



Meeting Minutes

Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) Advisory Committee Meeting

February 14, 2017

10:30AM – 12:00PM

Location: Facilities Services Building A Conference Room

Attendees: Karin Groth, Tibor Toth, James Nardello, Katherine Shurik, Andres Hernandez, Jessica Ross, George Gongora, Arokiaraj Panneer Selvam, Edmundo Martinez, Rosalva Barriga, April Hellam

Attendees on Zoom: Sonia Johnston, Martin Reed

Call to order: 10:30am

1/10/17 Meeting Minutes approved: Edmundo – motion to approve. Raj – second. Approved.

Karin – Before we move on to AVC updates. Eric Walle, our faculty representative, advised us that he will be teaching a class at this time for the spring semester. He understands the importance of staying on the committee and given the changes and decisions we will be making, he has agreed that we can send him the recording of the meeting and we will meet after to discuss. I said I would bring it to the table in case anyone has any objections to this plan. He will still be involved, but on a side-bar.

Raj – Can we reschedule the meeting to work with his schedule?

Karin – He asked that, but with so many people on the committee it's hard to find a time. This is a short term solution, really it's only 3 meetings. We talked about him appointing someone, which he is ok to do, but he recognizes that there is a learning curve and he feels like he has a solid understanding of our business and can make recommendations on behalf on his constituents. Is everyone ok with that? Are there any objections?

Andres – The only potential concern would be that with a subsequent meeting, there would be individualized attention with one person so could there potentially be more influence in that regard.

Karin – Our team here would be in the meeting and would invite anyone who wanted to join.

Katherine – Typically I also have a class at noon so I have to leave early, today specifically.

George – I don't have an objection, but I do have a question. Would he still be able to vote on motions brought to the table?

Karin – Yes he would have to vote. If we were actually voting on a policy change then we could have a tentative direction on where we were going then he would be able to listen to the meeting recording and then he could provide his vote. To address your concern, we would not make any changes off-line without bringing it back to the table.

Andres – As long as the conversation stays out in the open.

Karin – I'm willing to opening that up to anyone who wants to participate.

James – Those conversations would be recorded so anyone would be able to hear what is discussed.

Tibor – We could add the recordings to box for access.

AVC Toth – Updates

Tibor – I don't have much in 2020 project updates. We have shifted off to topics regarding refuse containers, loading docks, etc. and away from parking and circulation discussions.

Karin – These topics will up in the course of conversation today.

Tibor – The solar panels for North Bowl 1 and 2. We are continuing the contract negotiations with the developer. They are in progress. Nothing finalized yet.

Karin – Can you talk a little bit about the workforce plan and the chancellor's initiative?

Tibor – About 3 or 4 months ago the campus had a leadership meeting with the chancellor and vice chancellors to talk about campus priorities. We have the chancellor's vision and change alignment map. This talks about long term planning for the university. The reality is that there are limited resources so we have to establish priorities. Those priorities were established and communicated. Priority A is for research and academic distinction. Priority B is student success. Priority C is organization efficiencies and sustainability. Which includes infrastructure and revenue enhancements. These are the priorities based on the vision of what the campus is. There is also an emphasis on sharing a commitment with everybody on what the academic mission is. As well as focusing on methods to increase our structural efficiencies, talk about tradeoffs, and sub-optimizations. That is another way of saying that with the reduction in resources it could be balanced with a reduction in service levels or how we can be more creative in service levels and perhaps sharing those across departments. New initiatives and creating new revenue streams. Since we are so resource limited how we augment the revenue streams coming into the university. Those are the 3 priorities we have been given. We are modeling all of our strategies to be in alignment with those priorities. We have had discussions with capitol planning and budget as well as our core customer groups to have them better understand how we foresee facilities management aligning to those priorities. It is leading to creative dialogue and as long as we have those priorities in mind then we can come up with creative solutions.

Karin – In response to the priorities, we look at our 4 business units. Parking Services, Transportation Services, Parking Enforcement, and Fleet Services. How do we support the vision and align our priorities. Some updates that came out of the last 2020 meeting is that we are looking to have the first delivery of P4 as soon as September. So fall 2017. Originally the sequencing for 2020 parking was 3 stages. They have realigned and are pushing forward to deliver the first phase of the approximately 1750 spaces delivered by the start of fall semester. This means the existing parking will be taken at some point after that. That along with the solar project over North Bowl.

Tibor – The solar proposal that is still in development is to place solar panels on North Bowl 1 and 2, potentially the new P3, the corp. yard and Housing 4. The Plan is to have North Bowl 1 and 2 done this summer. The corp. yard and Housing 4 would be determined. The summer period is the only time to access the parking lots so the emphasis would be there.

Karin – The impact to parking is North Bowl 1 will be closed for construction during the summer and they will phase that into North Bowl 2 over the summer as 1 is completed. We made it clear that it has to be open for use by start of fall semester. And P3 is still to be determined.

Tibor – What makes P3 a challenge is that it is a 2020 developer lot and 2020 developer lots are maintained by the developer so we have to be cautious from a liability perspective to have a third party in on the dialog.

Karin – Looking at the handout – The P3 parking shows what Tibor was discussing. North Bowl can be divided into 4 sections. North Bowl 1, North Bowl 2, P3 and then beyond that the campus fleet parking. Solar will cover North Bowl 1 and 2 and potentially P3.

Tibor – It will not cover the new Fleet lot.

Andres – Will all spaces be covered?

Tibor – The drive isles may not be covered in all areas, but all of the parking spaces will be covered.

Karin – They are solar panels.

Tibor – Some of the drive isles may be covered, but not all to accommodate taller vehicles.

George – How will the solar affect lighting in the parking lot?

Karin – There will be lighting underneath it. I don't remember how tall.

James – It will be 11 feet at the lowest point, tentatively.

Tibor – Once we have the design drawings we will be able to share that.

Raj – Where is the income from the solar panels going? To the campus or to parking?

Tibor – To the campus. There really isn't income, it is a cost aversion. It displaces what would normally be purchased.

Karin – Looking at the parking sequence handout. They are planning to deliver the first phase of P4 in September 2017. Then the first step is to turn over the fleet lot and take over P. P3 improvements will have construction in that area. Then P4 turnover is approximately 1750 spaces then they will take Lake Lots 1 and 2 and all of Evolution. Turnover of P5 is step 4. That is supposed to be a pathway to connect P4 to the main campus until we get to substantial completion. So customers parking in P4 will have access to the main campus.

Parking Rates / Allocations

Karin – Now we need to talk about rates. What are our recommendations for permit rates? Looking at the current rates, the X permit is \$96, Preferred is \$69, Commuter Faculty/Staff and student is \$33, motorcycle is \$27 and our low emission vehicles, depending on parking location is either \$27 or \$56. With all the construction and the pending delivery of the projects including the solar and the P4 phase 1 delivery. We are anticipating that even though they are scheduling completion for September, it could easily roll into January. The recommendation we are bringing forward is that the new rates be effective in the spring semester, January 2018. Tibor, can you talk about the bargaining units and what we are bound to in the contracts?

Tibor – We have 5 or 6 different bargaining units and whenever there is a rate increase we have to work with human resources to make sure we are in alignment with the bargaining agreement. At this point we are limited to a \$5 per year increase for basic parking. That doesn't mean we are limited to \$5 across the board, only that everyone has to have the ability within that bargaining unit to be able to park somewhere and only see an increase \$5 per year. There are limitations to how much the core parking can increase. That limit is \$5 per month per year.

Raj – How are we addressing this in the new rates?

Karin – If you look at the current base rate of \$33 and we add \$5 that puts it at \$38 per month. That is a 14% increase. To be fair across the board we applied the 14% to the Reserved and Preferred rates as well. The Reserved rate goes from \$96 to \$109 and Preferred goes to \$79 per month. The logic is that that when these rates, if approved, go into effect, then North Bowl 1 and 2 would be covered parking. So once covered, these lots fall in line with Le Grand. Le Grand is close in proximity and North Bowl 1 and 2 are covered. Then depending on whether or not P3 is covered by solar would determine if that would stay at the \$38 rate. For P4, because of the challenges people will have getting to the main campus and the transit hub won't yet be in place, it will be challenging. Between when P4 opens and substantial completion we put forth to keep that at \$33 until final completion in 2020. Right now we do not have on-campus housing parking. When P4 is delivered when do we bring that back on campus? In talking with other campuses that is reserved parking. That is a dedicated spaces and basically garaging a vehicle.

So that rate would be equivalent to the reserved rate of \$109. But what year and where they would be located, that will have to be decided. Motorcycle permits following the 14% would go from \$27 to \$30. Low Emission vehicles. We are seeing more and more vehicles that qualify. To keep us in line with the vision of the chancellor and supporting the economic growth, we are actually losing money by incentivizing those with low emission vehicles with a lower rate. We have made the shift already and no longer offer that lower rate to students, but have extended them to Faculty and Staff. We are looking to no longer have the low emission rate and change to an incentive for zero emission vehicles with charging.

James – The only reason we still have the LEV's is because we've rolled all the Faculty/Staff permits. Once we move to a new permit cycle and type that LEV permit will no longer be available.

Raj – Only zero emission?

Katherine – So no more hybrids anymore?

Raj – That makes sense because the state is pushing for zero emission vehicles.

James – It has become an industry standard for almost all vehicles to be low emission.

Karin – The governor just mandated in January that by 2020 25% of our campus fleet vehicles will be required to be zero emission vehicles and by 2025 50% will be required to be ZEV. That is the shift we have to go with.

Tibor – Regarding the ZEV and how our utility rates are determined. We are on a tiered rate, meaning if you draw your power during a peak period it's called a peak demand charge then we are charged that rate for the entire month. Something we have to factor is not just the utility rate for charging the ZEVs but also the cost to the campus because it shifts it to a peak demand charge. The way the PG&E rate structures are is that they want you to use more in the evening and discourage use in the afternoon but that is when the ZEVs will be charging. That is something we have to factor. We have to understand the utility charge but also the demand charge as well.

Andres – I see the preferred permit, will they still have access to park in North Bowl 1 and 2?

Karin – Yes.

Andres – I am a current LEV vehicle owner. The questions will come in and a lot of people will be unhappy about this. When we get the new permits, will I be at risk of not getting a preferred permit? The concern is during renewal. Will there be a risk of LEV permit holders not being able to get a new permit?

Karin – We still have preferred LEV permits so they would transfer to a preferred permit. This is a great point because not only are we talking about rates but who is parking where.

Andres – So ALEV are considered Preferred? Will they be the same price as the others?

Karin – Yes, and that is a great question because not only are we talking about permit rates but who is parking where. Le Grand and North Bowl 1 and 2 are primarily Faculty, Staff and some Graduate Students. At substantial completion, if not before, this whole 2,800 space P4 parking lot will be open to everyone. Faculty, Staff and Students. We can make a recommendation for what that looks like. Is it one permit rate, one permit type, and open for first come first served? Or if we want to zone any of these sections for particular affiliations, certain customer base. For example, the way Le Grand is now.

Andres – Just to be clear, the ALEV and the Preferred would be the same price?

Karin – Yes.

Andres – So they are essentially the same thing. It would depend on where the parking is distributed. They would become the same permit?

Karin – Yes, they become the same permit. We would have Reserved, Preferred, P3 and P4.

Andres – Use me as an example. I have an ALEV and when I get my new permit it will just say Preferred on it?

Karin – Yes, something like that.

Andres – It will no longer have that low emission designation.

Karin – ZEV will probably.

Andres – In that case, ALEV will no longer exist, but the people who have that permit will still be able to get a preferred permit.

Karin – If you are driving a Prius right now, and you have an ALEV, if we go forward with these recommendations you will be in line to get a preferred permit.

George – So right now I park in North Bowl and it costs me \$33. A year from now it could cost me \$79 to park in the same spot. That would be a difference of \$552 per year to park in the same spot.

Karin – Correct.

George – How will that be communicated to the campus so they can decide if they want to spend \$500 to \$600 more per year to park?

Karin – Just as we have in the past for other rate increases and parking changes. We would make the recommendation and pass that up to VC Reese and he would message it.

George – Is there a possibility of having something in between? The people parking in Le Grand are only having to pay \$10 more a month and those in North Bowl are going from \$33 to \$79.

Karin – Absolutely, keep in mind that that is a choice that you make and the tradeoff is do you pay more to park closer or pay more to park under cover. We have had some of our customers say that North Bowl 1 is just as close as Le Grand and asking why they are paying \$69 and North Bowl customers are right there and only pay \$33. We've already had those discussions.

George – I know it's going to be covered but the parking spaces are still in the same place.

Karin – You have the option of parking in either P3 or the P4 commuter lot. I think it's important to keep in mind that phasing this in is open to discussion. Just as the project deliveries are being phased, we could have a phased rate increase as well. Ultimately we want to decide where we want to be operationally in 2020 and how do we align our business to get there.

Raj – There is a similar price shock for those moving from LEV to regular permit.

Tibor – I think the nice thing is that this allows the student commuters in P4 to maintain. It's nice to recognize the impact and maintain the level for them.

Karin – And recognizing that parking is getting shifted farther out and they don't have another option. And they have no choice. So keeping that rate until substantial completion is good for them.

Raj – Can P4 be open for Faculty/Staff also?

Karin – Yes, maybe not right away, but yes they can choose to park there and pay the same as the students. I imagine we will see a shift in demand. It's not

Tibor – The emphasis here is that you pay by location.

Karin – Which is a business model that we see at our sister campuses.

Katherine – I am in North Bowl 2 and that is more than a \$5 increase from \$33 currently to \$79.

Tibor – But you have the option of parking in P4 so as long as that option is available we are in compliance.

Karin – We aren't forcing you to pay that. You have the option to park in a different location and pay the lower rate.

Raj – You can choose to pay the same amount, or you can choose to park close and pay the higher amount.

Tibor – It's important to remember that in recent years we haven't had any increases.

Andres – Right, and that's why this increase has to be so much.

Tibor – There comes a time when we have to pay the piper. And the cost of not having an increase will eventually catch up to us. That is what we have to roll into.

George – Everyone has different reasons for parking where they choose to park. I park in North Bowl because it's close to PD. I would vote for an incremental increase but if it came to a vote right now I'd have to vote against going from \$33 to \$79 right now.

Karin – We have to keep in mind that we aren't just looking at one permit type, but across the board. If we looked at the basic rate going from \$33 to \$38 based on the \$5 restriction. If we scaled it back where would that be and then we could apply that percentage across all the levels. We aren't just making changes on the permit side. If we are implementing a rate increase such as this we need to be mindful of the parking enforcement side of it. We currently have about \$44,000 of outstanding citations for people that have 3 or more outstanding citations. If you look at scofflaw, which means we could implement booting and towing, we have about \$25,000 in unpaid citations from people who have 5 or more unpaid citations. Right now that is money just sitting out there that we may not be able to collect. We need to bring back to the table the option of booting and towing as part of the accountability side to protecting the integrity of the spaces for those who are paying.

Andres – I think that is an important point. I've heard the argument that they are charging us all this because they can't enforce the citations they've given already. The people who are following the rules are having to pay because they can't enforce. I can see where they would get that impression.

Karin – We've had discussions about booting and towing back in 2014 and when the recommendation to implement was taken to senior management, the campus wasn't in a position where they wanted to support that. This is a discussion we need to revisit. Some other recommendations we are putting out on the table is for students that have outstanding citations that we work with judicial affairs. Maybe we

pass it to student fee bill. That we hold transcripts until unpaid citations are paid. We have implemented that if a student has outstanding citations we don't allow them to purchase a new parking permit until the bill is paid.

George – How are they registering their vehicles if they have outstanding citations?

Karin – Some of them aren't registering their vehicles. These unpaid citations span from 2014, 2015 and 2016. Some of those may be written off as uncollectible.

Raj – What is going to be the expense to the department to implement booting and towing?

James – We would need to pull that information.

Karin – I think it would be minimal because parking enforcement officers are already in the field. There would be some administrative costs and equipment purchases.

Katherine – I know that some universities will withhold grades if they don't pay. Not just transcript, but grades each term.

Karin – We've had a few instances where we've worked with judicial affairs in the past. The cost to implement will be minimal. Also, over the next few years we will be making improvements to our kiosk machines and parking management systems so we can work more efficiently with less resources. For example, hopefully by 2020 we will go permit less. It will be by license plate recognition. With the license plate recognition software they can issue something like 55 citations per minute.

April – Not issued, but they can read something like 55 license plates in a minute and it increases the number found who are not in compliance.

Katherine – I can see an issue with that if there are two vehicles in a household and they need to swap vehicles for whatever reason. That means that that person cannot drive to campus anymore.

Karin – They can register both vehicles.

Raj – I think they should be able to register both vehicles but can only have one parked on campus at a time.

Karin – This technology supports that. In regard to transportation, we are looking at whether or not we continue to run the existing CatTracks routes as late as we do. It's not just parking rate increases that we are looking at, but across the board and aligning with the chancellor's vision. Back to the rate increases. Thoughts?

Raj – 14% would be a steep increase. Maybe we could phase 7% or 8% this year then again next year.

Karin – So 7% at the base would be \$35. Reserved would go to \$103, Preferred to \$74, North Bowl 1 & 2 to \$74, North Bowl P3 to \$35. Motorcycle would go to \$29.

Raj – This is still going to be a shock.

Andres – The shock is going to be those that go from \$33 to \$79. I'm a fan of just doing it. Make the jump, just do it.

Tibor – What about the student perspective?

Edmundo – Sounds good for the students to stay at \$33. Those in North Bowl 1 and 2 get screwed over.

Raj – If we increase 14% how many years would that continue?

Karin – We need to look at where we want to be at substantial completion. If in 2020 we want the rate to be \$45 in P4, open to everyone, what would be the rate in P3? What is our ultimate goal?

Jessica – If we do 2 phases, this is already a big jump for a lot of people over 3 years. Some may want to take the hit now and know where the rates will be for the next two years before the next big jump.

Karin – And some may say that they would rather see small incremental increases knowing that by this year this is where we will be. Some will say that recognizing that we haven't had an increase in a couple years and we need to just take the hit.

Katherine – I would say that more gradual increases would be better.

Andres – There is nothing gradual about going from \$33 to \$79. I think that those are the ones who will complain the most. But honestly, I don't see a lot of complaints coming from the preferred group. For the North Bowl group it's a big jump, incremental or not.

Karin – Some would say, in talking to some of our customers, that they would pay more for covered parking.

Andres – I think people would. I don't think that is a question. Especially here in July.

Jessica – So North Bowl 2 will be covered and paved. And P3 is gravel?

Karin – Gravel stalls and asphalt drive isles. The surface type as P4.

James – Same as Lake Lot 2 right now.

Karin – One option is to move forward with a 7% increase. Would that be January 2018? I think that fall 2017 is premature given the projects and not knowing the delivery. Or do we wait until fall 2018?

Andres – That would be a 7% fall 2018 and then we would have 2 huge jumps as we get closer to 2020. If we have small increases now then we have bigger jumps as we get closer to 2020. There's no way around it. So do we do it now or later on?

James – It sounds like this group is divided right down the line on what is palatable versus ripping off the band aid.

Edmundo – I think January 2018 is a good time to roll this out.

Karin – So the \$35 to \$38, the second phase of the rate increase is just under 7%. Then January 2018 would be the first phase then fall 2019 would be the next increase. Then in 2020 the P4 rate would increase. That would be in line if we raise the \$33 to \$38 in 2020 for P4.

Andres – Is the \$79 for Preferred the target number or would it be higher still in 2020?

Tibor – I think it would be probably higher.

Andres – Then it sounds like a nice gradual increase with the two rollout but when we look at something like \$90 by 2020 there is still a big jump.

Karin – In the past when we look at rate increases, we also look at where we are in line with other UC campuses. We don't want to out price our campus. In the past we've been right at the midpoint. We would want to consider what other campuses charge.

Martin – In terms of rate increases, I wouldn't raise rates in fall 2017. I like this proposal and looking at starting to raise rates in 2018. I would like incremental increases to get to the goal by fall 2020.

Sonia – I think that's a good approach.

Martin – I think that is a good approach because when that rolls out, it can be explained to the community. This is where we are going and what to expect for parking over the next few years.

Sonia – This also says that the committee has been thoughtful on making these recommendations. We've taken into account the issues with the campus growth.

Karin – So Martin's recommendation is 7% into effect in fall 2018 as opposed to January 2018.

Martin – January or fall 2018. I would go big to start then slow in 2019 and 2020

Andres – I think the tricky part is not knowing what the rates will be in 2020. If we had that we could divide it out over the years.

Martin – If our lowest rate is \$33 right now, what are the other campus charging? How much do they increase each year?

Karin – We are collecting that data and we have our Directors Conference coming up during spring break and will get that information then. I can bring that to the committee at the April meeting and we can make a recommendation for what we want that to be in 2020. So fall 2018? What that would mean was that we would message out to the campus that for fall 2017 we would extend the current permits and rates. No change to your current permit, at least for Faculty and Staff. Then in January or fall 2018 we will implement the 7% increase.

Raj – When will the solar panels be done? By this summer?

Tibor – That is the plan, but we don't have a final agreement in place so that could change.

Raj – I think the rate increase should be tied to that project completion. People would know that shade would justify the increase.

Karin – That is why we pushed it to January, not knowing if it would be completed by September 2017. But the possibility does exist that it may not even be done by January 2018.

Tibor – But we still have a growing liability that needs to be considered across the campus. Whether or not the solar panels are put on in a timely fashion, we need to increase the rates. We've gone 2 years without a rate increase.

Sonia – The other thing to keep in mind is that it's easier to do a fall implementation of a rate increase because that's when staff get their pay increases.

Karin – Let's project out to fall 2019, and fall 2020. Looking at North Bowl P3 in fall 2019 \$35 would go to \$38. Is that the recommendation for fall 2019 or 2020 with a smaller increase in 2019?

Andres – We need to see the data from the other UCs. If we are likely going to be higher in 2020 then I'd hate to put this out there then actually we go higher. This allows room if there is a change. There are a couple with a jump but it's a gradual increase for the most part. I like it like this.

Karin – P4 at substantial completion, 2020, would be \$38 or based on the data we collect.

Tibor – Since P4 is such a large lot, we may want to consider separating it.

Karin – This is a very large parking lot. 2,800 spaces. In my conversation with my colleagues they recommend, given the layout and design of this lot, moving away from zones and just open it up for everybody at a single rate. We could zone a section or two into being a reserved location at a different rate. I don't yet know at what rate or who could park there. To keep it simple we could say that the entire lot is a single permit and a single rate and it's open to everyone.

Raj – I like keeping it open and simple. You don't have to read too many signs to decide where to park.

Andres – I think the initial concern is going to come from Faculty/Staff who end up working in those buildings right there and some will say that those people pay \$38 whereas people who work over in S&E 1 and want to be close are paying \$79. I can see that debate coming up.

Tibor – These facilities here will be a combination of housing and instructional.

Andres – Will there be Faculty offices?

Tibor – There will be the primary Faculty offices will be 2A, 3A and 2B.

Karin – I image that we will hear from Faculty and they will make the request for a zone for them.

Raj – What about residents having their cars nearby?

Karin – There is a plus and a challenge to that. If we allocate a section to housing, because it's close in proximity to housing, then it takes away spaces from those who work near there. The benefit is that we have less in and out throughout the day and it reduces congestion.

Tibor – Those turn into dedicated spaces though. There is no turnover.

Karin – Right, that is why they would be at the reserved rate of \$109. We will hear from other customers asking why we are giving those spaces to housing when we need those spaces that are closer in. One recommendation is to allocate a section of P5 for housing. It serves both the existing housing as well as a new.

Tibor – Looking at the time, do we need to put forth a recommendation?

Karin – Does the committee agree that this is the recommendation to go to Eric to get his perspective from the Faculty side?

Katherine – When would we have the 2020 rates?

Karin – We should have that in our April meeting after our Directors Conference.

Katherine – Would the ZEV include the Grad students or only Faculty and Staff?

Rosalva – The Grad students should be another discussion. This is just about the permit types and rates, not who can get them.

Raj – We need to have another discussion about permit types. Let's simplify it to just A, B and C.

Karin – That is what we are trying to transition into. For example, with the Preferred, instead of A, ACP, ALEV. Just Preferred.

Tibor – We are calling for a motion from the committee on the recommendation that fall 2018 has the 7% increase, and fall 2019 has an additional 7% increase.

Raj – I make the motion for 7% increase in 2018 and another 7% in 2019.

Edmundo – Second

Tibor – All in favor?

George – No. My concern is the North Bowl rate going from \$33 to \$79. Everything else is ok.

Karin – Then what is your recommendation?

George – Somewhere between \$33 and \$79. Maybe \$50

Karin – I don't think that falls in line with being fair across the board. This rate increase isn't specific to a specific permit type. It's across the board.

Tibor – From an administrative perspective, does the committee require a majority or unanimous?

James – Majority.

Tibor – So the motion can be passed as is, pending Eric and Martin's review, but also showing George's vote of no. Let's send out to both Eric and Martin to find out what their vote would be on the motion.

Raj – To address the sergeants concerns, could P3 be \$33 the same rate at P4 since they are the same in distance as P4.

George – There is going to be an increase, there is no way around that. But for those in North Bowl it's more than 7%. But how do we get from \$33 to \$79. I know it's covered but that is a concern.

Tibor – But you still have the option of parking in P4

George – I know

Karin – But P3 is closer to the existing campus, and P4 pushes the student commuters farther away from where they need to be. At substantial completion they will be about the same.

Tibor – If you can image P4 Phase 1, this portion of the campus hasn't been built yet.

Karin – Which is why we are proposing that their rate stay the same from now.

Roundtable

George – I had a question from a Grad regarding the frontage road in front of COB2. When is that going to be open?

Tibor – We are making a capitol renewal request to be able to have that road opened. We have not been given the mechanism to open that up. We are in the preliminary design phase of what to do and prior to us doing anything we need the budget allocation for it.

James – This is the New Ranchers Road.

Andres – Several people have brought up a concern of buses pulling out on Lake Road from Scholar. I was going about 25 and had to slam the brakes when a bus pulled out. They may be pushed to keep their schedule and with the backups it's delaying them.

Tibor – I've seen also that drivers are turning on their turn signals too early and it looks like they are going to turn on Scholars when they are really going on to Ranchers.

George – We've notices that there have been incidents where the bus in turning onto Scholars and the car going forward is on the left of the bus and someone pulls out from Scholars because they can't see the car behind the bus.

Katherine – I've seen that those exiting on Scholars have to wait for a while to turn onto Lake Road.

Tibor – I will bring this to the 2020 team about these concerns. The 2020 team in aware of the challenges of the increased traffic. The plan is for the Bellevue intersection to be the primary entrance for campus. With that lighted intersection it should help but this won't be completed until substantial completion.

James – We have continued to post the message from VC Reese about the traffic concerns on our website. This can found on our home page under events.

Edmundo – The students that I've talked to is that they panic when they get tickets and they don't know what to do. They know there is an appeal process but they are really confused on what to do. They feel really helpless when all they can do is go to the website and figure it out. I don't know if you have workshops that show what to do.

Tibor – Don't we have an envelope with instructions?

Karin – The instructions are on the citation.

James – The info to share is that they should not panic. The instructions are on the back of the citation. Have them follow the dates and time frames for how to appeal it. Or they can go to our website for very detailed instructions.

Karin – Certainly they can always call.

Edmundo – I think they are looking for more person to person stuff. They have questions that aren't necessarily answered on the website.

Rosalva – Here is an actual ticket. All the information is on the back, including our phone number.

Raj – One complaint I've heard is a bus route being cancelled right before the Christmas break. This person normally takes the bus. Is there a way to communicate this ahead of time? This person waited more than a half hour for the bus.

James – We send out communications every time there is a schedule change. These are sent out as Facilities Advisories.

Raj – They said they didn't get anything this time.

Karin – Let's find out exactly which line and what time frame this happened. Was this a whole day or just one bus?

Raj – I think it was just one loop.

Karin – There may have been a breakdown or something.

James – When that happens we post it on social media and our website. Send me the details and we'll look further into this occurrence.

Karin – Would we say that the goal for the next meeting is to make the final decision, at least for the next two fall semesters, and then include Prof. Walle?

Raj – And maybe we need to simplify the permit names?

Tibor – Yes, anything we can do to simplify.

Karin – Remember that it is allocation by location.

Next Meeting

1. Date: March 14, 2017 from 10:30AM-12:00PM
2. Proposed agenda topics
 - a. Comparable date from other campus's in April meeting
 - b. Booting & towing expense to implement
 - c. Other methods to collect outstanding citations
3. Action Items

Meeting adjourned at 12:30pm

<u>Permit Type</u>	<u>Current Rates</u>	<u>Recommendation - January 2018 (pending projects completion)</u>					
			Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019		Fall 2020
Reserved (X)	\$96.00	Reserved	\$ 109.00	\$ 101.00	\$ 103.00	\$ 109.00	*ZEV - \$?
Preferred (A, ACP, AUB)	\$69.00	A	\$ 79.00	\$ 74.00	\$ 74.00	\$ 79.00	Chargepoint - Level 2 (Lib 1) \$2/hr first 3 hours \$5/hr thereafter
Commuter (B, BCP, C)	\$33.00	North Bowl / 2	\$ 79.00	\$ 74.00	\$ 74.00	\$ 79.00	Level 1 (Le Grand -2, NB-2)
Motorcycle	\$27.00	North Bowl / P3	\$ 38.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 38.00	
LEV	\$27/\$56	P41	\$ 33.00	Student commuter until final completion 2020?		\$ 38.00	
		On campus housing	\$ 109.00	(201?) ; location ?		\$ 38.00	Fall 2017
		Motorcycle	\$ 30.00		\$ 29.00	\$ 30.00	
		LEV					
		ZEV	?	Location ?			