

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Parking Expansion DTF, convened by Vice President Art Costantino, was charged with evaluating parking issues on campus and developing recommendations to increase parking spaces on campus. The DTF was to consider options to reduce vehicular traffic on campus, to examine the current management and operation of our lots, to incorporate steps for the maintenance and repair of our current lots, and to forward a funding plan to support their proposals. The DTF was to complete its work by March 15, 2000 and to engage in extensive consultation with the Evergreen community. The complete DTF charge can be found in the appendix and the web site (<http://www.evergreen.edu/user/parkingdtf99/>).

The DTF discussed and evaluated various options based on four criteria: Environmental Issues, User Impact, Cost and Aesthetics (see Appendix for complete list). Although a hired consultant developed options which provided parking for anticipated growth, the DTF decided to recommend building only enough parking spaces to satisfy permit requirements for Seminar II. After reviewing twelve formal options, as well as numerous variations, the DTF recommends Option 7. This option involves minor modifications to B, C, and F parking lots with a net gain of 400 stalls at an estimated cost of \$400,000. The rounded areas at the end of each row of existing parking, as well as the landscape “peninsulas” currently interspersed between groups of parking stalls would be removed to create additional stalls. This option preserves the general character of the parking lots and allows retention of many of the trees in the current lots.

## INTRODUCTION

In the near future, the college will need additional parking on campus. This need arises from three distinct areas:

1. Current patterns of use. There is a current lack of on-campus parking availability, especially on Tuesdays and Thursdays and during Fall quarter;
2. Seminar II. According to SCA, Thurston County will not issue a permit for the construction of Seminar II without requiring that 380 additional parking spaces be built (based on Chapter 20.44.030 of the Thurston County Zoning Ordinance); and
3. Future enrollment increases. The college plans to grow to 5,000 students by 2010-2011, which is likely to increase demand for parking. SCA Engineering, a consultant hired by the college, estimated that 380 stalls (about the size of Parking Lot B) will be needed.

## CRITERIA

The following criteria were used to evaluate all the options considered by the DTF.

### Environmental Issues

- Maintain or improve surface water quality
- Minimize or eliminate impacts on the hydrology of surrounding ecosystems
- Do not cut any additional forest and preserve as many trees as possible
- Preserve existing habitat
- Minimize air pollution

### User Impact

- Keep parking fees reasonable while encouraging driving alternatives
- Maximize accessibility, availability & convenience
- Ensure safety to drivers, pedestrians, possessions

### Cost

Minimize the overall costs in all of the following categories.

- Construction
- Maintenance, repair, replacement
- Management and operation

### Aesthetics

- Minimize landscape impacts
- Adhere to guidelines of the Campus Master Plan
- Preserve campus character

During consideration of all options, the DTF was guided by the constraints in the Master Plan.

## OPTIONS CONSIDERED

### Option 1: Reconfigure Lot B Only

**Total Net New Parking: 525**

**Estimated cost: \$890,000**

Option 1 is the total reconfiguration of parking lot B, including the “Slug” lot (the smaller lot located to the right of B Lot). All the existing surfaces and landscaping in B-lot would be removed and replaced. This option has 45-degree angle parking, one-way circulation within each aisle and two-way circulation along the perimeter of the parking lot. The aisle between parking rows is thirteen feet. A fourteen-foot landscape strip is provided between the rows, and landscape islands are interspersed every nine stalls. The treed area between B-lot and the “Slug” lot would be removed in this option.

Pros: With a total reconfiguration, the surface drainage could be re-graded to improve the treatment of runoff. This would decrease the current negative impact of the parking lot on the hydrology of the surrounding ecosystems. Doesn’t impact any new undeveloped areas.

Cons: Increases impervious surface by 1.4 acres. Cost. Does not have a phasing potential; Loss of all trees currently in lot.

### Option 2: Reconfigure Lots B and C

**Total Net New Parking: 521**

**Estimated cost: \$960,000**

Option 2 is the reconfiguration of parking lots B and C. Similar to Option 1, all the existing landscaping and pavement would be removed before reconfiguration. This option provides standard ninety-degree stalls with a six foot planting strip and twenty-two foot aisles between parking rows. This aisle width allows for two-way circulation within the lot. Parking lot B has an increase of 412 stalls; lot C increases by 109 stalls, for a total new additional parking of 521 stalls.

In lot B, the asphalt area is increased by 2.4 acres, so that 83% of the total area of the reconfigured lot is paved. Landscaped planting strips allow for the addition of trees and shrubs. As in all the options presented here, the vegetated buffer along McCann Plaza remains intact in its current condition. The density (88.7 stalls per acre) is on the low end of the Master Plan guidelines.

Pros: Does have a phasing potential. With a total reconfiguration, the surface drainage could be re-graded to improve the treatment of runoff. This would decrease the current negative impact of the parking lot on the hydrology of the surrounding ecosystems. Doesn’t impact any new undeveloped areas.

Cons: Increases impervious surface by 3.5 acres. Cost. Loss of all trees currently in both lots.

**Option 3: Reconfigure All Existing Lots****Total Net New Parking: 522****Estimated cost: \$1,050,000**

Similar to Options 1 and 2, all the existing landscaping and pavement would be removed before reconfiguration. Option 3 includes a ten-foot landscape strip, 22-foot aisle, and standard ninety-degree parking. Two-way circulation within the lot is provided. Perimeter parallel parking remains. All three of the College's lots are reconfigured under this option, thereby providing additional parking at the northwest portion of the campus in Lot F, which the other options do not. By including provisions for compact stalls in lots B and C, the total width of the landscape strip can be wider (10 feet) than in Option 2 (6 feet).

Pros: Does have a phasing potential. With a total reconfiguration, the surface drainage could be re-graded to improve the treatment of runoff. This would decrease the current negative impact of the parking lot on the hydrology of the surrounding ecosystems. Doesn't impact any new undeveloped areas. Distributes parking spaces around campus.

Cons: Increases impervious surfaces by 3.7 acres. Cost. Loss of all trees and current aesthetics of all lots

**Option 4: Multi-Level Parking Structure/Lot B****Total Net New Parking: 547****Estimated cost: \$8,500,000**

Option 4 includes the reconfiguration of parking Lot B to include a three-level parking structure. Because the structure itself accommodates most of the additional parking needed, this option is able to incorporate a fourteen-foot landscape strip and several large vegetated areas within the parking lot. Nevertheless, all the existing landscaping and pavement would be removed before reconfiguration. No changes to Lots C or F are needed under this scenario.

Pros: Runoff from new impervious surfaces would be easier to collect and treat.

Cons: Increases impervious surfaces by 2.5 acres. Does not have a phasing potential. Loss of all trees currently in B-lot. Cost. Aesthetics.

**Option 5: Addition of New Lot****Total Net New Parking: 520 Stalls Estimated cost: \$1,300,000**

Option 5 includes the addition of a completely new parking lot, and providing for all the additional parking needs (520 stalls) in one high-density lot (100 stalls/acre). This lot and the accompanying storm-water facilities would occupy about eight acres (5.5 acres for parking and 2.5 acres for storm-water facilities). This lot could be placed anywhere on the campus. If this option were chosen, a site selection study would be necessary to identify the best location for a new parking lot. Phasing would not be available under Option 5. The new lot would need to be constructed to accommodate parking needs for Seminar II, as well as the 2010 student population.

Pros: Can locate parking in areas of campus where parking is limited, thereby distributing parking more evenly around campus. Does not impact aesthetics of current lots.

Cons: Increases impervious surfaces by 5.5 acres. Considerable negative impact on habitat and wildlife. Does not have a phasing potential. Cost.

**Option 6: Expansion of Lot C**

**Total Net New Parking: 130 Stalls Estimated cost: \$292,500.**

(Additional costs would be incurred to reconfigure lots B and C to attain the total parking requirements.)

Option 6 would expand Lot C beyond its currently paved area and onto the grass field below and adjacent to the existing parking area. The 1.3 acre area could accommodate approximately 130 stalls if the lot were designed at 100 stalls per acre. An access road from the main lot to the expansion area would be required. An access would also be needed from the expansion site to the roadway near the day care. To provide non-motorized access from the lower expansion up to the existing lot, a pedestrian path would also be required. This path would need to be designed to meet Americans with Disabilities Act guidelines.

Pros: The only real benefit of this option is aesthetic because it impacts previously cleared land instead of forested land. Because this location has already been deforested, paving this area would be of less environmental significance than taking forested land.

Cons: Primary impacts to the environment would be in the small treed area at the current southeast corner of Lot C where the access road would run and the additional storm-water runoff generated by the added impervious surface area. Paves 1.3 acres of previously unpaved land. This land is fill and potentially unstable. Does not meet the requirements for Thurston County. In order to provide the 380 needed stalls, both lots B and C would have to be reconfigured in addition to expanding Lot C.

**Option 7: Minor Reconfiguration of B, C, and F Lots**

**Total Net New Parking: 400 Stalls: Estimated cost: \$400,000**

# Waiting for additional text from SCA

Parking Option 7 involves eliminating the rounded areas at the end of each row of existing parking to create additional stalls, as well as removing the landscape “peninsulas” currently interspersed between groups of parking stalls. This option preserves the general character of the parking lots and allows retention of many of the trees in the current lots. It includes a ten-foot landscape strip, 22-foot aisle, and standard ninety-degree parking. Two-way circulation within the lot is provided. Perimeter parallel parking remains. All three of the College’s lots are reconfigured under this option, providing additional parking at the northwest portion of the

campus in Lot F. By including provisions for compact stalls in lots B and C, the total width of the landscape strip is wider (10-feet) than in Option 2 (6 feet).

Pros: Less impact on trees and habitat, this plan saves most of the older trees and surrounding habitat. Lower cost. Preserves current aesthetic of lots. Can be phased.

Cons: Minor increases impervious surfaces. Will lose some trees located on the peninsulas. May make future expansion of existing lots more difficult.

**Option 8: Parking on the Evergreen Parkway**

**Total Net New Parking: 380–520 Stalls: Estimated cost: \$150,000**

Option 8 involves closing one two-lane side of the Parkway and configuring this area to accommodate one-way, 45-degree angled parking. The DTF estimated that about 0.67 miles of the parkway would be needed for 380 additional parking stalls (0.94 miles for 520 stalls). There are also city busses that pass this area every thirty minutes. Barriers and signs would be installed to direct traffic. Shelter/shuttle stops would be built along this route.

Pros: This option would not pave any new area and may decrease future costs of maintaining the Parkway by reducing the active roadway. Lower debt burden. Lower user cost.

Cons: Would require significant work to collect and treat surface run-off. Safety issues, negative impact on traffic for the larger community. Problems with assuming “ownership” of roadway. Ongoing cost of shuttle. Negative impact on surrounding neighborhood.

**Option 9: Build New Lot at Cooper Point Road and Evergreen Parkway**

**Total Net New Parking: ### Stalls: Estimated cost: \$###**

Option 9 would involve the purchase of the vacant lot at the SW corner of the Parkway (Kaiser) and Cooper Point Rd. A lot would be constructed on this site and a shuttle van would be purchased and staffed during peak use hours. Two different city bus routes service this area. This site has been recently cleared and filled.

Pros: No new forest would have to be cut to construct this lot. Does not impact aesthetics of campus core area.

Cons: Zoning restrictions, remote location, cost of purchasing the land, paves habitat. Increases impervious surfaces in Green Cove Watershed. Requires shuttles.

**Option 10: Purchase parking space from Capital Mall and shuttle to campus**  
**Total Net New Parking: 100 - 150 Stalls: Estimated cost: \$###**

Option 10 involves renting space from Capital Mall and shuttling users to campus. Similar to Options 8 and 9, this would entail purchasing and staffing a shuttle van. Environmental impacts would be minimized because Capital Mall is already paved.

Pros: No construction cost or environmental issues on campus.

Cons: Capital Mall rental policy prohibits rental of any parking spaces between October 1<sup>st</sup> through March 1<sup>st</sup>. Ongoing monthly rental costs. Necessitates a College-operated shuttle.

**Option 11: Build a New Lot on Old “Soil Farm” (north of library, across Driftwood Rd.)**  
**Total Net New Parking: 70 – 80 Stalls: Estimated cost: \$150,000**

Option 11 would pave the open field behind the library building on Driftwood Road (where the soil remediation project was done). This would place parking on the north side of campus where parking options are currently limited. All of the negative impacts of a new lot—increased impervious surface, loss of habitat, and associated environmental impacts—would accompany this option.

Pros: Lot would be located in a disturbed area. Puts parking on the north side of campus.

Cons: Considerable negative impact to wildlife and habitat. Somewhat remote location.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

### **Options**

The DTF considered many options in addition to the ones outlined above. We evaluated all the options using the criteria listed earlier and considered input from all the different user groups. This report, while a summary of our deliberations, is also a request for additional input from the campus community.

Although the growth projections indicate that the campus will need additional parking to accommodate future increases in students, we decided to limit our consideration of the current parking expansion to the minimum number of parking stalls needed to satisfy the permit requirements for Seminar II (380 stalls). Discussions with SCA gave us the impression that the county is firm about this number; they did not apply current parking requirements to the rest of campus which would have significantly increased the required number of stalls. Thus, many of the options outlined above could be modified somewhat to decrease the number of spaces generated. The impacts of each modified option would be basically the same, only slightly decreased in magnitude.



### **General Recommendations**

All of the options include upgrading the treatment and handling of surface runoff. Our campus goal for storm water (as expressed by Michel George) is to not have any new impacts on the surrounding ecosystems and to eventually decrease that impact to zero. Independent of the final option selected, the following recommendations should be implemented.

1. Maximize compact car spaces in each lot to the maximum allowable rate of 20%, which will increase the number of stalls without any new construction.
2. Strengthen the Commute Trip Reduction program (CTR) for any option chosen. This would include securing funds for incentive programs as well as increase the number of carpool stalls.
3. Urge faculty and administration to distribute class schedules more evenly throughout the week to alleviate the parking “crunch” on Tuesday and Thursday. Comments were made that current governance times tend to restrict scheduling especially programs with labs. This may be a task for another DTF.
4. Minimize the loss of trees and habitat currently in lots. Any option should take into consideration the Environmental Impact Statement and overlay produced by Jill Corder and Trevor Lyttle.

### **Preferred Option**

We believe that Option 7 satisfies our criteria in the best possible combination. We recommend that this option be modified to preserve as many trees as possible (see #4 above). This option is the least expensive, it distributes the parking around campus, and it preserves the current aesthetic quality of the lots.

### **Management and Fees**

We also discussed a number of parking management options, which are independent of the final expansion option selected. These included changing the fee structure to favor car pools, differential parking fees (paying more to be closer to campus), automated parking control structures, relocating or eliminating the parking booth, etc. The DTF is prepared to reconvene after we receive a more detailed version of Option 7 to finalize recommendations for management and fee structure. At this time, the estimated cost of the reconfigured lots is estimated to be between \$400,000 and \$500,000. Implementing Option 7 will save the college about \$100,000 in scheduled maintenance costs (resurfacing the parking lots).

Regardless of the final option selected, parking fees will need to increase. The current parking fees are insufficient to cover current parking operations and ongoing maintenance and repair to our existing parking lots. In addition, any changes (additions, modifications, etc.) to the parking lots needs to be funded by parking fees. Thus, we expect to recommend a parking fee increase of between 40% to 60% to cover construction costs of the final option and ongoing repair and maintenance. The exact amount of this increase will be determined after the final option is selected and a parking management scheme is developed.



## APPENDIX

Attachment 1 – Consultants

The DTF discussed and evaluated numerous parking options that were generated by a hired consultant (SCA), as well as a number of options developed by community members. Representatives of campus groups that participated in the discussions included WFSE Local 443, Conference Services, Campus Land Use Committee (CLUC), Housing, and Seminar II DTF. In addition, the DTF received technical input from the following advisors.

- Susan Graham and Perry Shea (SCA) on design, cost and construction.
- Bill Zaugg (Cost Sub-Committee) on budget.
- Sherry Parsons (Commute Trip Reduction) on commuting alternatives.
- Darren Schaffer (Evergreen Alternative Transportation) on an additional reconfiguration proposals.
- Jill Cordner, Trevor Lyttle, and Thomas Bain (Environmental Sub-Committee) on surveying and identifying habitat and trees to be preserved.
- Michael Van Gelder (State Dept. of General Administration) on commute trip reduction plans.
- Michel George (Director of Facilities Services) on consultants, CLUC, the Master Plan, construction concerns, repair and replacement issues, parking management, etc.
- Tom Holz (SCA) on Zero Impact Paving Options, exploring paving options that have no net impact on the hydrology of surrounding ecosystems.
- Jim Stroh (Geology faculty) on Parking and Hydrology at Evergreen.

The DTF also received reports from:

- John Shadoff (Manager TDM Resource Center, WA State DOT) on transportation demand management.
- Dan Brane and SCA, on parking management.
- Joan Cullen (State Agency CTR Program Manager) on Parking Programs at Colleges and Universities.
- Sherry Parsons, on commute trip reduction options.
- Darren Shaffer, on concepts for higher density lots.
- Thomas Bain, on alternative reconfiguration plans.

**FAQ's**

1. Q – Why do we have to increase parking?

A - In order to get a permit for the construction of the new Seminar II Building Thurston County is requiring that 380 additional parking stalls be built (based on Chapter 20.44.030 of the Thurston County Zoning Ordinance).

2. Q - Is it true that money appropriated for building seminar II can not be used for parking construction?

A - Yes. The College's request for Seminar II included parking, but that part of the request was not funded by the legislature.

3. Q – How does Thurston County figure we need 380 new parking spaces?

A – Thurston County requirements for parking are based on the total number of classrooms, offices and meetings spaces which includes requirements for lane width and landscaping for redesigned or new lots.

4. Q – Why can't we all just ride the bus and not worry about parking?

A – The DTF has explored a number of commute trip reduction programs as a part of our work and the final proposal will include a CTR plan. However, the college has only increased CTR use by 4% in the last year. The CTR program will not net the required 380 parking spaces to build Seminar II.

5. Q - Will this raise my parking fee?

A – Yes. Every option listed requires some increase in parking fees. Cost and user impact were two of the top criteria used for screening various options. The DTF made low cost a priority when reviewing options.

6. Q – What do other colleges do?

A – The DTF looked at the Parking Programs used at all Two and Four Year College and Universities in the State of Washington. That information is available along with a written draft of the report at the Library Reference Desk.

7. Q – Why do we have to pay to park at Evergreen?

A – Washington State regulations require that the cost of operating and maintaining parking lots be paid for by the users.

8. Q – Wouldn't it be more efficient to charge all students and employees a parking fee as a condition of enrollment or employment?

A – The DTF feels it is unfair to ask the community members who don't use the parking lots to subsidize those who do. In addition, this would eliminate one of the deterrents (cost) to driving to campus.