



Meeting Minutes

Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) Advisory Committee Meeting

March 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, Ken Leytem, George Gongora, Arokiaraj Panneer Selvam, Edmundo Martinez, April Hellam, Maryam Crogman

Attendees on Zoom: Drew Shelburne

Call to order: 10:30am

2/14/17 Meeting Minutes approved: Andres – motion to approve. Jessica – second. Approved.

Karin – As you know from our last meeting that Prof. Walle has a conflict this semester as he is teaching a class. At the last meeting we agreed that we would have a subsequent meeting with him, and we had a few others from the committee that joined that meeting. What came from that meeting we were going to discuss here as part of coming up with a recommendation to move forward and take that recommendation back to Eric and then finalize that recommendation and send it up to Michael Reese.

AVC Toth – Updates

Tibor – I don't have too much to share about 2020. They are in the middle preparing their construction area. It's known as trailer town. If you look south of the bowl you will see a set of modular trailers being set in. There is nothing that has been shared that will impact campus transit at this time. We are continuing to work with them on schedule and circulation impacts. The developer has been pretty good about listening to our concerns and they recognize that we want to minimize the impact that we have in the middle of our academic year. So far they are paying attention to our concerns. The latest work they are doing is on fleet parking. Once the fleet parking is done they will take over the asphalt drive isles of P3 parking lot, which is the existing fleet lot.

Karin – If you imagine North Bowl in 4 sections. We have phase 1, phase 2, and the P3 gravel is the current fleet area. Then they will add the fleet yard beyond that. My understanding is that the scheduled completion is sometime in April.

Tibor – We are supposed to get an update on Thursday.

Karin – P4 is what they are working on adjacent to campus. At substantial completion that will be about 2,000 spaces. First delivery will be about 1,800 spaces and is tentatively scheduled to open in September. More information on schedule to be given at our meeting on Thursday. The solar project is still on target to begin.

Tibor – We hope to finalize the agreement at our meeting tomorrow. We are getting everything aligned. It's an aggressive schedule so we want to get them installed in the summer term. We don't have a firm commitment yet as the contract is not yet signed but that is our scheduled to have this accomplished by this summer.

Karin – We have impressed upon them the importance of that timeline so we can maximize the number of spaces available in 1 and 2. Starting in the fall semester we need as much parking as possible. Not knowing when they will take Lake Lots 1 and 2, which they won't until the first phase of P4 is delivered.

Ken – P4 will be at the front of campus?

Karin – P4 is the construction you see as you approach campus.

Tibor – South of the Bellevue extension is P4.

Karin – We've heard dates as early as Thanksgiving and then it shifted to spring or summer of 2018 then shifted back to September 2017.

Parking permit rates

Karin – Going back to our last meeting. The recommendations we set were pending project completion. That included the solar over North Bowl 1 and 2 as well as delivery of P4 2020 parking south of Bellevue. What we brought to the committee was a rate structure based on what we are able to do bound by the labor contracts. The base permit rate is \$33, which applies to student commuters and faculty/staff in North Bowl, we applied a \$5 increase so it goes to \$38 which is a 14% increase. So if we applied a 14% increase to all permit types, \$96 for reserved goes to \$109, \$69 for preferred goes to \$79, \$33 commuter in North Bowl 1, 2 and Lake Lots goes to \$38. We had the discussion that with solar going over North Bowl 1 and 2, some have said they would pay more for covered parking. We've also heard feedback that North Bowl isn't that far from Le Grand and the \$33 is kind of a steal. The dialogue with our customers and here at the table is that we need to reevaluate the rate for North Bowl, especially North Bowl 1 and now that we are adding solar that absolutely would warrant a higher rate. Some would say that covered parking would be equivalent parking to Le Grand. That is why you see North Bowl 1 and 2 at \$79. Then we came back and said that for those parking in the front of campus in the commuter lots, knowing that the fall semester and P4 parking schedule, that they would be pushed somewhere, we had dialogue that we would leave the student commuter rate at \$33 without an increase until final completion 2020. On campus resident parking, we do not currently have any due to space. The dialogue we had in the meeting was that when we are able to accommodate on campus resident parking that permit rate would be equivalent to the reserved rate because it's a 1:1 ratio and basically 24/7 garaging the vehicle. Other universities charge more for resident parking. When we bring on campus resident parking back it would be at the reserved rate of \$109. We talked about motorcycles. Right now they are at \$27 they would jump to \$30. A year ago we did away with student LEV permits. We still have the faculty/staff LEV permits because we extended the permits and grandfathered in the current permit holders but do not offer any new LEV permits. Why are we doing this? For LEED certification we can either offer close in parking for low emission vehicles or offer a reduced rate. At the time we introduced the LEV permit the number of vehicles was relatively low. We have grown so much and the industry has changed so much that the number of LEV vehicles that now qualify for this permit type puts us in a position now where we are losing money. Talking to my colleagues about the governor's mandate and industry standards with vehicle types that we would offer an incentive for zero emission vehicles instead of low emission vehicles. Moving forward, after our meeting we met with Eric Walle and had some productive and insightful dialogue. One of the things we discussed was tied to the student commuter rates of \$33 in the Lake Lots. We've seen that with the limitations of space and the campus mission is to promote sustainability and encourage alternative transportation that by not imposing a fee increase there, we are encouraging that behavior to continue. With the massive construction that we are going to see we really do want more people to use alternative transportation. We looked back at the change to the tired approach back in 2010 and we saw an increase in ridership. We also talked about our financials and that the rates have been frozen for a few years. We have to get to a certain point by 2020 and because we are bound by labor agreements, we are going to have to have a phased approach. We will have to start giving the developer fee payments. Our first payment is set for, Tibor?

Tibor – It would start at first delivery.

Karin – So if we don't address those debt payments, and they are pretty significant. The campus lots you see are typically spread over 15 years. Like North Bowl, when we assume that debt the payments will be spread over 15 years. The budget office came back with discussions on how we are going to fund 2020 and they said that on North Bowl 2 they want a very aggressive payoff of 5 years. This is a significant hit to the bottom line. So the debt payments, the fact that we haven't seen a fee increase and we need to address both sides of transportation and parking, is why we are having these discussions.

Edmundo – If we increase the fee rate, but where we are promoting alternative transportation, the busses are already full and I only see that getting worse.

Karin – Please keep in mind that we are constantly evaluating the entire picture of transportation. We have a group looking at an RFP for transportation to start in the fall. We are always looking at ridership and efficiencies. We are in a position where we cannot make changes internally. We have to have leadership support up to the chancellor because of the funding. We rely on campus funds to help support our operation.

Tibor – The other element of funding is student fees.

Karin – Student fees only covers 1/3 of the cost of operation. We have to rely on 2/3 of that coming from campus funds.

Katherine – Is the frequency of the service going to increase? Once an hour is not realistic.

Karin – As funding allows, yes. We will continue to discuss transportation. I met with VC Reese last week and told him about our dialogue and that we would have a recommendation for him very soon. He is receptive to that and understands the challenge we are in. He is committed to making a decision hopefully before the end of summer and will communicate that to the campus community. We also had dialogue about a phased approach. Concerns were brought up about LEV permit holders paying \$33 jumping to \$79. We talked about how we've known that the rates for North Bowl have been too low and that there is still the option to park in P3 or P4 at the \$38 rate. It may not be ideal but that is the nature of parking. We talked about North Bowl P3 would be \$38, North Bowl 1 and 2 because it was covered would be \$79 starting in fall. Then preferred would be \$79 and then \$109 starting in fall 2019.

Maryam – I'm sure you've made projections. All of those increases would bring additional revenue how much would that respond to the needs?

Karin – Right now the proformas are in the budget office. Once we have a recommendation on what the fee increase will look like we can put those numbers in and it would show what the impact would be to the bottom line.

Maryam – It's hard to make a recommendation when you don't know what would help.

Karin – We are in a position where we have to increase rates.

Tibor – The challenge we have is a multi-variable equation. There are more variables than equations. We have to start with a base line and when a recommendation is made by the committee then the iterative process can start. Then we can see what type of revenue and expenses, and the bottom line impact. Then that information can be assembled and brought back.

Maryam – Once we make those recommendations, speaking for grads, once we have those number can we have the grad also chime in? What is the room for discussion after we make a recommendation?

Karin – Rates are not established by affiliation. It's by location. How we allocate who parks where is another discussion. As the campus has grown, based on past history, the space has been available for Faculty, Staff and Grad but as the population has grown we've had to make some changes to parking allocation.

Maryam – We are more hit by those rates in the preferred locations than the Lake Lots.

Tibor – But you don't have to park there.

Karin – In talking about LEVs, we brought up with Eric Walle and he understood but didn't like it. We had discussion about if we could offer it to hybrids only.

Tibor – Plug in hybrids?

Karin – Yes, plug in. Maybe like a PLEV.

Tibor – Is there a way to look at their registration and identify if they are a PLEV?

April – The registration does not say that. It only gives a make, model and year. In the past we've used a LEED green list and tried to figure out if it was a 1.5 liter or whatever and making a determination from a giant list if it qualified.

Tibor – I was thinking more administratively how we could enforce for it. Maybe that's a sidebar conversation.

Andres – I think one concern is that it becomes an elitist angle. If you can afford one of the more expensive hybrids then you pay less money to park. Which would not go over well with the staff. If you can afford the car then pay less to park.

Karin – To address the concern of the huge jump from \$33 to \$79. We talked about instead of taking the big hit that in fall of 2018 we would jump 7% then in fall 2018 go to \$79. This would be two steps to get to the \$79.

Katherine – The rates are strictly faculty, staff, and grad, not undergrads, right?

Karin – Going forward with P4 coming online with 1,800 spaces we would say that these are faculty, staff and some grads only. With P3 possibly being student commuter and overflow event parking. Another element is that when you come back on Ranchers Road, ideally to add the number of spaces we've added on this side of campus has been ok but created another problem with increases in the amount of traffic and pedestrians. The student commuters are the ones coming and going. If we opened student parking back there it would further magnify the problem we see with pedestrians.

Maryam – When we return in September the new parking will be open?

Karin – When we talked about the need for P3 we weren't sure when they would deliver P4 parking. At that time they had talked about P4 being delivered in four quadrants. The first was 400 spaces then 800. Now we will get 1,800. That is why we no longer see the need for student parking back here or really even event overflow.

Tibor – The other element is that the new spaces ratios will be leaner than they currently are. Less spaces available per population.

Karin – We took your concerns about the significant jump to Eric Walle. The green represents what came out of that. He came back and said that we need to be mindful to all permit holders and that if we are trying to change the mindset of the community that not changing all the rates across the board sends the wrong message.

Jessica – I agree 100%

Karin – From that meeting, we still stayed with \$38 at the base. We talked about the concern of North Bowl 1 and 2. Instead of jumping to \$79 or \$74 we talked about going to \$43. We talked about where we want to end up and I don't have that answer yet. That is partly dependent of where we fall in line with other universities. We don't want to outprice our campus. I mentioned that we are having our Directors' Conference in a couple weeks and I hope to have a completed permit matrix for our next meeting.

George – Did he vote? What was his vote?

Karin – He liked the \$43.

George – But the actual vote, up or down. What did he vote?

Karin – We didn't vote, we just recommend. From that meeting I was going to come back and share with all of you.

George – I thought that based on the fact that we had already voted at the last meeting was that you guys were meeting with him about the last meeting that he might potentially vote on what was presented.

Karin – We only voted on the green to meet with him. To get his opinion. We haven't voted.

George – My understanding was that we voted on that. I thought that in your discussion with him that he would have a choice to vote up or down.

Karin – We were taking the recommendations here to him. There were a couple different options. Then he had the opportunity to give his feedback. Instead of \$74 or \$79, his recommendation was we go forward and raise the commuter rates. North Bowl P3 would be \$38. North Bowl 1 and 2 covered would be \$43 not \$74.

George – Right, I'm just trying to sound this out here because we voted on this. I thought we would get feedback from that.

Tibor – I understand the confusion. The process step was as a committee there was a recommendations for a certain pricing structure. Because Prof. Walle wasn't able to be part of the discussion and dialogue we had to provide that opportunity to him. So based on the committee's recommendation he could vote for or against it or provide more feedback. So what Prof. Walle is saying is that he wants his feedback brought back to the group. This is what Prof. Walle wants to throw out as a recommendation and now the committee can review Prof. Walle's recommendation and we can do another vote.

George – I understand. For the future, because we voted. We all voted and it was a fair vote. I'm not questioning that. Several people voted yes and I voted no. So I thought that was the end of it. He would be spoken to and asked for whatever feedback and he would be asked for an up or down vote on what we discussed.

Karin – What we voted on was that this would be the recommendation that we would take to the meeting with Prof. Walle and give him the opportunity to come back and respond as a committee member. He is still an active committee member.

George – Ok, maybe that is where the confusion was. I thought that this was the actual recommendation.

Andres – That's what I thought as well.

Katherine – I did too.

George – I thought this was the recommendation we were considering to go up and he was getting the chance to give feedback and possibly a vote.

Karin – He did. And we didn't take it up because he had some other input.

George – That's what we thought we were talking about. We were recommending that something to go higher, not necessarily just to him.

Karin – I think what is reflected in the minutes is that we would be taking these recommendations to him.

George – No, it's there, but I think we thought that based on what was said at the meeting that that is what was done.

Tibor – I understand the confusion but to take the talking point further the committee still has the opportunity to vote in the original recommendation or they can take Prof. Walle's feedback and make that the new recommendation or as a group you guys could say let's look at something else. I would recommend that the group reviews Prof. Walle's recommendation and either accept it or deny it.

George – I don't want to get too far off topic but that's why I asked about the voting rights and responsibility. This is exactly the example of what I'm talking about. I don't mind if people have concerns or feedback before the meeting, in the meeting, or after the meeting but this is a perfect example of where it become too confusing. We really need to talk about it. In the committee charge it says that it's a majority of all members present so it's something that if we are going to do that, we need to think about it.

Karin – I go back to the start of the last meeting. I brought to the members the situation that one of our active committee members was teaching. The committee agreed that whatever was discussed would be carried to a second meeting with him. All were invited to attend. So we could have the same discussion and get that person's feedback from that meeting. Then we'd come back and share what was discussed with those committee members that also attended. This was the feedback that he provided and what was discussed at the table. We can say that you voted no on the original recommendation. We said that there was committee member who was not in favor. We talked about that and the concern about this. That was the result of that meeting. What I'm looking for from this group is to say ok, does this make sense and seem reasonable and what is the recommendation we want to take forward.

George – I understand that and maybe we should come back and revisit. I thought we were actually voting on the recommendation and he was going to provide a vote.

Tibor – I understand the confusion but I think it's important to continue the conversation forward.

Andres – I have similar concerns now that this is in action. I don't like the two meetings and we need to talk about that later.

Raj – I think the interpretation in this case is that Prof. Walle voted no and offered a new recommendation.

Tibor – But everyone still has the option of keeping the original recommendation. It was a majority vote. We can say thank you to Prof. Walle for his feedback and still move forward with this recommendation.

Raj – What is the effective date for the green? Fall 2017?

Karin – Yes.

Andres – So we still end up at the same numbers. Is this just a different way to break it down?

Katherine – It starts increasing sooner.

Andres – Is the end number the same? They will still get to the \$79. The one suggested at \$43 at fall 2017 will still get to \$79 by fall of 2019?

George – It will still get to \$79 by fall of 2019.

Jessica – The reason we came to the \$43 was because we were looking for a way to phase North Bowl 2 into becoming preferred.

George – Right, but by fall of 2019 it will still be \$79 like we had talked about.

Karin – We actually left this open. We took your no and your concerns to that meeting.

George – Thank you

Karin – We do listen and try to come up with a fair rate increase and what the time line looks like.

Andres – It's going to be unknown but it's still prime real estate with being covered and everything. It's going to be an issue if they are going to park there for \$50 and everyone else jumps to keep that 14%

Karin – We'd talked about using a dollar amount instead of a percentage. We are bound by the \$5 so we added \$5 across the board. So \$69 goes to \$74. We'd talked about, what is the ultimate rate we want for P4? If you look at the map for substantial completion, those who are parking P4 will probably be doing their business or going to class somewhere in the new part of campus. Those parking back here will be conducting their business in S&E 1 and 2. We need to look at the rate structure as what makes sense today and what we want to see at substantial completion. Generally speaking, if \$45 for North Bowl 1 and 2, along with P4. In relationship to building these are more apples to apples.

Andres – If we keep North Bowl 1 and 2 rate of \$79 open so to speak, then all of them should remain open. That's the downside of giving one category more flexibility than the others.

Karin – When we had the discussion, my understanding was that because North Bowl 1 and 2 would be covered that they would be the same rate. What that rate ends up being is open for discussion. We'd talked about it being equivalent to Le Grand, preferred, and we could either rip the band aide off and jump to \$79 or we can ease people into it at \$74 then \$79.

Andres – If the recommendation is to start in fall 2017, is our recommendation just based on that, or does our recommendation include the final values?

Karin – We'd talked about not making changes until project completion. Solar project and P4. In the meeting we had with Prof. Walle we said that we could be done with the solar and why are we waiting. Because we've had the rates frozen, one more year only puts us farther in the hole. The recommendation

was that we start this fall but let's look at North Bowl 1 and 2, instead of going straight up to \$79 in fall 2017 let's let them know that it is coming and do a little bit at a time.

Andres – So North Bowl to \$79 will still be on the general recommendation. Those final values won't change, just how we get there in terms of breaking it up.

Karin – Does the committee agree that the fee increase should be across the board regardless of when it's implemented? Whether it's fall 2017 or fall 2018. Does the increase also include the commuter lots? What we left with was yes on this, but this would stay at the \$33.

Andres – Yes

Edmundo – No

Karin – So we will say that whenever we implement the fee increase it will be across the board. So the \$33 base rate, regardless of student commuter or faculty/staff in the commuter lots

Tibor – We have one person's input saying yes. How the entire committee feel about that?

Edmundo – If we increased it to \$38 in fall 2017 would we then not increase it again until 2020?

Karin – We haven't yet talked about when, only that when we implement the increase, does the committee agree that it should be across the board for every permit type.

Drew – Yes.

Karin – Now the question is when. Is it fall 2017 or fall 2018?

George – That they make it to the numbers in the green?

Karin – We know we're going from \$33 to \$38. A \$5 increase.

Andres – I'm for 2017.

Katherine – Can I make the suggestion to modify the 2017 increase to \$35?

Tibor – To increase it by \$2?

Katherine – We'd said \$38 in 2018 so make the increase smaller.

Tibor – So for fall 2017 what would it be?

Katherine – \$35.

Tibor – What would it be in fall 2018?

Katherine – Move the \$38

Karin – Our recommendation is for one permit type we only increase it by \$2 and the rest \$5 in fall 2017?

Andres – I think it should be consistent across the board. Break it down by percentage. I understand the step, but I'm still for the band aide approach. If you are doing a percentage it should be across the board.

Karin – Ok, \$38. North Bowl 1 and 2 we have it phased in 2017 at \$43, 2018 at \$74, and 2019 at \$79.

Tibor – I'll write up a new voting sheet in blue.

Karin – For Commuters, when? 2017 or 2018?

Edmundo – 2018

Raj – When are we getting new the lots?

Karin – As far as we understand, September 2017.

Tibor – At this point in time it will be by fall 2017.

Raj – They are going farther and paying more.

Tibor – But remember there hasn't been a fee increase in 3 years.

Karin – We've talked about the freeze and the upcoming payments to the developers.

Tibor – And we are going to be selling less permits. The revenue stream will be reduced.

Raj – We want to get 14% increase by 2019, right? What if we do 5% in each 2017, 2018, 2019? So you get 15% across the board.

Karin – We had that dialogue and there was some concern about what that does to the reserved and preferred rates. We came back to \$5. We can go back to talking about \$5, \$5, \$5 and this was 7%.

Tibor – I think we are at the point where we understand the magnitude of the numbers. My recommendation for the committee is get to the point of how do we want to progress to those numbers. We could debate 14% or \$5 but we understand the magnitude of the increases. We need to get to the point that we see what the increase in the rate structure is going to be. Let's still with the numbers we have and get the timeline for the increases and where they will be. Let's get to that point.

Karin – 2017 or 2018 if we do the \$5. Reserved \$103, preferred \$74, North Bowl \$74

Maryam – How sustainable is it for this department if we do the increase in 2018 but it is a higher jump?

Karin – When we've talked about that some of our customers say they would rather see a phased increase versus nothing then a big jump. Some say just rip off the band aide. Nobody is going to like it either way. Some would say we should wait another year, others that they recognize where we are with parking and what we are faced with. We need to increase the revenue for the aggressive payoffs for the debt which starts a year from now.

Andres – I think the 2017 works well because way it can be sold is that we've had X number of years without an increase so here is a bigger one, but in reality if we'd had the increases all along the jump wouldn't be so big. I'm ok with a stepped increase, but we need to start doing it.

Tibor – Let's make a clean chart for the committee to vote on. Option one in green: \$101, \$74, \$48, \$38. And option two in another color.

Karin – Option one is red. Option two is green. Option three is black.

Edmundo – For option three, do we need to discuss what that will look like in 2020?

Karin – Everyone agrees we'll start in 2017 and that the base will be \$38, right? So this is what the rate structure will look like in 2017.

Jessica – So for option two, if we vote on that, what happens after fall 2017?

Karin – We haven't talked about part two yet. At that meeting we said we needed to bring this back for everyone to hear. We've only talked about fall 2017 up to this point. The black.

Tibor – We are looking for a recommendation from the committee just for 2017.

Karin – We can't move forward until we know our starting point for 2017.

Tibor – We are looking for a recommendation just for 2017 and what is on the board in green and black.

Karin – I also want to bring up North Bowl at \$74. Do we stick with \$74 or go to \$43?

George – I discussed this with my colleagues and just in my office the answers were one person said they would consider parking somewhere else. I spoke to about 10 or 11 people and no one was in favor of jumping from \$33 to \$74. They expressed my same concerns. Other things that were brought up was that you're not changing the location of the lot, and if there weren't solar panels would the rates still increase? You still have to walk the same distance and walking to the lot still isn't covered.

Karin – Good feedback. So based on that, what would your recommendation be?

George – I would be more likely to consider in the green right now, but would like to know more about 2018 and 2019. That is actually lower than I thought it would be. That's good though.

Jessica – I would be more comfortable voting for green if I knew what the rest would be.

Karin – Let's talk about that. We said green fall 2017, then fall 2018 \$74, then fall 2019 \$79. Is that an option for North Bowl 1 and 2?

George – For me, based on my feedback it's the end number.

Andres – The issue is the end number, not the step increase.

Tibor – You have to remember that come fall 2017 we will have the P4 lots. North Bowl 1, 2 and 3 will be significantly closer than P4. If you think people complain now, P4 is farther and they will have to cross a major thoroughfare to access the campus. The North Bowl parking lots are going to turn into preferred lots.

Andres – You can do the \$43 but it will be the same uproar when you go to the next one.

Tibor – I understand why people won't be happy.

Katherine – I think the transition will be easier in smaller steps even though the end is the same.

Karin – Commuter lot, meaning P4, and North Bowl P3 will be the same rate structure at \$38. Keep in mind that the last quadrant of P4 will probably be a different rate because of its proximity to the heart of campus. Ideally the rate for that quadrant will be follow North Bowl at \$74 or \$79.

Andres – For some people that will be parking right next to their building.

Karin – Correct. For commuter lots, P3 will be \$38 in fall 2017. North Bowl 1 and 2 which will be covered parking, \$43 in fall 2017 and then jump to \$74 in fall 2018. Or do we go to \$74 for fall 2017 and \$79 in fall 2018?

George – All the other lots will be done?

Karin – With regard to what's back here, construction will be completed this spring.

Andres – If it's going to be completed and everything is there, you are getting one month of pretty cheap to park in a preferred area. Just go to \$74.

Karin – We have 17 minutes left and it's March. If we are going to make a recommendation for a rate increase to go into effect in fall 2017 we need to make the recommendation to VC Reese and the announcement needs to go out before May. I want to have some direction so we can move forward.

George – Is there any way we can vote on 2017 and come back next year and vote on 2018/2019 once we have a better idea of what is going on.

Karin – We just need to be mindful of what the options are for 2018/2019 in making the recommendation for 2017.

Andres – I think that is a concern that if we vote for \$43 and then there is a fight to keep that low while all the others are going up.

Karin – When I met with VC Reese last week, I asked that he please take the recommendation and decide and announce to the campus community. Because we don't know what is going to happen at the leadership level and what we want to do, in all fairness to the campus community, if they are going to expect a fee increase over the next few years that that be an announcement that is made so VC Reese doesn't say that this is just the fee increase for 2017. I want to be as transparent as possible and give our customers all of the information and what we are talking about at the table.

George – I don't think we need to hold anything back. This is what we have considered and we are going to make a decision and vote on it, but there is a lot that is still realistically contingent on things that are unforeseeable.

Karin – Let's go back to the recommendation for fall of 2017. In the red, fall 2018 is not realistic since it wouldn't be a fee increase. I need to know if we want to make the recommendation on 2017 without knowing where we are going in 2018.

Raj – So the one in black is a flat \$5 increase, except for North Bowl?

Karin – Yes.

Katherine – Can we vote between the black and green? Can I motion?

Tibor – The motion is for the committee to make a vote to do either the green or the black for fall 2017. Is that the motion?

George – Can I add to that? That we vote for one or the other with the option to come back in fall 2017 to discuss 2018 and 2019.

Tibor – The motion is for the committee to make a decision between green or black in fall 2017 and at a further committee meeting to make recommendations for fall 2018 and 2019 to 2020.

Andres – As long as the end numbers stay the same I'm fine with it. But if the \$79 for North Bowl could potentially become \$70 then I'm not for breaking it down that way.

Karin – Really the only difference is North Bowl 1 and 2. \$43 or \$74. We keep going back to that. We'd talked about that this was still too low for that parking. I want some definitive direction. I'm still hearing both sides.

Raj – We need to find further middle ground. \$74 is too high and \$43 is too low.

Andres – I agree with that. I think it would work if there was more of a middle between those two.

Karin – That's how we came up with the \$43. The conversation was that \$79 was too high and \$38 was too low.

Andres – There is still going to be a big shock. Is there an easier way to go from \$43 to \$79?

Tibor – Administratively, a motion was made. From the motion that was made, is there a second?

Jessica – I second it

Tibor – Now the committee needs to vote on that motion. The motion was either do fall 2017 in green or black 2017 for fall. And there will be a future discussion for what 2018, 2019 and 2020 will be. But that will have to be very soon. Karin do you have a concern about that motion?

Karin – I do. We are in a position where we need to have some definitive direction for the next few years that VC Reese can decide this semester.

Tibor – So what you are asking the committee is to make a recommendation for 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020.

Karin – At least through 2019.

Tibor – This is requesting from the committee members a motion for a rate structure for 2017, 2018 and 2019. Correct?

Karin – Correct.

Katherine – If we are looking at the green 2017, can we change 2018 to make it more of a transitional step at maybe \$60? And then go to \$79

Andres – But then the others don't get a tiny transition.

Katherine – But those transactions are already small.

George – Change \$33 to \$43 and then add 7% across the board with what's in green.

Tibor – To Karin's point before, we could go over the numbers so many different ways. So much work has already been done. You can start with the black or the green 2017 then transition to the 2018 column then the 2019 column. And that would be the three year transition. The only question being, do you start with the black or green for 2017.

Maryam – It sounded like people wanted to start with the green then there is just an issue with North Bowl 2 being too high of a jump from 2017 and the next year. Maybe make North Bowl 2 higher so it's smoother.

Katherine – Exactly, a smoother transition.

Tibor – North Bowl 2 higher when? In 2017 for the green?

Katherine – In 2017 make it \$43, in 2018 make it \$50, and in 2019 up to the \$79

Andres – I was thinking the other way. In 2017 make it \$50 then just raise it a little.

Katherine – That's not a little bit. From \$33 to \$50

Andres – Other people are paying more as well. It's not just North Bowl.

George – It affects everybody.

Tibor – We are looking for numbers for 2018. North Bowl 1 and 2. What rates are being proposed for 2018?

Karin – I'm hearing \$43, \$50, \$79

Raj – How about \$50, \$65 and \$79

Katherine – Maybe \$60 and \$79

George – If you did 7% starting at \$43 you'd have \$43, \$46, and then \$50

Raj – But they want to get to \$79

Andres – It spreads it out more gradually at \$50, \$65 and \$79

Tibor – It goes back to you have to pay the piper. The longer you wait to make the payment you are just pushing your pain to a future generation. We have a responsibility of paying for this now. We've had three years of no increases.

Raj – What was the calculations for the commuter motorcycle? What was the formula used there?

Karin – This is all we are talking about right now. North Bowl, P3 and P4 in black. Ultimately \$45.

Raj – What will be the end result for those in 2019?

Karin – I'm waiting for recommendations. This says there is a rate increase for some but not all.

Edmundo – What is the end goal for the front lots? Now we are saying the end result for student commuters is \$45? When did that happen?

Karin – The committee just agreed that there should be a rate increase across the board. That's where that goes. We have 2 minutes. For 2017, \$46 or \$50?

Andres – \$50

George – \$46

Karin – I want a motion for \$50

Andres – Motion.

Raj – Second.

Tibor – All those for \$50. We have 4 for and 3 opposed. So by majority it would pass. \$50 stands. Do we have a motion for 2018?

Andres – Motion for \$65

Raj – Second.

Tibor – All those in favor? 5 in favor, this is passed. Motion for 2019 at \$79.

Andres – Motion.

Raj – Second

Tibor – All in favor? 3. Not enough.

Andres – Is that the one we voted on last time?

Karin – We voted last time for North Bowl to be \$79 in 2019.

Drew – I just realized my mic was muted, I voted for it.

Karin – There are two caveats. First, we talked about having the permit distribution for faculty and staff. If we do not have a new permit distribution and we just extend the current permits. You continue to display your same permit, but this is the new rate.

Andres – Is this also for the preferred low emission?

Karin – Yes. The second caveat is we can say that this is our recommendation. That we recommend that there are increases in the fall and that if there is any concerns from your constituents, that what we recommend for 2018/2019 that the committee will agree to come back and further discuss. We want to push forward to get this to VC Reese.

Raj – If it is approved by Michael Reese, can the table be posted on the website?

Karin – It will be communicated to the campus community.

Tibor – Was everyone ok with the methodology used to get to this point. Just want to make sure everyone understands the function.

Andres – I think it's been fair.

George – We've already voted.

Karin – As far as Prof Walle goes, we have enough votes in favor of these that this would just be information sharing. Even if he came back and was against this, we already have enough votes.

Jessica – What about Peter’s vote?

Tibor – For Peter’s case, there was not a pre-arranged agreement with him like Prof. Walle.

Karin – The understanding is that if you aren’t going to be at the meeting you should send somebody in your place.

Maryam – I don’t think he understood that.

Tibor – So you are here for him, does that mean you are now a voting member?

Karin – No, she just came because I invited her yesterday.

Tibor – Ok, then you aren’t here in the place of someone.

Karin – We didn’t talk about the permit rate for motorcycles. We can talk about that at the next meeting as an add-on.

Roundtable

Andres – On the permits, those with low emission vehicles, both preferred and regular, will have to go to the back of the line to get a new permit?

Karin – No, they will be grandfathered in. Even if we are extending the existing permits, they will not have to come in to switch them out.

Andres – Another issue is skateboarders and bicyclists going down Ranchers Road.

Raj – The kiosk that is closed on Lake Lot, when will that be opened?

Karin – It will not be opened. That is a sticker permit only lot and kiosk permit are not valid in the lot. It will be a moot point soon. By the way, we are getting new kiosk machines soon. That can be on the next agenda.

Raj – Can we simplify the permit names? Maybe A, B, C, D

Karin – We talked about that at the last meeting. Also carpool. We used to offer carpool permits at a lower rate but found that people were taking advantage of that. So we made that rate equivalent to where you were parking and it was up to you to get more people and split that cost.

Edmundo – Recently the External Vice-President of UCOP came and I was unable to attend but had someone go in my place and he brought up my question if UCOP could provide some sort of funding or a grant to help our transportation and parking services. He said it would be a hard sell but he was open to seeing what we had. Me and another senator are working on a presentation to go up. I was wondering if this would be something that TAPS would be willing to sponsor.

Karin – Yes, in fact we are working with the office of economic development and research and working with green commuter on assisting us in getting funding for transportation and electric vehicles charging stations. Per the governor’s mandate we are required to have a certain number of spaces that are EV charging capable as well as the number of chargers. We are looking for funding opportunities to support

an all-electric transit fleet. We are aggressively looking at funding opportunities. I would be happy to participate in that.

Next Meeting

1. Date: April 11, 2017 from 10:30AM-12:00PM
2. Proposed agenda topics
 - a. Motorcycle rates
 - b. Low emission / zero emission permit types and rate structure
 - c. New initiatives: new kiosks and parking management system changes
 - d. Transportation RFP
3. Action Items

Meeting adjourned at 12:08pm