

**Meeting Minutes**

**Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) Advisory Committee Meeting**

January 12, 2016

10:30AM – 12:00PM

**Location:** Facilities Services Building A Conference Room

**Welcome and Introductions**

**Attendees in person:** Karin Groth, James Nardello, Tibor Toth, Peter Reschke, John Bunce, Eric Walle, Coty Ventura, Arokiaraj Panneer Selvam,

**Attendees on Ready Talk:** Sonia Johnston, Jessica Ross, Drew Shelburne, Martin Reed and Dominque Jones

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Meeting minutes for December were approved by Eric and second by John

**Committee Member Updates**

Tibor– 2020 getting ready to send final RFP, a lot of work by legal and design, will go out this week or next week, will be able to send developers their final response will need to be, working with them for a number of months refining what the UC wants. Next couple of months will be able to see what the final design elements will be looking like.

Karin – do they have where the shovel will hit the ground?

Tibor – can’t recall the date, but looking at 2017

John – nothing to add this month, turned in minutes to Grad students, haven’t heard complaints. Minutes go out within the next week

Peter –Ditto working on same page along with Jessica

Donna – not an official member, but I am a member of campus climate, CCPI, parking issues did not come up at last meeting, sometimes they specifically about disability issues, and if I hear anything I will bring it to the table

Eric – no updates

Tibor – how does info go from here to your colleagues?

Eric- informally, there’s no standard way or by the minutes being posted on the TAPS website

Tibor – should consider that a talking point, how to get information out to your represented group more formally

John – is there a way things can be funneled to who it should go, grads to us and faculty to Eric

A good way for information to flow back

Karin – perhaps posting to Panorama, issues related to parking these are the representatives,

Coty – meets on Friday the same week of this meeting, I take updates and break it down, sometimes there is feedback, downtown parking issues regular offenders, can we regulate, issues with businesses. Also concerns with CART program, HR was not aware, they felt they should be informed because they have people that might need it.

Karin – did not do a formal broadcast because it’s a pilot program, it was more targeted to students, but certainly available to faculty and staff, we weren’t sure how it will roll out

Coty – maybe you can just notify HR

Tibor – dialogue, make sure level of agreement and expectations are met, more detailed dialogue

Karin – we can provide our parameters, temporary service, not allowed to pick up/assist in any way, during business hours

Karin – point right on, collaborating with Housing to start pilot program, will continue to collaborate with other departments as well. Do you have a specific contact?

Coty – David Ellington, contact for HR

Martin – talked to team, question wanted to know if student from the Resident Hall

Association could join the committee. To express student feedback and give their perspective, they are excited about the cart program, fixing potholes around lots and the process how to fix, and lighting around lots

Tibor – should we have a side bar?

Martin – yes, we can

Karin – an RA that wanted to join the committee

Martin – the housing management team wanted to know

Tibor- do we have representation for undergrads?

Karin – yes, we have one, can be more successful in communication

Tibor – agenda item, increase membership of undergraduate

Jessica – communicated with GSA, talked to John on how we can better communicate with grad students with their concerns, better way for us to more formally to communicate

James – consider box, open to everyone

**Update on Transit/Offsite Parking Locations**

Tibor – coming into the new year we tried to develop a combine parking solution of both on campus and off campus would be a park and ride with a transit center and would partner with the City of Merced, that deal could not be arranged now look at how all parking needs met on campus, need 406 spaces by August 1, 2016 and 404 by August 2017. So presently coming up with a strategy to make it happen, two options

1. Rapidly build NB phase 2, however with timeline it’s going to be a huge task
2. Alternative option is to request CPPD to allocate space for the expansion of 2 existing temporary lots Mountain View and the existing COB 2 contractors lot the idea is that would give combine 406 between those two lots in addition to what is there. We will feel very confident we can deliver by fall 2016, but now at a point of trying to obtain funding and or determine trying to expedite North Bowl phase 2. In the

2020 plan those additional lots will not be included as part of total parking spaces, they will be lost and investment will be lost as well, those are the current talking points , meeting scheduled for tomorrow evening, hopefully will get a good idea by end of week.

Karin – anything else on that?

No response

**Lot Analysis Update**

Per last meetings request, was asked to do day by day plot for the month of November, bar graph looks cleaner, listed dates, only collected data for actual count days.

The presentation given by Jewel Wise included the following:

Average peak percent available spaces for North Bowl, Le Grand and Library, Little Lake, Lake 1 & 2, Evolution Valley lot & Rd, Mammoth Lakes Rd and Mountain View lots.

Solar Parking Meters and Electric Vehicle Revenue report including occupancy data

ADA parking lot availability

Specialty permits in unmarked spaces such as AUB and carpool permits

Finals week analysis for North Bowl, Le Grand, Lake 1 & 2 parking lots

**Electric Vehicle/Solar Meter Analysis**

Karin – what are the requests from our EV customers, had a chance to talk to Faculty member Stefano Foresti, very informative, educational for us to hear their needs, to see what we could do not only for faculty, but staff and or students, result of that meeting, currently have two (2) level 1 in North Bowl because of the mode we have challenges if four (4) vehicles

Tibor – too much of a current draw to have all four (4) outlets at the same time, so it’s been limited to two (2)

James – submitted work order to change to single outlets, only 2 vehicles can charge at a time

Karin – because of that we have coned 2 spaces, recommendation to open the other two (2) just for parking, we’ve welcomed and moving forward on changing the signage, 2 chargeable and 2 additional parking, also recommended instead of hybrid perhaps only for electric vehicles only. In talking with him customers coming from far there is more of that need of having that certainty of having the capability to charge otherwise they can’t get home. We should consider for only zero emissions primarily as opposed to the hybrid.

John – how do you keep all four spaces from cars that aren’t charging?

James – with signs, it’s enforceable, look at vehicle hybrid vs. electric

John – you have 4 spaces that two can be plugged in at any given time, but open up all 4 spaces only 2 for parking how do you not end up with just 4 people parking in prime spots.

James – it’s how the signs are going to be allocated, how those two other spaces are going to be identified

Karin – another topic was location, what type level 2, 3, 4, North Bowl has a level 1 trickle charge, level 2 is located in the library lot which are quicker, we incorporated 4 hour time limit for these spaces, but realistically it doesn’t make sense in North Bowl due to not getting much of a charge, in good faith if you have an electric vehicle you could unplug from other vehicle and plug it into your own, have that commitment within that group.

James – still need to review that sharing, convenience vs I need to charge, that program is guided by the charging folks themselves, not TAPS, self-sustaining, when we get involve there could be liability issues, more to review on friendly charging and how that process can roll out, there’s actually an app on your phone “Charge Bump” allows you to see where there at on charging and being able to do a charge bump and move them, really interactive process, more discussions to come.

**Research Participant Space Update**

Karin – last meeting we asked Eric to put together a draft for an agreement or request, currently have two (2) spaces in Le Grand, and there was a request to perhaps add additional spaces in developing a formal policy or procedure of how that request would be has triggered this draft.

Eric – discussed draft, biggest issue is as we get more researchers we will need more spaces, each lab does not need their own space but one space to share

Karin – received formal letter from the Interim Dean of SSHA, additional space and consider part of 2020 the importance of having close in parking for participants as they continue to do their research, I did reach out to them and told them I would be bringing this to table, and see if they need to go through a formal process or approve a space for spring semester or SSHA. Basically, what they are looking asking for is one (1) space in the Le Grand lot. Does this go through a formal process or if we can make a recommendation today?

Tibor- why can’t they reserve a space when a space is needed rather than have a space dedicated to them

Karin – that is an option, they’re request is more than just a here and there but a daily need

John- sometimes we go through 5 to 6 families a day

Eric – some do use that method, another issue is the location having the space close to the building

Tibor – times of use are those limited, 8am to 4pm, would this space be available for use for other customers

Eric – currently reserved 24/7

John – we run 9 to 6, consistently and sometimes make appointments after that timeframe

Tibor – looking at it from a customer’s point, driving in space not being used, would bring that up as a frustration point

Karin – good point that’s when the lot analysis comes in place,

Raj – is there a limit

James – high demand for preferred parking, currently have 2

Eric – total wouldn’t get, we’ve added faculty, more than 5 or 6, and we pay for it can be expensive

James – discussion item, one to one, but can be shared among the group, will have a dedicated analysis of those

research spaces so that we have an idea of how much it’s being used

Eric – might be the case that the majority of the time it’s not used

Karin – another point with COB 2 opening more of a need, will need an additional space, waiting for fall of 2016 is too late

Tibor – opens in April

Sonia – have we looked at other campuses where they use families and children as part of their research and how they allocate parking spaces, be curious percentage per program or research grant?

John – I know at UCLA

Sonia – at UCSB only 2 spaces, large program, curious on the percentages that are used identifies the number of spaces not reserving too many but enough to continue the research

Karin – don’t have specific model or percentage that other campuses use, will reach out to get more specific data

Coty – how they are monitored that actual participants are parked there

Karin – each department has a specific permit that is used and distributed. Being responsive to SSHA and the request for another space at this point can we go forward and establish one reserve space

Eric – is this a separate request or the same issue?

Karin – same issue, growing number of psychology professors are asking to use the spaces and it’s getting difficult to manage multiple requests, with COB2 opening there will be increase the

Coty – will the dean determine who can use it?

Karin – yes

Tibor – make a motion to deny or next meeting finalize

Karin – yes, but because it’s time sensitive, don’t know if we will have set and ready to go for next meeting, do we wait or approve now

Peter – still unclear as to who is it going to get it, why is it going directly through TAP’s and not the form

John – special case, I would be willing to make motion to give a space and then move forward go on

Tibor – time limit, expiration date

Karin- the other two spaces do not have an expiration

Tibor – valid through June until the process is in place and after June go through the process

John – motion to approve a space for SSHA that will expire on May 31st and then going forward will have to resubmit request

Coty – Second

Voted and approved

**Other discussions**

Karin – working with Green Commuter, partnering with them to submit a grant proposal which says UC Merced agreeing to be a deployment site for a 3 year pilot program for electric buses using our current schedules, proposal options include replace a transit route or add campus castle another option is as we continue to add offsite locations Mondo, parcade, the downtown admin bldg., that we could have a dedicated shuttle that would connect satellite locations to campus and then perhaps we are going to secure offsite housing locations for our residents that we could incorporate those shuttles, definitely options to use electric shuttles, deadline is here working fast would start spring of 2016 after 3 year program and as we build with the 2020 project we could certainly use for intra campus transit as the parking is pushed further currently have an immediate need and going forward we can see it growing.

Karin – we have time to back and talk about downtown parking, we have no jurisdiction to enforce on the streets in front of the businesses, we encourage the campus community to be a good neighbor, told them where to park, yes we have received photos and reached out to those, but there is no way for us to enforce

Coty – I think they know that, but it’s frustrating I think when it’s the same people

Karin – hopefully with transit, incorporating a dedicated transit route perhaps it could be a solution or minimize the number of vehicles going downtown, ongoing issue and we continue to have discussions

Coty – on this electric bus is the proposal for the cost of the bus

Karin – yes and the driver and any infrastructure charge to install charging stations

John – just one bus

Karin – not necessarily, they will look at the request, not a 40 footer but smaller, it could be 2

Coty – what happens after the 3rd year, do you keep it?

Karin – the bus would go back, actually last week we had a vendor come out, we are exploring the option of purchasing electric buses, and the infrastructure is paid for with this grant

**Next Meeting**

1. Date: February 9, 2016 from 10:30AM-12:00PM
2. Proposed Agenda Topics
3. Recap of Action Items

Research form to be vetted back and forth with TAP’s and next meeting have a finalize draft to approve

How faculty will reach out to groups and grad students

RA Association representative

Research participants having discussion for more specific data

Planning process for next year

Karin – asked the committee if next month’s meeting can be moved to the 16th due to a conference I’m attending.

The committee agreed.

Meeting adjourned at 11:50am