



Meeting Minutes

Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) Advisory Committee Meeting

January 10, 2017

10:30AM – 12:00PM

Location: Facilities Services Building A Conference Room

Attendees: Karin Groth, Tibor Toth, James Nardello, Eric Walle, Peter Reschke, Arokiaraj Panneer Selvam, Kiabeth Landa, Rosalva Barriga

Attendees on Zoom: Jessica Ross, Andres Hernandez, Sonia Johnston, Martin Reed, Drew Shelburne

Call to order: 10:31am

12/13/16 Meeting Minutes approved: Eric – motion to approve. Kiabeth – second. Approved.

Karin – The purpose of this meeting and next two. We will share with you the updates not only to 2020 but also parking updates and the challenges we are facing. We will talk about the current rate structure and the delivery as we understand it to be. What we are sharing is not necessarily permanent but this is the timeline we are anticipating the schedule to be. We will talk through the shift and try to develop a solid recommendation to give to VC Reese on what we think makes the most sense for a rate structure both for now and for the next few years through substantial completion.

AVC Toth – Updates

Tibor – I don't have much in the way of impacts except for rain delays. On the screen we are looking at photos of Lake Lot 3. This is the new lot built to replace Evolution, Little Lake, and Mountain View is now an actual lake. We are working with the developer to pump out the water and build a trench in order to drain the lot. The cause is that when they made the grade improvements for the Bellevue extension it made an earthen dam. Which then prevented it from going down to the lake overflow. The developer and construction team is aware and they are planning on having this ready prior to the start of instruction.

Karin – We had a 2020 meeting on Thursday or Friday and they shared with us that the developer is planning to trench in and drain out the water.

James – These are photos taken yesterday. This is the flooding in the Evolution Valley Extension.

Karin – While we know that the developer is working aggressively to fix this, there isn't any place for the water to go. The problem is that they moved the earth and now there is no place for the water to go. They are also doing trenching and utility work in Lake Lot 2 and we have been told that that will be completed and the lot will be back in its original condition by start of instruction. The rain has had a significant impact to the lots and as you can see there is a lot of work to be done still.

Tibor – We are working very closely with the 2020 project construction team and understating the needs of our customers and they are assuring us that they can hit those schedules for us.

Karin – If that doesn't happen for whatever reason, that impact is about 400 spaces. If students were arriving today we would be about 400 spaces short because of the impact of the construction and the water.

Tibor – The contractors are willing to work weekends and overtime as well.

Karin – Our team was talking this morning about whether or not we should send out an advisory to the campus community about impacts to parking. As we get closer to the end of the week if we still see those impacts we will certainly send something out.

James – We will also post information on our website and tweet it.

Eric – Do they need the rain to stop to meet the schedule?

Tibor – My understanding from the construction team is that they are prepared for additional rain. They know it's coming. Also impacted by the rain delay is the replacement Fleet lot, called P3. That was supposed to open next week but construction hasn't started for the replacement lot in order to open that new lot. The latest update for completion is the end of January instead of the middle of January.

Raj – In case it's not ready by next Tuesday, do we have a plan for overflow parking?

James – This area was the replacement parking. We don't have a back up to the back up.

Raj – Lake Lot 2 is also having construction?

James – Yes. That is impacted as well. It's about 230 spaces impacted in Lake Lot 2

Karin – There is also 190 spaces in Evolution Valley Expansion. So about 400 spaces total

Eric – So what do we do if things aren't ready? In the event that things are ready, are they on the hook for doing something?

Tibor – There are performance requirements and if they don't meet them they get dinged through a payment mechanism. They don't get paid as much.

Karin – He brings up a good point. There is the financial side of it, but we still have the impacts. In the meeting last week the goal was to have it drained and parkable by yesterday. You saw the pictures from yesterday. Not that they are working to solve it, but we need to have a backup plan and a message ready

Eric – So even if Lake Lot 2 is ready by Tuesday we are still short spaces. Right?

Tibor – We do have North Bowl 2 that has been opened. We have additional spaces available to us now that were not available at the beginning of the semester.

Karin – So what we would do is fill the front of campus to capacity and have ambassadors re-route traffic to the back of campus as need

James – We need to remember that with this rain the Evolution Valley Lot is impacted as well. Just from nature.

Tibor – Our plan of action is to have a dynamic look at this. As we get closer to the end of the week we will get an update and status. Depending on what information we receive we will send out communications. It's a very dynamic environment. We are hesitant to share any formalized plan because we are so dependent on an unknown outcome.

Peter – Would it be useful to send out a very general heads up to plan for extra time parking in case of unexpected closures? To help students not be so angry that they didn't plan.

Tibor – We will assess on Thursday morning to get an idea of what the campus will look like on Tuesday and if we think there may impacts then we will absolutely send something out.

Karin – VC Reese did send out a communication at the beginning of the fall semester. One of the points was to address the delays getting onto campus and the suggestion to allow extra time. We know what we faced in the fall so it might be a good idea to send a reminder.

James – The rain is supposed to stop by Thursday. There should be a week before the next rain.

Eric – Even if students are redirected to North Bowl 2 that wouldn't impact any of the Faculty spaces, right? Those are in North Bowl and Le Grand.

Tibor – Yes, the impact is going to be to commuter students.

Karin – Correct, the people who park at the front of campus, Lake lots 1 and 2 and those areas, are primarily commuter students.

Eric – So Faculty should allow for more time too because it may take longer to get to Le Grand and North Bowl.

Karin – Correct. But we would not re-direct until everything was full. But we are prepared to use resources with ambassadors for wayfinding.

Tibor – Signage and wayfinding is a frequent topic that we have, especially with the 2020 project.

Andres – Just checking about the big concerns are that if people are re-routed to North Bowl 2, what about the traffic jam that will occur. Are there additional plans for that?

Tibor – We will work with PD so they are aware of the circumstances. We would need to rely on commuters to allow enough time.

Eric – Can we have a crossing guard at that intersection if there is going to be all that extra traffic? And who would be the crossing guards? TAPS or PD?

Tibor – We've worked with Risk and PD and the challenge is that crossing guards shift the risk to the university. The cross walk was designed in such a way that it can be safely walked across. We'd be looking for the drivers and pedestrians to cross safely.

Eric – You might be looking at possibly 300 students parking in North Bowl 2. That's an additional 600 crossings at that intersection and that is a lot. Especially on the first day of school.

Tibor – That is where we would work with PD on it for them to provide assistance. These are great points and what we need to be prepared for is unknown. To be able to respond to future situations we need to anticipate with so many variables and that is such a challenge.

2017-2018 Student/Faculty/Staff/Grad

Karin – Permit distribution for spring semester. The students will be getting their permits next week. Some have already picked up. Faculty/Staff permits were extended. No change in rate through August 2017. The students will be coming next week for their permits.

Rosalva – We sent out a tweet for those who have already purchased that they can pick up this week.

Karin – We messaged them, knowing the challenges coming with the rain and traffic, we encouraged them to come this week. Trying to make it easier for them as well. That leaves us with where we are today. What recommendations are we going to put forth to VC Reese for fall 2017 and spring 2018? We are looking at the full campus lot count map.

James – Looking at that map, we have two numbers referenced. The first number is the count of unmarked or regular spaces then the slash and the total numbers which would include any ADA or other signed or painted spaces. North Bowl 282/386. Le Grand 169/237. Library Lot is 100% marked lot, 69. Library Lot 2 42.

Karin – For Library Lot 2, Le Grand, and North Bowl – the 282, 169 and the 42. Those are preferred parking. Primarily Faculty/Staff and a small number of Grad students. There will no change or impact to those as a result of 2020. North Bowl 2, the 576 are Faculty/Staff but can be overflow for student commuter. Tibor, where are we in the process for solar?

Tibor – We are currently in the analysis stage of making an apparent award winner. We are hoping that by the beginning of next week we will be able to notify the apparent award winner. The plan is that starting in the summer we will have put in solar covered lots in North Bowl 1 and 2. So that by fall 2017 it will be done.

Karin – By the first day of instruction?

Tibor – That is the plan. As we have a firm schedule I will give a report to the committee.

Eric – What will the panels be used for? Where will the energy go?

Tibor – It will go to the whole grid. To the university.

Karin – Le Grand is prime due to its close proximity to the academic core. North Bowl 1 is now prime and will be more attractive once it's covered parking. Keep that in mind when we discuss rate structure.

James – Viewing the south end of the map now. The Evolution Valley Extension is 191 spaces, like Karin said, with the impacts we are seeing added to the Lake Lot 2, we're looking at approximately 400 spaces impacted. Now for Lake Lot 2, the exit is impacted as well as the entire southern section of that lot.

Karin – Lake Lot 1 is currently sticker permit only. No meter or day parking. That is primarily Lake Lot 2 and Evolution where the kiosks are. My understanding is that from the last update last week is we may see the first delivery of 2020 parking as early as right after Thanksgiving in the fall 2017. Looking at the UCM 2020 map now, keep in mind this is dated March 2016, I tried to get an updated version from the team but it's so fluid. The green represents delivery of phase 1. As mentioned this could be as early as right after Thanksgiving in fall 2017.

Tibor – To clarify, fall 2018 is the 1st delivery, phase 1 first delivery, however as they take parking lots they have to give us space in kind prior to taking the lot. Just to make sure there isn't confusion as to when the phases of delivery will take place versus when parking lots will be available for us.

Karin – Yes, our phased approach will be earlier than the actual first delivery of the 2020 project. The section up in North Bowl, they moved that green area beyond, the Fleet replacement lot, over to the other side of North Bowl 2

Tibor – The new fleet lot is supposed to be completed by the end of January so we can move our Fleet Lot over to this one so they can begin construction on P3.

Karin – The green is the first delivery of parking. Orange is phase 2 delivery of parking. I think the first delivery of the green is about 800 spaces. The total section, the green, orange, and blue. That total delivery is almost 2900 spaces at substantial completion. Once they deliver the green they will take Lake Lot 1, a portion of Lake Lot 2, and some portion of Evolution Valley.

Tibor – The green is phase one delivery but we will get portions of that as they take Lake Lot 1 and portions of Lake Lot 2. Phase two is the orange. Fall 2018 for green, fall 2019 for orange, fall 2020 for blue.

Martin – When can on-campus residents start parking on campus again?

Tibor – We will have to table that as part of an overall discussion for the parking spaces that are available through the committee and even have a discussion if we will even return to that model. The space ratios are a lot leaner than we had before and the availability of spaces will not be the same.

Martin – I look forward to that conversation.

Tibor – We are not sure if there will be enough parking spaces to have on-campus resident parking.

Martin – By 2020 I will have about 4,000 beds on campus. If I expect some continuing students to live on campus they will need to park their cars on campus and not ride a shuttle to a remote parking lot. I don't know if I will be able to get students who are second, third, or fourth year to live on campus.

Tibor – We completely understand that concern but the ratios were established far ahead of this dialogue. We are limited by the number of spaces we have and the number of Faculty, Staff, and Students that we have to find spaces for.

Karin – We may be faced with making policy changes as well. We may not say that we won't have any on-campus parking but maybe the restriction will extend to first and second year and only third or fourth years can park. This is a business model that other universities follow.

Tibor – Your concerns are duly noted and we understand them.

Martin – It will be interesting. Are any of those parking lots in green, orange or blue covered with solar as well?

Tibor – No. The discussion is that once those spaces are completely turned over to the university we will look at possibly installing solar. The challenge we have is that we have to match our demands with what our energy production capability is. We can't put in more solar if we don't have the demand for that energy.

Eric – Is there any way to know how many spaces are in the green box?

Karin – That is what I'm waiting for.

Tibor – Let me look to see if we have that.

Eric – I understand they will replace in kind but with more students it will be a net loss.

James – As a side note, the surface will be the same as we have in Lake Lot 2. Asphalt driving rows with the center section being gravel.

Eric – My other question is accessibility. When Lake Lots 1 and 2 are closed, what will be the path from the green lot?

Tibor – The concern has been given to the developer but we haven't heard back. Over the next couple of weeks we are meeting with the developer. I can assure you it is a significant concern. I will update the committee when have that information.

Karin – Knowing that we could potentially see the delivery of the first phase of parking during the fall semester of 2017. We will need to come up a decision or recommendation for a rate structure. Will we have a permit rate increase? Also, what will parking allocation look like? Who is parking where? If we will have this change in the fall semester, let's discuss what we want to recommend for the fall semester. This academic year we extended 2015-2016 Faculty/Staff permits through 16/17 with no rate increase.

Tibor – The P4 lot partial, the green, will provide 805 spaces. Lake Lot 1 partial removal will be 207 spaces. Lake Lot 2 partial removal will be 143 spaces. So a total of 350 spaces is expected to be removed with an addition of 805.

Karin – What about the orange?

Tibor – These are cumulative, including what will be removed. Parking sequence phase three which is by the completion of second delivery so by fall 2019. Lake Lot 1 will have 442 spaces removed. Lake Lot 2 199 spaces removed. Evolution Valley Lot 354 spaces removed. The additional provided for P4 is 2011 spaces. That will be the green and yellow combined. Delivered by fall 2019. It will likely be prior to fall 2019 that these will be available. The sequencing for parking is different than the sequencing of the facilities. Parking will be delivered by fall 2019 not on fall 2019. Final sequencing all of P4 will be 2,867 spaces. The same removal of spaces from Lake Lot 1 and Lake Lot 2. Evolution Valley Lot will have 354 spaces removed.

Karin – For the academic year 2017-2018. Specifically fall 2017 we will not have any impact to Faculty/Staff in the preferred lots. In the fall we could see a shift out of Lake Lot 1 and partially Lake Lot 2 into P4 delivery one which is the 805 spaces in the green that Tibor was talking about. We need to make a recommendation about the rate structures. Should there be any change for the fall of 2017? Or

should we extend the prices we currently have for spring 2017? We will see the solar project. The intent is to have it ready by start of instruction fall 2017. It could have an impact to North Bowl 1 and 2 if there are any delays. At some point we understand that the first delivery of the 800 spaces from 2020 could be delivered late fall after Thanksgiving. Less than a year from now.

Tibor – The intent of this information is to open dialogue about the rates and permit types for the different lots. With the intent that for the next meeting to come up with recommendations at the next meeting.

Eric – Looking at the permit sold sheet with prices. Looking at the North Bowl 'B' permit is \$33/month verses the Le Grand which is a step up and is more than double. So that price could go up because the demand for North Bowl will be so much greater, especially with it being covered.

Karin – One option is that it could be equivalent rate to Le Grand. Because it's now close in proximity and will be covered.

Tibor – We have North Bowl 1 and North Bowl 2 which will both eventually be covered by solar panels but we need to understand that there is a distance between the two.

Eric – But they are currently the same price?

Karin – Yes.

Raj – Will Le Grand be covered?

Karin – No. Also keep in mind that those employees that are represented. It is written in the union contract that we can't raise the rates more than \$5 per year. We are bound by the contract. If we have the intention to exceed that amount that would have to go back for negotiations.

Tibor – I believe that does not apply to the preferred permit so long as the employees have the option of another permit that only has a \$5 increase.

Karin – Back to the 2020 map. At substantial completion there is a section of the blue area that could become prime real-estate. So looking at the rate structure of P4. That is closer to campus. Some portion of the blue area could be priced higher and that section could be allocated for a certain group based on business need and demand. Those are the things we need to keep in mind during these discussions.

Eric – One thing that strikes me about parking is thinking about what we can do to drive the parking demand down. One thing we can do is increase prices and the second is to decrease availability. We are decreasing availability independent of anything so we have to increase pricing and offsetting that by improving alternative transportation. So what do we need to do that? What sort of price structure would we need to increase the public transportation side and also discouraging people from parking?

Karin – Right. We can't look at parking and transit separately. In having discussion with senior management we can't look at them separately. We need to have a more mature transit system in place. And looking at the cost to achieve that and looking at how to fund that. Senior management and the budget office are aware of that.

Tibor – This is called TDM, Transportation Demand Management. Karin is a huge advocate for this and is looking at other methods of getting people of campus. There are buses, bikes, Zipcar, Zimride, carpools, etc.

Karin – We are also aggressively exploring looking at electric buses to add to our fleet. In response to the funding challenges we are working with sustainability office to look at grant opportunities and exploring different ways to have an improved TDM. You are right we need to look at these preferred areas and pricing them in a way to deter people.

Eric – I don't think you want to deter people. You won't be able to modify very many of those people's driving habits. I think you will modify the commuters parking habits and so the increase rates will have the biggest impact.

Karin – Agreed but we should discuss increasing the rates in the preferred locations. In talking to our sister campus would say that our preferred rates are pretty cheap for this area.

Eric – I agree with that, coming from Berkeley. But I think the commuter rates would need to go up to dis-incentivize that group.

Peter – I'm looking at the permits sold. What are the revoked? Is that people that wanted to park but were denied?

Rosalva – The first column is the currently active permits. The revoked is permits that were cancelled. Maybe they left UCM or changed to a carpool.

Karin – These could also be those that were on a waiting list and changed from one type of permit to another.

Peter – Is there any information about how many wanted to park in one area but could not because the cap was met?

Karin – We don't currently have anyone on the waiting list.

Peter – So everyone who wants to park on campus has a permit, unless they live on campus?

Tibor – Or a first year students

Rosalva – Some are parking at the remote lot at Merced College or Heritage students.

Peter – How does this quantifies the demand that is going on between the different types of permits? There are more C commuter permits because there are more spots for those. But are they all getting them whether that's what they wanted or not?

Eric – The Faculty/Staff/Grad rates are monthly right?

Karin – Yes.

Peter – What about the transportation fees that are charged to students each semester. Does this all go to the same place?

Karin – No, the current transit fee that students pay covers about 1/3 the total operating costs of transit services alone. As an auxiliary, the revenue generated from parking and parking enforcement in theory could be used to subsidize alternative transportation programs but we are not in a position now where that is a viable business model. We are also bound by OP on raising that transit fee. And we do not currently charge Faculty/Staff to ride. We may recommend the senior management that maybe we need to charge a transit fee to Faculty/Staff to ride. Since 2007 we have only raised the student transit fee once. Right now it's \$87.50 and half that goes to financial aid.

Tibor – Do the students vote about fee increases?

Karin – Yes.

Eric – Is there a limit to the amount of increases for the commuter rates? I hate to pick on undergrads but if we increased the STC permit from \$160 to \$200 we'd increase total revenue by \$80,000. And I don't think \$200 per semester is an insane amount.

Tibor – That's the reason for this forum.

Peter – If increasing student fees have to go to a vote. Who would decide if Faculty/Staff have to pay?

Karin – That would go through us and we would have to have staff assembly and the unions involved.

Tibor – This committee would make a recommendation to leadership. They would decide if a study would be need to be done. Then we would have to have the equipment in place to know if someone was a student or a staff member.

Karin – When the campus first opened it was a flat structure. In 2010 we shifted to a tiered structure. The committee at the time looked across the UC campuses to see where we were in line with other campuses. We have to remember our demographic when we look at those prices. Last time the committee put forth recommendations and it was the vice chancellor and chancellor that blessed the rate structure.

Raj – So Eric mentioned increasing the fees to the students.

Eric – I'm not in favor of raising the transit fees because the students don't have a choice, but raising the permit prices because they can choose to purchase a parking permit.

Tibor – But the student fees are going directly to pay for transit services. It's not going toward parking. The student fees are going into a system that the students utilize. They are paying a portion of that fee to use the service. The parking rates are there to cover the expenses of the parking lots and system.

Eric – I think the parking permit rates need to help subsidize the alternatives to parking. If you are a first generation college student and can't afford a fee increase, you don't have a choice. If you are a first generation college student and can't afford the parking permit then you don't have to park. You have a choice whether to purchase a parking permit. They don't have a choice on paying the fee. I would rather raise the permit cost than the fees.

Tibor – Just to clarify, the fees are voted on by the student body. We don't impact that.

Karin – We can make a recommendation on what a fee increase could look like, but it would have to go through student government.

Peter – The students who pay the transit fees. Does that subsidize so the Faculty/Staff don't have to pay to use it? Do Faculty/Staff pay to use transit?

Karin – All students pay the transit fee whether they use it or not. The majority of the riders are student. The ridership of Faculty/Staff is very low.

Peter – What percentage of student fees go to cover transit expenses?

Karin – What we collect from registration fees only covers 1/3 of the total operating budget. That means that the campus is subsidizing 2/3 of the transportation.

James – The number of Faculty/Staff riding transit are extremely low. Almost non-existent. Only one or two on the AB Line.

Karin – We will probably see a shift in that as we build the downtown building. And we want that. We want to encourage the use of alternative transportation, not driving to campus.

Raj – One other option we can look into is increasing all the rates by maybe 5 or 10%. Taking into account the union regulations.

Eric – For example, we can only increase C permits by \$5. Contractually that the limit.

Tibor – Yes. Another option is we could look at whatever percentage \$5 is to \$33 and we could then convert that to a rate and distribute the increase across the board.

Eric – We would just need to be careful about the semester permits versus the monthly permits. So it would be about a \$20 increase to the STC permits because it's for 4 months.

Peter – It seems like all need to receive some kind of increase so everyone shared the burden. If the preferred didn't increase then people would ask why. Everyone should share in it.

Karin – To your point, going back to the 2020 map and you consider locations. The perception is that the commuter spaces are being moved even further out and there was no impact to Le Grand or North Bowl. If we raised the rates for commuters but no increase for preferred. Someone is going to say something.

Tibor – Another point is that administratively our permitting system allows a fixed number of permit types.

Rosalva – We only have 5 GTNs

Tibor – We have a fixed number of permits and permit rates based on our administrative system. As we build out the campus we need to look at restructuring the number of permits we have. Looking at the permit types we currently have, we need to combine some of those so we don't have as many different ones.

Karin – Going back to what we originally had when we opened the campus, more of a flat line rate structure.

Tibor – Exactly, instead of having so many different permits, as a customer we may want to have fewer permit choices so it's less confusing.

Karin – On the 2020 model, and these are just random numbers, but we could say that maybe P4 the green and orange is \$45 to park there, then the preferred Le Grand, North Bowl 1 and P4 blue could be \$100.

Tibor – So a blue, orange, green pricing. The rates would be related to location.

Eric – If we were to go back to the \$5 limit. If we completely eliminate a permit type and create a new one, could we then impose whatever rate we wanted and get around the \$5 limit?

Tibor – The contract language is that employees have a right to be able to park on campus. Part of that contracted agreement is that if there is a rate increase, it can be no more than \$5 per year. Restructuring the permits wouldn't matter because it still had to be within that \$5 increase.

Karin – But we could get there as a phased approach. We could say that by 2020, or substantial completion, we want parking to be by zone. And you would pay by zone. This is what we want the parking and rate structure to be at substantial completion. So how do we get there when in the interim we are bound to the \$5 increase per year? By 2020 we want parking in the green and orange zones to be \$45 and then the blue is a different rate.

Tibor – We could establish that as a recommendation today so it's up for discussion for 3 years to get to that end point. So by 2020 there is a \$15 increase total.

Karin – We went through the exercise before the meeting. It would take us 4 years to get from the current \$33 to \$45. It's doable. We need to make the recommendation today for what we want the future state to be.

Eric – After looking at the spreadsheet, it looks like Faculty/Staff pay less to park on campus than undergraduates. If you take the \$160 and make it \$40 a month, whereas the B and C for Faculty/Staff is \$33 a month. Is that right?

Karin – Faculty/Staff are based on 12 months. The students are based on 9 months. It should be equivalent.

Tibor – Maybe for the next meeting we can see the numbers normalized.

Raj – What about the \$504 for Heritage carpool?

Tibor – That is for the entire academic year, not semester.

Karin – That is for August through May. That also factors in not just one person, but a carpool of 2 or 3.

Kiabeth – But that is still more expensive than the commuter carpool and it's for the same amount of people using it. Why not raise the commuter carpool rate for students because Heritage is paying more.

Tibor – Part of that is the dedicated transit service. Heritage is receiving a benefit that nobody else does. The carpool permits are completely voluntary as there is a dedicated transit serviced provided.

Kiabeth – We have had discussion before about the buses running late. And some are not able to find carpoolers and they aren't willing to pay the \$504 just to come to campus even though they are considered on-campus resident, just living off campus. I was not able to find anyone with the same schedule as me and I can't get the permit to park on campus.

Tibor – We understand and acknowledge the challenges the Heritage resident have to contend with. We have tried to mitigate that by offering additional services for them that isn't provided to any other group. This can be a discussion in the committee for recommendations to restructure the rates.

Eric – Should the carpool rates be the same for everyone?

Tibor – I don't know if that would make sense since the services provided to Heritage residents are provided to everybody.

Eric – The other permit customers probably do have access to a transit line.

Tibor – The difference is that the University made the investment in to transit specifically for the Heritage residents. Like Martin asked about when residents will be able to park on campus again. And we don't know if that will ever be allowed in our future state because the ratios will be so much leaner.

Eric – Does the price of the carpool permit increase your likely hood of riding the bus?

Kiabeth – It depends on the student. They have to ride the bus because they don't have any another option. They can't park on campus. They can't buy a kiosk permit. They get cited on campus. Their options are very limited. So don't have cars because there aren't enough spaces to even park at the apartments.

Tibor – There simply not enough spaces to allow Heritage residents to park on campus. We had to make difficult decisions to find ways to limit the number of people parking on campus. So it became that if you are a campus resident, you can't park on campus. I understand that people don't like it and we are empathetic but the decision had to be made.

Eric – That seems an effective model because the price incentivizes people to take the bus.

Karin – It's priced as such because it's not intended for one person to pay it. It is set to incentivize more passengers in the car. Then you split the cost over more people. Also we have to look at it from the perspective that we are trying to decrease the number of cars coming to campus to meet our suitability goals and reduce greenhouse gasses.

Kiabeth – Like Martin brought up earlier. In 2020 there will be an increase in the number of beds on campus and if I were still here I would not live on campus because of the fact that I couldn't park on campus. It would help to have a few spaces specifically for those living on campus. I know a lot of people want to be able to leave campus and not rely on a bus.

Tibor – That is exactly the opposite behavior we are trying to encourage.

Eric – If more people who lived on campus could park on campus then it would decrease the space available for commuters to drive to campus. This would drive down parking on campus and also potentially increase revenue by just jacking up the price to have a car on campus.

Karin – In fact that is in the plan for a rate increase because those people who live on campus and park on campus are in fact garaging their vehicles. You should pay more to garage your vehicle.

Tibor – It should be preferred.

Karin – Yes, there will be a rate increase when we bring resident parking back.

Eric – It looks like the permits generate about \$421,000. How much more would be necessary to double the bus lines, so they came every ½ hour instead of hour? How much do we need to add to the bottom line from permit rates to fund transit? We could increase rates by \$5 but that wouldn't be meaningful because it wouldn't fund another bus.

Karin – I'll be meeting with the budget office next week to have these discussions. Not just parking but also transportation. Looking at the transportation part of it. We would have to double the transit fee just to meet our current operating cost of \$3.1 million. That would be no increase to service.

Eric – What is the current transit fee?

Karin – It's currently \$87.50 per semester.

Peter – For those who don't use it wonder why they need to pay it.

Karin – They should be using it. We are looking at electric buses and grants to help us make these changes.

Kiabeth – In regards to Faculty/Staff/Grads. Do they pay the transit fee?

Peter – Grad students do.

Kiabeth – If Faculty and Staff started paying the fee, would that help in any way?

Karin – The percentage of Faculty/Staff that ride is so small that the financial impact is minimal. That doesn't mean they shouldn't pay to ride and as we grow we should see an increase in ridership from Faculty and Staff. What we may do is implement a per ride fee. If you don't have your CatCard you pay \$2 to ride.

Eric – If the transit fee is \$87.50 per semester, then if all 6,500 students pay that we would need a million dollar increase per year.

Peter – Where is the funding coming from now?

Tibor – The campus gives an allocation.

Peter – Will that dry up eventually?

Karin – When we found out we had to take on more student beyond the original projects. Including the Heritage and we knew we'd have a parking challenge. Martin and I worked together on that. So housing is subsidizing the Heritage. As an auxiliary we're looking at different business models to meet that challenge. We've had a campus subsidy that's been going on.

Tibor – I meet with the budget office and the term they use is buckets and they have been funding. We don't know the different bucket types and sizes, but they have been able to consistently find the funding.

Peter – So if we doubled fees and met our own, would the budget subsidy would go away?

Tibor – Correct.

Peter – It sounds like we are painted into a corner. We could raise fees but it just means that they would subsidize less.

Tibor – The discussion is service level. Depending on the service level that is required. If we want to provide more service then we need more funding. If the budget office won't provide that then we need to look at ways to pay for the additional layers of service. How do we increase frequency? The recommendation could be that a percentage of this could be allocated to increase transit fees.

Karin – Next meeting topics?

Peter – How many people want to park but can't. Something to see what the demand is for each level of permits. Is there higher demand for the lowest cost permit?

Tibor – We don't have anything that would give us the perceived demand by lot. The preferred lots are fully utilized so the perceived demand is high. But North Bowl 1 and 2 the usage is relatively low so the perceived demand is low.

James – We could add the number of Heritage students plus the freshman and residents. Get the number of those who aren't allowed to park on campus.

Karin – I would say that every lot on campus are in high demand. The lots are full. There isn't going to be a change until the P3 delivery.

Eric – I'd like to know what it would cost to double the bus routes.

Peter – Is it possible to consider allowing residents to park on campus. That would increase demand for that and make student commuter space sparser and we could increase rates?

Tibor – I think we should save that for another meeting. For the next meeting we need to come up with number to recommend to leadership. We want a decision to be made prior to the end of the semester so people are prepared for fall 2017 to know what the rates will be.

Karin – And knowing the construction impacts and solar impacts it may be that we extend the rates until again with the first rate increase to come in spring 2018.

Tibor – I think we need to focus on fee recommendation for the next meeting.

Raj – Can we see what the fee increase would look like in terms of revenue?

Martin – My concerns are that there are private developers building new student housing in Merced. I need to be able recruit upper division students to live on campus and not just go off campus. Parking will be an issue. We need to consider allowing resident parking on campus like it was in 2014. We had about 200 spaces for on-campus students to park. We are going to have competition starting in 2018 and beyond. Students will have a choice to live on or off campus.

Eric – Does it affect the campus revenue stream if students live off campus instead of on campus?

Martin – It has a negative impact on our revenue stream. We are getting close to 4,000 students on campus. Unless the University admits 4,000 new students every year, where all the beds are filled, we will end up with a lot of vacancies on campus. Very nice apartments are being built around Merced. The competition will be very great by the time we get to 2020. We need to consider students.

Tibor – Would you be able to give a recommendation on what the rates should be for an on-campus resident to have dedicated parking?

Karin – That should be a committee decision.

Tibor – Yes, but I'd just like to hear what he thinks the residents are willing to pay. If they are willing to pay \$30 per month then no, but if they are willing to pay \$200 per month, that would be good to know.

Karin – It's a one to one ratio and currently our highest rate is \$96 for the X permit. I would say that that would be the starting point.

Tibor – I'd just like to hear from his perspective.

Karin – Other campuses have a structure that says that residents can park on campus but for event days the residents need to move their vehicles to make space.

Martin – I'm open to all ideas.

Tibor – Housing concerns were brought up in the initial phase of parking lot determinations. It won't be a surprise.

Kiabeth – I just received an email from a co-worker asking about residents getting motorcycle permits for Lake Lot. Can on-campus resident purchase a motorcycle permit?

Rosalva – We haven't sold any type of permits to residents.

Next Meeting

1. Date: February 14, 2017 from 10:30AM-12:00PM
2. Proposed agenda topics
3. Action Items

Meeting adjourned at 12:13pm

Faculty/Staff/Grad	Rate	Permits sold	
		as of 1/10/17	Revoked
SMG Reserved "X"	\$96	18	2
Preferred "A"	\$69	221	67
Preferred Low Emission "ALEV"	\$56	70	15
Preferred Carpool "ACP"	\$69	21	6
Preferred Departmental Business "AUB"	\$69	46	6
Commuter North Bowl "B"	\$33	324	125
Commuter Carpool "BCP"	\$33	29	11
Commuter Low Emission "FSCLEV"	\$27	129	45
Commuter "C"	\$33	295	202
Student - Fall Semester (Aug. - Jan.)	Semester Rate		
Housing "H"	\$160	56	5
Commuter "STC"	\$160	2066	89
Commuter Carpool "STCP"	\$160	124	10
Heritage (Aug. - May)	Academic Rate		
Carpool "HCP"	\$504	25	2