sensitive to the Campus Plan, they are separate initiatives and will continue on its own path.
  - A comment was then forwarded that this TDM plan should drive the Campus Plan – that the process appears to be “a bit backward”. The TDM plan should be completed before the Campus Plan.
- A comment was forwarded with respect to the significant opportunities that car sharing present – that the information could be included in the student registration package.
- A comment was forwarded with respect to carpooling, with the suggestion that the current qualifying criteria are too restrictive and that a successfully carpooling program has an attendant ridematching system.

### **3.0 DISCUSSION OF FOCUS GROUP SESSION**

#### **3.1 Description**

Sue Hallatt from Boulevard Transportation described the “mechanics” of the focus group sessions, slated for late October, early November.

- There will be four target groups: students, staff, faculty and community
- Six sessions will be held – 3 students, 1 staff, 1 faculty and 1 community
- They will be held over two days, with mid day sessions, late afternoon and evening, so as to be as convenient as possible and meet the needs of diverse schedules.
- There will be 10 to 12 participants per group.
- The Focus Group will be led by a skilled facilitator, and member of the consulting team, Mr. Richard Drdul, who led similar focus groups for both the UBC, and SFU TDM strategies.

- Participants will be asked a series of questions in an attempt to determine where the barriers are and where the fertile ground lies for changing habits. It will be important to capture the diversity of opinions, so as to ensure that strategies finally developed will have the broadest application.

- The participants will be randomly selected, with the exception of the community focus group, where it was suggested that 5 members of the stakeholders participate and 5 members pulled from the community at large. This strategy to be confirmed with the stakeholders.

- A discussion ensued, and it was agreed that the community focus group would be made up of entirely randomly picked residents, and no members of the Stakeholder Committee would participate to ensure the purity of results.

- The committee members were asked to break out into three groups and to brainstorm issues and questions that could be asked to the various groups. A matrix was posted, and each group was randomly assigned to several different perspectives.

**Matrix of Group Interests**

	Pedestrian	Cycling	Transit	Auto
Students	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 1
Faculty	Group 2	Group 3	Group 1	Group 2
Staff	Group 3	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Community	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 2

- To facilitate the brainstorming exercise, the issues and expectations that were recorded during the last Stakeholders Committee meeting were presented.

Issues:

- Available parking for community on campus
- Concern that TDM efforts at other universities has not been successful
- Want to see a reduction in all traffic –of all modes.
- All modes should be subsidized – not just autos.
- Concern about the influence of parking prices on spillover

Expectations:

- Inclusive
- Set an example
- Improve roads
- Innovations
- Preserve UPass
- Reduce traffic
- Change consciousness
- Instill long-term habits of students
- Support issues as presented by the Bicycle Users Group, such as:
  - Double the percentage of cycling
  - Increase in funds directed towards cycling from parking fee revenues
  - Survey bike users
  - Strike a Bike Committee
  - Provide bike courses



- Provide safety information to drivers ("Share the Campus" campaign)
- Install more bike lanes
- Install covered parking
- Install more after trip facilities (showers)
- Widen pedestrian paths within the ring road to safely accommodate both peds and cyclists.

### 3.2 Results from Brainstorming Exercise

#### Staff & Cycling

Would you be interested in participating in a cycling course?

Why don't you bike?

Do you see any opportunities for health and fitness?

What would be your #1 incentive to bike to work?

#### Staff & Transit

Is the ProPass system an incentive for staff to use transit?

Are there other incentives?

Where do you go for transportation info relative to UVic

What things can UVic do to lead the way in alternative transportation?

#### Staff & Walking

How close do you live?

Do you have access to shower facilities? Would you want them if you walked?

Does time of year matter?

Do you have traffic safety issues? Where?

Do you feel safe crossing the ring road? Any crossing concerns elsewhere?

Would a subsidy help? If so, what: shoes, cool UVic umbrella, reflectors

Would you be encouraged by a high profile promotion, such as "Walk around the World" campaign/competition.

Capture the awareness of the health benefits of walking

Capture the awareness of the stress relief associated with walking

"promotes epiphanies!"

Determine if there is interest in a modified bus pass to accommodate mixed modes – bus one way/walk home

Link with other modes – find out where the natural links are (ped and bus, bike and ped etc.)

#### Staff and Autos

Not completed

#### Students & Transit

Do the times for transit suit your UVic schedule?

How did you decide how you were going to commute to Uvic

Did you receive any info on transportation choices when you first registered?

*Comments: stratify new students*

### Students & Cars

Why did you choose UVic?

If parking was prohibited/more restricted, would you go to another University?

What does it cost you to drive to campus?

Do you have a part/time job? Do you need a car?

Why do you need a car?

Where is the closest bus stop to your residence? Do you know?

Do you have parking at home? Are you charged?

Do you pick up hitch-hikers/spontaneous carpool opportunities

Any suggestions towards improve or impede access to parking?

### Students & Walking

What deters you from walking?

How much time are you prepared to walk to school

Is personal safety a consideration in your decision to walk?

Do you consider walking to school part of your fitness program?

Have you experienced traffic conflicts while walking?

What are important elements to the walking experience?

Have you ever walked to:

University/College

Highschool

Elementary school

### Students & Bikes

When you applied to UVic, what did you budget for transportation

Did you even think about it?

How'd you get here tonight?

If you did bike, where would you park?

Are you aware of campus facilities

Would a subsidy encourage you to bike?

What kind? Cool UVic helmet, a bike, reflector equipment

Do you have safety concerns?

### Faculty & Auto

Would you stop driving if parking fees were:

\$60 mo., \$90 mo., \$120 mo., \$150 mo.

Where should parking revenues be applied

Is your mode of transportation based on your schedule or where you live?

What are the main factors determining your mode of Transportation? (scheduling, health, location)

### Faculty & Walking

Do you feel safe walking?

What would be your number one incentive to walk to UVic?

When do you walk?

*Comments: graded questions – 1-5 agree, strongly disagree*

*My behaviour affects climate change*

*I have the ability to influence in my own travel choices?*

#### Faculty and Transit

At what price (parking) will get you to use the bus

How cheap does Transit have to be?

Does the frequency of your trips to campus influence your mode choice? (only come to campus 3 half days a week)

Open ended question: Why won't you ride the bus?

#### Faculty and Bikes

Not completed

#### Community & Transit

Do you believe that increasing transit service would benefit your community

How can UVic be a better community neighbour through transit?

Where would you consider an appropriate place for another exchange?

#### Community & Bike

Would you benefit from a bike safety programme in your community?

Would you support bike lanes on your roadway?

Would you be prepared to close your street to accommodate bikes?

Is there an issue of conflict between bikes and pedestrians in your neighbourhood?

#### Community & Walking

Not completed

#### Community & Auto

Not completed

### **3.4 Prizes for the Focus Group Participants**

The stakeholders were asked to brainstorm some appropriate prizes and or "thank-you gifts" to present to the participants. The following list was developed:

- Recreation pass
- Cinecenta Tickets
- Bus pass
- Finnerty Express gift
- Bookstore gift
- University Club dinner
- T-shirts
- Symphony tickets
- Phoenix Theatre
- Cadboro Bay
- Garden Sale
- Dunsmuir Lodge Brunch
- Swans Hotel
- Tour of the Observatory
- Tour of the Finnerty Gardens
- Uvic pens

### **3.4 Finding community participants**

The committee was asked to brainstorm ways to randomly select and contact residents. It was recommended that the voter's list be used, and that people be selected according to their proximity to the school (by way of postal codes)

### **4.0 Close of Meeting**

All participants were thanked for their energetic and creative contribution. Next meeting, scheduled for January, is to be announced. Committee members can expect a hard copy of the Progress Report in November. The meeting came to a close at 9:10 pm

Attachment: Bicycle User Group handout



**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

Date: **Tuesday, January 28, 2003**

Time: **6:30 – 8:30**

Location: **University Club, University of Victoria**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0 Review Focus Group Report
- 2.0 Brainstorm TDM options
- 3.0 Parking Dilemma
- 4.0 Other Business
- 5.0 Next Meeting

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date:** Tuesday, January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2003

**Time:** 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm

**Location:** University Club, University of Victoria

**Present:** T. Sheldon, CRD Roundtable on the Environment Ctte)  
S. Warren, CUPE 951, UVic  
K. Burns, Professional Employees Association  
R. Irvine, Councilors, District of Oak Bay  
S. Warren, UVic CUPE 951  
J. Smith, UVic Graduate Student Society  
F. Hamersley-Chambers, CUPE 4163, (UVic Sessionals)  
A. Stewart, North Henderson Residents' Association  
D. Clode, Executive Director, Student and Ancillary Services, UVic  
B. Trotter, Quadra/Cedar Hill Comm. Assoc. & Island Transit Alliance  
S. Tyler, Gordon Head Residents' Association  
I. Graeme, Camosun Community Association  
L. Burgess, Gordon Head Residents' Association  
M. Sanseverino, UVic Bicycle Users Committee  
L. Howse, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic  
S. Hallatt for M. Skene, Boulevard Transportation Group

**Absent:** P. Meekison, Cadboro Bay Residents Association  
J. Brownoff, Councillor, District of Saanich  
D. Bright, alternate for P. Mack, Mt. Tolmie Community Association  
N. Boivin, Gordon Head Residents' Association  
S. Bigelow, ICBC  
E. MacNair, Eco-Research Chair  
T. Sebastian, UVic Students' Society  
J. Dopp, UVic Faculty Association  
J. Luton, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition

## 1.0 SUMMARY of FOCUS GROUPS SESSIONS

Susan Hallatt summarized the results of the focus group sessions, and published a full report that was made available to all committee members. The following comments/questions were offered by committee members:

- There are no buses that go directly to the airport because of an agreement forged by the taxicab companies.
- What, if any, "surprises" or unexpected information came out of the focus Groups sessions?

Answer: There was a strong consensus that parking fees on campus are too low, and that transit service is woefully inadequate.

- Other shower facilities on campus include: The Engineering Lab Wing, Elliot Building. Showers are being considered for the new building (DTO) and there are plans to put showers in the Continuing Studies building.
- It is important to remember that there is a maintenance cost to showers, not just installation costs.
- There are currently bike lockers that are underutilized. This is due, not to a lack of demand, but lack of awareness.
- There may be an issue of liability with the University with respect to endorsing and facilitating carpooling.
- If you say that carpooling did not receive a favourable response in the Focus Group sessions, are you saying we shouldn't do Carpooling?

Answer: No, we are saying that we should not expect a huge number of people looking to convert to carpooling because the average commute trips to UVic are, by and large, too short to be an attractive option. However, it is still vitally important to offer incentives to carpooling as part of a full compliment of options. TDM is all about options.

- Is there a travel distance where carpooling becomes an attractive option?  
Answer: Trips longer than 30 minutes.
- In addition to travel time, I would think that the irregular class scheduling would present a substantial barrier.
- One concern I have is that we do not have pride at our University in the way that say, Nova Scotia is developing pride around its successes in recycling and waste reduction. Perhaps through programming and promotional campaigns, we can begin the work of creating a culture of pride that we have a high-number of cyclists, transit users etc.
- What is being done about the inadequacy of transit?
- Answer: That remains a problem. BC Transit is doing its best, but their funding is being cut, while demand everywhere is rising. They are about to cut service to other communities in order to bolster UVic runs.

## 2.0 DISCUSSION OF TDM OPTIONS

Susan Hallatt reviewed the various options that may be appropriate for the University based upon information gathered from the Focus Groups sessions, data collection and Best Practices researched at other institutions. Susan noted that the most crucial component of the ultimate TDM Strategy, will be the options that relate to parking. A separate report is currently being published, and will be made available to the Committee for consideration in late February, early March. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation which highlights the options available is attached. The following comments/questions were offered by the Committee members:

### CYCLING:

- We need a comprehensive survey/ audit of where we are deficient in cycling routes – so a capital expenditure plan can be developed.
  - Would be useful to talk with David Cubberly to see if any discussions are in the works as to where route improvements are slated.
  - UVic's cycling committee should connect with the Saanich bicycle committee, and work together.
- The Bicycle Users Committee commented that there are currently 32 bike lockers that are charged out at \$40 per term.
- They commissioned made-in-Victoria bike lockers at a cost \$800 per to build and install. The expensive part is over – the design, templates and jig development, so any more that are built will be considerably cheaper. It is important to use local talent – if for no other reason than they understand the weather conditions and the impacts on design.
- - There was a suggestion that every effort should be made to use the talent within the Ring Road – Engineering students, Art department for design, Environmental Studies for awareness campaigns. There are all sorts of opportunities.
- The option recommended of formally allowing bicycles into the buildings, as a cost saving measure, was flatly rejected due to concerns about mobility and fire regulations.
  - It was noted that cyclists can bring their bikes to the Campus Security building, and they will lock it up, free of charge. There is also secure parking under the University Center.
  - Certainly every new building on campus should have bike lockers.
  - Need to look at the bike parking requirements of new buildings – they should be higher than average for UVic.

### TRANSIT

This campus lacks basic services – so of course people who live on campus need their cars. We should be looking at inviting businesses to open satellite shops on campus – such as groceries.

- This has been tried a number of times, but businesses have a problem making a profit on campus. We don't have the population and activity drops off in summer therefore we can't offer 12 months of customers.



- What is the encouragement for BC Transit to improve bus routes if they already have the money through the UPass?  
Answer: This question has been brought up a number of times. Transit's response is that they are mandated to respond to demand, to the extent that they have the funds. With provincial cut backs, it makes it very difficult for them to meet their mandate.
- There was a comment that it seems pointless to put any effort into improving transit amenities, if the service remains inadequate. It seems the highest priority is to focus on improving service. "Whatever it takes."
- UVic tried to go the "private" route by commissioning Pacific Coachlines in the past to take people on express routes. But it proved to be uneconomical.
- Another identified barrier is the deal that PCL Coachlines purportedly negotiated whereby BC Transit is not permitted to advertise its express routes, as they compete with PCL.
- There was a suggestion that UVic should look into putting more finances into BC Transit to increase the much need service.
- There was a suggestion that the current UPass subsidy of \$170,000 which comes from the Parking revenue, should be re-routed towards transit specifically. The current UPass subsidy only amounts to \$2.00 per person, meaning that students' bus pass would increase from \$38.00 per semester to \$40.00 per semester.

#### OTHER ISSUES

- A concern was forwarded with respect to the accuracy of the various Traffic Studies that have been completed between 1996-2000. The outcome of the reports clearly states that there has been a steady decrease in traffic to the Campus, yet those results are counter-intuitive to the experience of the local residents who feel the traffic is definitely increasing.
  - If UVic is purportedly not the culprit. There needs to be some sort of analysis to alay the concerns of the community. Perhaps a more comprehensive study, a joint study, which captures the traffic for the whole area, will offer an understanding of where this traffic is coming from and going to.
  - Furthermore, no-one has collected data on the UVic cars that park off-campus.
- Creation of all TDM tools is of course important, but will have no effect if there is not a TDM Coordinator charged with the task of implementation of all the measures, and ongoing, relentless promotion.
- One option not mentioned in the report is the importance of off-campus education.

#### Action Item:

Time limitations prevented full review of all the options. The remaining options will be presented at next meeting, along with a summary of the Parking Report. Committee recommended that the options will be presented by order of priority rather than by mode.

### **3.0 DISCUSSION OF 'THE PARKING DILEMMA'**

Lynn Howse described the discussions currently underway with the District of Saanich regarding parking requirements for the new student housing building. She submitted the options put forward by Saanich in a letter to UVic, as requested by Committee member Judy Brownoff, for consideration.

The Committee agreed that Option 4 was the most promising, however there was some discussion as to the 'fairness' of the amount of money assigned to the cost of parking, that should be put into TDM Measures. Some people felt that the \$600,000 was a realistic amount of money needed to invest in TDM measures and were not concerned with the proposed amount. Another committee member felt that, in principal, the option is fine, but that the amount of money should be considerably less and more closely aligned with the actual demand on campus rather than the very high parking requirements in the zoning bylaw.

It was agreed, however, that missing in the proposal, was an understanding that there needs to be a partnership with Saanich. Uvic cannot, on its own, improve the regional bike routes for example. Similarly, UVic must somehow forge a partnership with Transit if service is to improve. The committee would like to see Saanich commit to matching funds to ensure real success in TDM measures which will ultimately benefit the municipality as well as the campus community.

### **4.0 NEXT MEETING**

The meeting ended formally at 9:05 but informal discussions carried on until 9:30pm.

The next meeting will be arranged once the Report on Parking is completed and approved by the Steering Committee.

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date: Thursday, May 1st, 2003**

**Time: 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm**

**Location: University Club, University of Victoria**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0 Follow-up on Discussion with Saanich re: Parking Requirements
- 2.0 Review of Parking Options Considered
- 3.0 Review of other TDM Options, not yet covered
- 4.0 Next Steps in the TDM Strategy
- 5.0 Next Meeting: (May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2003, 7-9 pm)



**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date:** Thursday, May 1, 2003

**Time:** 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm

**Location:** University Club, University of Victoria

**Present:** S. Tyler, Gordon Head Residents' Association  
S. Warren, CUPE 951, UVic  
K. Burns, Professional Employees Association  
R. St. Arnault, Eco-Research Chair  
D. Clode, Executive Director, Student and Ancillary Services, UVic  
B. Trotter, Quadra/Cedar Hill Comm. Assoc. & Island Transit Alliance  
R. Fuoco for J. Brownoff, Councilor, District of Saanich  
L. Bartle, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic  
M. Skene, Boulevard Transportation Group  
S. Hallatt, Boulevard Transportation Group

**Absent:** T. Sheldon, CRD Roundtable on the Environment  
J. Dopp, UVic Faculty Association  
J. Smith, UVic Graduate Student Society  
J. Luton, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition  
T. Sebastian, UVic Students' Society  
N. Boivin, Gordon Head Residents' Association  
J. Story, ICBC  
I. Graeme, Camosun Community Association  
Mary Sanseverino, UVic Bicycle Users Committee  
P. Meekison, Cadboro Bay Residents Association  
P. Mack, Mt. Tolmie Community Association  
A. Stewart, North Henderson Residents' Association  
R. Irvine, Councilors, District of Oak Bay

### **1.0 Review Negotiations with Saanich**

Lynn, aided by Russ Fuoco from Saanich, reported on the outcome of the discussions between the District of Saanich and the University regarding the parking requirements for the Student Housing project underway. There is an agreement in principle that the University will set aside \$300,000 specifically targeted for TDM initiatives in exchange

for a reduction in parking requirements for the building. This agreement will be presented to Council for consideration and final approval.

## **2.0 Review of Parking Options**

At the last meeting, most of the TDM Options were covered with the exception of the options which specifically relate to parking.

The consultant reviewed the parking options with a powerpoint presentation (attached) The following comments were received:

It should be noted that the parking department also pays for 50% of the campus patrol.

Question: Has the traffic coming to the University absolutely decreased?

Answer: (consultant) According to the independent traffic studies completed, the answer is "yes", absolutely.

Question: What time of year were the studies done?

Answer: Every study is done around the same time – February/March, with the same The data was collected and analyzed according to nationally accepted/agreed upon standards.

Question: If traffic went down, but the perception amongst neighbours is that traffic is greater.... how is that reconciled?

Answer: (Cttee members) Certainly auto ownership is up, amongst residents, and the number of trips people are taking through out the day is increasing.

General Discussion: One committee member observed that traffic on McKenzie Ave. dropped substantially during the public school's Spring Break, (observation only) yet there was no discernable drop in traffic during the University's Reading Break.

Another member pointed out that this may change in the future as public schools begin to charge for parking in their lots.

The problem therefore may not be UVic, but the community itself. Remember however, that the Focus Group information gathered suggests that the community is less concerned with the number of cars and more concerned with the behaviour of the drivers – and the drivers have been identified as the young university students.

A discussion ensued regarding the expected impact that the next round of fee increases will have on transportation choices of students. For example, over \$10 million dollars will be taken out of the pockets of students next year – how will they choose to spend their money? We don't know, but we can speculate that students will choose not to own a car as a cost saving measure, and rely solely on the UPass.

An alternate viewpoint suggested that the increases could result in a backlash – that the University would only draw more affluent students, who will simply choose to drive because money is not a factor.

The same discussion applies to the international student fees which are going up substantially.

It was suggested that if financial increases leads to a reduction in auto use, we would have seen a trend this year.

The response was that the changes in habits appear to be progressive. The University has tracked a decline in textbook sales for example. Choices are being made – but it remains to be seen, what trends will finally play out.

Furthermore – the financial awareness depends upon the maturity of the student, suggesting that 1<sup>st</sup> year students may be more carefree and 2<sup>nd</sup> year students become more frugal, because they have 'done the math'.

The consultant responded by saying that this discussion underscores the likely support the option which refers to a Merchant Discount programme linked to UPass users.

#### **Discussion regarding Smart Card systems:**

A comment was made that the smart card would support a programme that targeted drivers who only drove part-time.

It was suggested that the smart card system not be limited to parking payments, but support other modes, such as link it to a staff based Upass. That is, those who sign on to buy a Upass, get some cheap or free parking in support of their choice.

#### **Discussion regarding Good Neighbourh/Spill Over Parking strategy**

There was a question as to whether the University had the authority to enforce Resident Parking Only in the surrounding neighbourhoods as they are clearly outside its jurisdiction.

Saanich (R. Fuoco) clarified that it is possible for the municipality to contract out the enforcement, in the same way that the City of Victoria contracts out to the Commissionaires.

It was re-iterated that the residents' issues relate to driver behaviour more than parking infractions.

A comment was made that then the on-street parking is a traffic calming measure!



It was confirmed that any parking management in the neighbourhood would necessarily require the neighbour to report the offending vehicle.

#### **Discussion regarding proposed parking price increases.**

There was a comment that although the Reserved Parking is already much higher than the other fees, it should remain higher due to the benefits of parking within the Ring Road – therefore, those fees should increase by 30% as well.

It is imperative that the rationale behind the price increases clearly states that as the prices for parking, the available alternatives must improve, otherwise, people are just going to pay the price, and no change will result.

There was a suggestion that the increase is too gradual – that it will not be shocking enough to bring about a change in behaviour.

It was commented that Campus Security encourages the sale of monthly parking permits over daily which undermines the TDM objectives, thereby re-enforcing the need for a Transportation Department rather than two departments trying to find common ground.

It was pointed out that conceivably, the sale of monthly passes creates more administration than simply selling daily passes.

The consultant responded by saying that the administrative details would have to be worked out within the department.

It was pointed out that even with the rather substantial increases, that after 4 years, the cost to park daily is still considerably more than if a person bought an annual pass – so where is the motivation to buy daily?

Consultant: It was acknowledged that although the increases are still pretty substantial, it still is more attractive to buy an annual pass than buy a daily pass.

(If a person pays \$245 for an annual pass and works a 47 week year (5 weeks holiday and stats) resulting in 235 days; then daily parking is \$1.04.)

The problem is, we don't want to decrease the cost of daily parking – that is the wrong message to send. Add to that, the bus fare, for non UPass holders, is \$3.50 return. To make things equal – parking fares should, at the very least, be more than the cost to take the bus. From there – monthly passes would be even more (\$3.50 x 235 days equals \$822 annual!)

The question was asked as to why we haven't recommended higher parking rate increases. It was suggested that 30% per year would be the more likely numbers that would bring about real change.

The consultant responded by saying that the team felt that although there was general support for an increase, they didn't want to push the envelope so much that there was a

backlash and the whole project became paralyzed. This happened at SFU with only a marginal price increase recommendation. The increases chosen therefore were a strategic compromise working with the best data available on the effects of parking fee increases on travel habits, combined with what they felt the University community would find acceptable.

This point was re-iterated by the CUPE represented who said that members who are already strapped financially will not be happy with a huge increase.

One member suggested that this gap could be bridged through dialogue between the University and the unions.

It was also suggested that there be a different price structure for staff, students and faculty. For example, structure the fees so that parking is very difficult for students – they already have the UPass as an option.

We were reminded that at the University of Calgary, where they have a 4 year waiting list for a parking pass, the staff have first priority, then faculty then students.

It was noted that the University of Victoria has an abundance of parking, and is expected to have an abundance for quite some time – especially if investments are made in TDM choices.

It was generally agreed that the issue of parking fee increases is a complicated subject and that perhaps a more moderate approach is the best way to go.

It was also suggested that as long as alternatives are funded, and the process is transparent, then people will be less inclined to complain, and parking will become less of an issue.

Another member, however, reiterated his statement that he didn't think the parking increases would result in any change in behaviour.

The consultant responded by saying that this is a working document, and that we will never know until we try – data will ultimately tell. If changes are not forthcoming, then we simply turn up the heat by increasing prices and improving alternatives.

There was a suggestion that parking should be charged for the entire 12 months, not just the terms that people work/study – this would increase revenues and discourage people from buying them.

Question: How would the fees, after the increases, compare with other Universities.

Answer: They will still be considerably lower than current rates of the universities that were polled in the study, and about \$20 lower than the University of Northern BC rates.

It was suggested that the price increases should aim to, at the very least, work to come in line with other comparable universities.

It was pointed out that the increases should be above inflation rates, and that this should be stated explicitly, so as to avoid confusion or misunderstanding.

There was a suggestion that parking fee increases be linked to tuition fee increases.

This suggestion was responded to by one member who stated that parking fees should be more independent.

A concern was raised with respect to the current scenario where parking at night is free and that this was perhaps not fair to people who drive during the day.

One member commented that night fees were suggested to the Board of Governors but the motion was declined.

The consultant suggested that there may be issues with Security - some people have to drive to be safe and with respect to equity - the buses do not run as frequently at night and cycling is not as safe at night. Furthermore, it can be said that TDM certainly works to reduce auto reliance as its broad goal, (reduction in GHG emissions etc.) but it's primary goal is to reduce the driving that occurs during am and pm peak times, where the pressures on collective resources are greatest. Evening parking is therefore, not a priority problem.

#### **Discussion regarding Option to Ban 1<sup>st</sup> Year Students from owning a car.**

A statistic is now available that suggests only 89 out of 1200 first year students (who live on campus) own cars.

This suggests that 1<sup>st</sup> years are not the problem - although this stat does not reflect the auto ownership of non-resident students.

It does however suggest that the parking requirements imposed by Saanich lead to oversupply.

#### **Closing Comments.**

It will be crucial to make transparent the expenditures on TDM.

Extra parking revenues must go into funding alternatives - improving choice. This activity should be reported upon annually.

Important messaging is to develop strategies which force commuters to think about their travel choices everyday. Monthly and annual passes do not do that.

Emphasis must also be made on all the other benefits TDM brings such as ecology and health – not just reduction in traffic and parking demand

The University should be looking to not just maintain the existing number of stalls, but reducing the stalls.

The consultant reminded them that, indeed, the premise behind the entire study is to prove out that it is entirely possible meet the University growth objectives, lose the anticipated 300 stalls (from development inside the Ring Road) and to not build anymore parking.

The report should have a budget which attempts to cost out the various strategies – perhaps a 5 year plan, and if possible – link those investments to the expected mode split results.

A suggestion was made to link the work of Campus Housing services to BC Transit services – that is, "here are the bus routes that are most efficient – here is where you might want to start looking first."

### **3.0 Next Steps**

The consultant will take the committee's comments back to the Steering Committee, then re-convene in two weeks with the final report for review.

Next Meeting: May 15, 2003, Cadboro Commons, 7:00 pm.



**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

Date: **Thursday, May 15 th, 2003**

Time: **6:30 pm to 9:00 pm**

Location: **Cadboro Commons**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0 Review Final Draft TDM Report
- 2.0 Update on Negotiations with Saanich.
- 3.0 Next Steps in completing the study
- 4.0 Next Meeting: July 3<sup>rd</sup>, 7-9 pm



**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date:** Thursday, May 15, 2003

**Time:** 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm

**Location:** Sinclair Room, Cadboro Commons Building, University of Victoria

**Present:** S. Tyler, Gordon Head Residents' Association  
S. Warren, CUPE 951, UVic  
K. Burns, Professional Employees Association  
R. St. Arnault, Eco-Research Chair  
D. Clode, Executive Director, Student and Ancillary Services, UVic  
R. Irvine, Councilors, District of Oak Bay  
L. Bartle, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic  
M. Skene, Boulevard Transportation Group  
S. Hallatt, Boulevard Transportation Group

**Absent:** J. Dopp, UVic Faculty Association  
J. Brownoff, Councilor, District of Saanich  
J. Smith, UVic Graduate Student Society  
F. Chambers, CUPE 4163, UVic  
J. Luton, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition  
T. Sebastian, UVic Students' Society  
N. Boivin, Gordon Head Residents' Association  
S. Bigelow, ICBC  
I. Graeme, Camosun Community Association  
J. Holland, UVic Bicycle Users Committee  
P. Meekison, Cadboro Bay Residents Association  
P. Mack, Mt. Tolmie Community Association  
B. Trotter, Quadra/Cedar Hill Community Association and Island Transit Alliance  
A. Stewart, North Henderson Residents' Association

**1.0 Review Final Draft TDM Report**

**Q/C:** Have already reviewed most of the options except some further discussion on trip reduction.

- Q/C: Flextime is offered in both the PEA and 951 union agreements but for the most part you have to be here when the service is operational.
- Q/C: In reality the distance learning is about expanding the student population not about replacing the classroom.
- Q/C: Students who participate in distance education will need to come to campus for a short period of time and they will take their cars.
- Q/C: Need to look at classrooms in different areas like downtown.
- Q/C: Gonzaga University in the States has had tremendous success with distance learning.
- Q/C: Canadian universities do not look at distance learning as a revenue generator therefore they have an opposing view.
- Q/C: The student loan system does not recognize those sorts of programs.
- Q/C: Should look at the CRD report for trip reduction strategies.
- Q/C: We now want to look at some possible changes to the parking section of the report which we have handed out.
- Q/C: If you pay ahead of time for a commuter pass it is not inconvenient.
- Q/C: How do you credit people who bike?
- Q/C: Do individuals take into account the true cost of driving?
- Q/C: Is ICBC on side for increasing the use of the car for pleasure?
- Q/C: Charge up card and credit for alternative modes.
- Q/C: Have you looked at thresholds for various groups?
- Q/C: The unions will likely oppose the huge increase in parking.
- Q/C: Students have more choice so you may be able to apply to one group and not the other.
- Q/C: The one poster child for why this wouldn't work is the single mother who has to work at 6:00 in the morning.
- Q/C: The impact of a vehicle is the same no matter who it is. We are not trying to create a social utopia.

- Q/C: How do you get people from Colwood?
- Q/C: Maybe you provide a sliding scale based on your commute distance.
- Q/C: Provide bursaries for low income.
- Q/C: Some people will accept it. Some people will not.
- Q/C: We could solve everything by making parking scarce.
- Q/C: University has to work with municipality by-laws on parking supply.
- Q/C: The University wants to put on layered parking.
- Q/C: You can put a cost on layered parking.
- Q/C: The University could subsidize parking or bus pass cost for three years.
- Q/C: Use the subsidy from the Upass.
- Q/C: What percent of students are parking?
- Q/C: We don't really know people's behavior because parking permits are not registered to people.
- Q/C: Coin operated or swipe card will have infrastructure costs.
- Q/C: You could go with a magnetic strip instead of high tech.
- Q/C: Magnetic strips would never collect the same information nor achieve the same goal.
- Q/C: Could look at special event days to provide an incentive.
- Q/C: Afraid the University will look at the cost of parking and say it is too much.
- Q/C: Put parking on food service swipe cards.
- Q/C: How do we get a credit for walking?
- Q/C: We should be more general in principle in report then coming up with prescriptive options.
- Q/C: Who decides on final report?

- Q/C: Open house in the fall, then the report goes to the President and then to the Board of Governors.
- Q/C: Report should include measurable accountability. If not met on this date we will re-examine.
- Q/C: Could say this is the mode split. This is what it should be. Here is how to get there.
- Q/C: Parking should not need to increase if TDM is effective.
- Q/C: The MOU between Saanich and UVic was passed. UVic has put aside \$300K for TDM initiatives.
- Q/C: Good start. UBC spends \$1 million/year.
- Q/C: Include information on how much revenue will be generated by increase in parking fees.
- Q/C: Hard to determine because you don't know how many people will choose not to drive.
- Q/C: Administration would not go for \$2.50/day for parking.
- Q/C: That's why we need to develop more palliative options.
- Q/C: Need to improve options first.
- Q/C: Like in 1993, funding for the Bicycle Users Group and the Transit Loop.
- Q/C: Where did that money come from?
- Q/C: Need to change Polis Project contact information.
- Q/C: What about light rail. Light rail plans don't even include UVic.
- Q/C: Again distance vs satellite.
- Q/C: Parking is paid for when teachers park at the downtown campus.
- Q/C: Parking revenue could be used to build infrastructure for distance education.
- Q/C: Should include in the report something about being part of the more larger regional strategy.
- Q/C: What about increasing the residences on campus?

**Email any remaining comments on the report to Sue within two weeks.**

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT**

<b>NOTICE OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date: Thursday, July 3, 2003**

**Time: 7:00 – 9:00**

**Location: University Club, University of Victoria**

**AGENDA**

---

- 1.0 Update on Final Report
- 2.0 Final Comments
- 3.0 Next Steps
- 4.0 Acknowledgements



**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**  
**STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON**  
**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT**

<b>RECORD OF MEETING</b>
--------------------------

**Date:**           **Thursday, July 3, 2003**

**Time:**           **7:00 pm to 9:00 pm**

**Location:**     **University Club, University of Victoria**

**Present:**       S. Warren, CUPE 951, UVic  
                  R. St. Arnault, Eco-Research Chair, Polis  
                  J. Brownoff, Councilor, District of Saanich  
                  A. Stewart, North Henderson Residents' Association  
                  J. Smith, UVic Graduate Student Society  
                  R. Irvine, Councilors, District of Oak Bay  
                  J. Story, ICBC  
                  I. Graeme, Camosun Community Association  
                  Eric for T. Sebastian, UVic Students' Society  
                  T. Sheldon, CRD Roundtable on the Environment  
                  L. Bartle, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management, UVic  
                  M. Skene, Boulevard Transportation Group  
                  S. Hallatt, Boulevard Transportation Group

**Representatives from the Steering Committee:**

                  S. Pitt, Director of Engineering Services, District of Oak Bay  
                  M. Segger, Director, Community Relations, UVic

**Absent:**        J. Dopp, UVic Faculty Association  
                  J. Luton, Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition  
                  N. Boivin, Gordon Head Residents' Association  
                  S. Tyler, Gordon Head Residents' Association  
                  K. Burns, Professional Employees Association  
                  Mary Sanseverino, UVic Bicycle Users Committee  
                  P. Meekison, Cadboro Bay Residents Association  
                  P. Mack, Mt. Tolmie Community Association  
                  D. Clode, Executive Director, Student and Ancillary Services, UVic  
                  B. Trotter, Quadra/Cedar Hill Comm. Assoc. & Island Transit Alliance

## **1.0 Update on Final Report**

The Consultant gave an update of the changes, edits and additions made to the Final Report, in response the feedback given at the last Stakeholders Meeting. Namely, the changes included:

- A section on “Why TDM”
- A section which expands on the benefits of satellite school rooms and long distance learning as it relates to trip reductions to the campus.
- Cadboro Bay merchants are explicitly mentioned in the text, for their key role in servicing the campus population.
- A new section which explicitly identifies education and promotion as a stand alone option.
- Physical health benefits of TDM were included.
- Blue bike programme was included.
- Explicit and reiterated recommendation that revenues from parking should go into TDM specifically.
- TDM should be implemented before parking fees increase to show good faith and transparency as to why and where the monies are going.
- Integration of transit route information into housing and orientation.
- Smart Technology is mentioned as an option – but de-emphasized so that it does not come across as proscriptive.

## **2.0 Final Comments**

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to respond to the changes and to add any final comments.

- Option 3 should have a recognition component for the “Super Commuters”
- There should be explicit emphasis that UVic is a leader in the community and should, therefore, play an active role in any regional initiatives that are currently underway or planned.
- The recommendations regarding mitigating the impacts of spillover parking into the neighbourhoods should mention Oak Bay, not just Saanich.
- The Memorandum of Understanding between Saanich and UVic regarding the TDM funds in lieu of parking provisions should be in the Appendix.
- The implementation plan should establish clear targets and be transparent in their work.
- The education and promotion recommendation should not be an “option” but rather mandatory.
- With respect to trip reduction and satellite classrooms, use the language of “Learning Commons” (ie: Uvic library downtown may have a common study area for e-learners so they don’t have to come out to the campus everyday.)
- Should link this work and UVic specifically to the Greenways programme that is underway in the region.

- The option that puts the auspices of TDM and Parking under the same roof – as a combined initiative, should be emphasized as the best option.
- With respect to the “big picture”, the University could be involved in integrating Land Use planning and Transportation planning, just like SFU’s Burnaby Mountain, Sustainable Community.
- Transit service needs to increase. More money should be given to Transit so that they can increase the service.
- It should be explicit as to who’s responsibility TDM will be on campus – a dedicated position – not just a task someone is given and they do it off the corner of their desk.
- If the parking increases are going to be a major barrier to implementing TDM, then perhaps a two tiered system could be put in place, where by the Faculty and Students pay the increases, but the staff, who have frozen wages, get a lower increase.
- Goals and Targets should be made – especially as they relate to Kyoto targets.
- Smart technology should be emphasized – not de-emphasized.

### 3.0 Next Steps

The final report will be edited and published, and presented to the broader community in the Fall of 2003 during and Open House. The date of which is to be determined. All Committee members will be apprised.

### 4.0 Acknowledgements

Martin Segger, as a representative of the Steering Committee and on behalf of Mr. Gerry Robson, Executive Director of Facilities Management, thanked the Stakeholder Committee members for their year long commitment to this project, and all their hard work in developing this document which will serve as the foundation for an implementation plan.

The Stakeholder Committee was adjourned and the meeting was converted into a social Wine and Cheese.

