

TO: The Senate

FROM: University Resources Policy Committee

DATE: September 19, 1983

SUBJECT: Campus parking (for information only)

The University Resources Policy Committee has deliberated the current parking problem at meetings held on September 6 and September 13, with the following results.

At its first meeting the committee heard assessments of the parking problem from administrative members of the committee, and from resource persons of the Physical Plant and the Safety and Security Divisions of the University. A variety of proposals were made at that meeting by administrators, by faculty, and by students, but all seemed to have unacceptable drawbacks except the expansion of existing parking lots. No motions concerning the parking problem were made at this meeting, but it appeared to be a general consensus of the committee that the proposal made by Vice Chancellor Carnaghi, extension of parking lot 10, was the most appropriate solution to the parking problem.

At its second meeting, the committee heard additional assessments of the parking problem, heard proposed solutions to the problem, visited campus sites proposed as parking lot extensions, and voted on three of the proposals. Factors that seemed to have some effect on the voting of the committee members include the following:

1. In recent years the aesthetic appearance of this campus has been notably increased through the liberal use of plantings and other landscaping techniques.
2. Any conversion of grass areas to parking lots on this campus will at least temporarily detract from the aesthetic appearance of the campus.
3. An effective effort has been made to beautify parking lots on this campus, through the use of green buffer areas, islands, and plantings. These have been used to break up the sweep of parking asphalt, to hide lots and vehicles, and to make the lots and drives as attractive as possible. An example is the tree-lined Gold Drive through lots 4 and 5.
4. The present parking problem is real and is urgent. More than 200 vehicles currently cannot park legally on this campus because of the lack of parking spaces. As a result, some parking rules cannot now be enforced.
5. A parking garage could not be constructed on this campus in time to alleviate the present parking problem. Also, funds are not now available for a parking garage. This solution may be worth serious consideration for solving future campus parking problems, however.
6. To make present parking stalls smaller would not gain enough space to solve the present parking problem, and it probably would create other serious problems.

7. A southern 150-car extension of lot 10, along the St. Joseph River, would provide the most convenient parking for the greatest number of users. At least a part of this area is not original topography. It is "made ground" that has been previously bulldozed, filled, and grassed over.

8. A western 200-car extension of lot 1 would provide the most parking spaces, but they would be in the least convenient location for most users. At least a part of this area is underlain by unconsolidated fine sand with construction properties and drainage properties that may be detrimental to parking lot construction. In addition, a part of this area is original rolling topography. This area consists of small sand dunes of Pleistocene age, and is one of only four such sand dune areas remaining in Allen County. The value of preserving this area should be discussed before it is destroyed.

9. Small extensions to several existing lots would be more expensive than adding one large lot, and they would also destroy present green buffer areas between and around existing lots.

Committee voting on proposals 7, 8, and 9 was as follows:

PROPOSAL 7:	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Absent</u>
	D. Bezdon	M. Lipman	W. Kolb
	J. Carnaghi		
	E. Goebel		
	T. Harris		
	D. Kandis		
	J. Lichti		
	J. Moore		
	E. Nicholson		
	J. Sunderman, Chair		

PROPOSAL 8:	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Absent</u>
	None	D. Bezdon	W. Kolb
		J. Carnaghi	
		E. Goebel	
		T. Harris	
		D. Kandis	
		J. Lichti	
		M. Lipman	
		J. Moore	
		E. Nicholson	
		J. Sunderman	

PROPOSAL 9:	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Absent</u>
	J. Moore	D. Bezdon	W. Kolb
		J. Carnaghi	
		E. Goebel	
		T. Harris	
		D. Kandis	
		J. Lichti	
		M. Lipman	
		E. Nicholson	
		J. Sunderman	