



Meeting Minutes

Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) Advisory Committee Meeting

April 11, 2017

10:30AM – 12:00PM

Location: Facilities Services Building A Conference Room

Attendees: Karin Groth, James Nardello, Katherine Shurik, Andres Hernandez, Drew Shelburne, Jessica Ross, George Gongora, Arokiaraj Panneer Selvam, Edmundo Martinez, Maryam Crogman, April Hellam

Attendees on Zoom: Tibor Toth

Call to order: 10:30am

3/14/17 Meeting Minutes approved: Jessica – Motion to approve. Raj – Second. Approved.

Karin – After our last meeting we met with Prof. Walle again and he sent out an email. Did everybody get a chance to read his email? It is important to know his feedback. This is a very important meeting. Our goal is to draft the memo to send to VC Reese by Thursday of this week. It is absolutely imperative that we understand what is going to be communicated up to VC Reese. The handout is a one page summary of what has been approved and what is still proposed. From left to right. The columns are: Permit types. Permit name. Our current rate. The 2017 permit rate recommendation which per the last meeting was approved was passed 4 to 3. That is the \$96 to \$101, preferred will go to \$74, North Bowl 1 and 2 will go from \$33 to \$50 and the commuter lots going up to \$38. That was approved and passed with 4 to 3 votes.

Maryam – Does the approved count included Prof. Walle?

Karin – Yes. 2018 was approved and passed 5 to 2. So that is jumping from the 2017 recommendation \$101 to \$106, \$74 to \$79, \$50 to \$65, and \$38 to \$43. The 2019 was proposed. I'm saying proposed because there was another segment that we did actually agree on in the last meeting. That was in P4, the first phase of that will be quadrants 1 and 2, about 1,800 spaces. That is supposed to be delivered sometime this fall, in August or September of 2017. So the permit rate for those areas are equivalent to the commuter P3 at the \$43 and then the \$45 in that segment. But when the 3rd phase of that is delivered, which will be closed to the academic core, there was discussion in the committee that that would be equivalent to a higher preferred rate like Le Grand. So the reason it says proposed is because we didn't have final clarity on what that recommendation would be. In reviewing the meeting minutes we went back to make sure we had accurately represented the voting. Which is why we included it here as approved, approved and proposed. It's important to note that when we met with Prof. Walle, his recommendation wasn't to hold off on a rate increase for the commuter lots because we are trying to change the mindset and the commuting pattern so the rate increase should be across the board.

Jessica – I would like to point out one thing for Prof. Walle. He was concerned about the end rate between North Bowl and preferred. The end goal of the \$79. I think he felt pretty strongly that those shouldn't end up being the same price.

Karin – I absolutely agree and that is not reflected in this table but was reflected in his email. What she is referring to is the second line on the table. Where it shows preferred as \$69, \$74, \$79. Really that should be \$82. Right?

Jessica – Yes.

Karin – So preferred P4, quad 3 would also be \$82. And then North Bowl 1 and 2 would be \$82.

Jessica – North Bowl 1 and 2 would be \$82 and also preferred P4, would all be the same rate?

Karin – Yes. I have an update on the solar on the North Bowl lots. That project may be delayed for a year.

Katherine – Which one?

Karin – North Bowl 1 and 2. Tibor, is that the same as you know?

Tibor – You may have more up to date info than I have. What I have is that we are negotiating with PG&E on a connection schedule. The initial reports are that we may have to delay the full expansion of the lot. Instead of doing phase 1 and 2 this summer, it may just be phase 1 of the North Bowl lot for this summer.

Karin – ok.

Raj – One of the factors we considered for the rate increase was the solar panels making it covered parking. If it's delayed, should we reconsider this?

Karin – Great question. I want us to be mindful of what is in the minutes and the conversations we've had up to this point. North Bowl has been underpriced regardless of the solar. My recommendation is we still move forward regardless with increasing the rate for that area.

Katherine – On the same note, if it's going to stretch out a year, can we stretch out the increments for that extra year to reach that level? It would still go up but not so extreme.

Karin – In the past that area has been underpriced. That has been a point regardless of it being covered. We did consider a more phased rate increase. Remember that what we originally proposed was different than the \$50. It was much higher. We did factor that in to the permit rate for 2017.

Tibor – I want to reaffirm what Karin is saying. We should not tie the solar installation with parking rates. A, because it's very fluid and B, because there is no any cost avoidance that goes into the parking funds with the solar panels. We are planning on installing solar panels throughout the lot and to tie it in with a rate increase is nearly impossible scheduling wise.

Katherine – One of the things that was brought up originally, and I understand that you don't to tie it into the solar panels but the fact that you are raising the prices and the students will be leaving and they may not be here long enough to see the solar panels.

Karin – That isn't student parking. It's faculty, staff and grads.

Katherine – I'm talking about grad students. I said it wrong.

Andres – They will be gone before it gets to the full increase.

Karin – Keep in mind that the original recommendation was to jump to \$79. So we have a phased rate increase already.

Jessica – Just to be clear, the solar panels are, at this point, scheduled to be finished by 2018?

Karin – The original plan was for construction to begin after commencement and be completed by the start of the fall semester. Like Tibor said we have to work with PG&E so there may be a delay. And we have made it very clear to them that if they can't meet that schedule that it would be pushed.

Jessica – To fall 2019?

Karin – A year from now. Fall 2018.

Tibor – The reason we have to schedule in summer is to minimize the impact to the campus. The parking lot has to be shut down to install the solar panels. The summer is the best time to do that.

Karin – Then reflected in this table we will jump to 2019 so we can all make the corrections. For reserved \$109, preferred \$82, preferred P4 Quadrant 3 also \$82, North Bowl 1 and 2 \$82, and then commuter P3 and commuter P4 Quads 1 and 2 will be \$45 in 2019. That is the recommendation for the next three years.

Andres – Did we vote on \$82 or \$79?

Karin – That's why it's listed as proposed. There were two pieces missing. We had this \$79 at the last meeting that should have been \$82 and also we didn't discuss what the rate would be for P4 Quadrant 3. So this is proposed. Does that make sense? This is what we will send to VC Reese by then end of the week. So with that we'd like to move forward with a vote. Do we have motion to approve the rate increases for the next three years as represented on this chart?

George – P3 and P4 where are those again?

Karin – Commuter P3 is the section beyond North Bowl 2 that will not be covered. Commuter P4 is at the front of campus, the 2020 parking.

Andres – Motion.

Drew – Second.

Karin – All in favor? 2 opposed, 6 approved.

Jessica – I'm still concerned. In Prof. Walle's email and in our meetings he wanted more distance between the A and B permits. I think he's concerned about people parking in Le Grand and North Bowl at the same price. In his proposal in his email, the \$82 was for the A and \$58 for B. I think he did that intentionally in order to differentiate those two permit types. I want to make sure that his concern is brought up. This proposal has \$82 across the board for both. I'm struggling about how to vote. I'm not sure what I'm proposing.

Karin – His concern at the meeting was that for those parking in Le Grand, if we open up to the same permit type that those in Le Grand. The spaces would fill up and he would like more availability in Le Grand.

Jessica – Are we doing anything to address that?

Katherine – It's also that the spill out goes pretty far out. It turns out to not be as fair for those who get pushed way out in the North Bowl compared to those who come in first thing in the morning and get those slots in Le Grand. I can see how we should have some variation between those lots.

Maryam – Especially if we say that it's not tied to the solar. He has it at \$58 which we agree is low. We could talk about a difference between \$82 and maybe \$75. That's still a \$10 increase.

Karin – A couple things to remember is we still haven't talked about how we are going to apply rate increases for LEV and ZEVs. If that's a different rate or dedicated spaces. We haven't talked about the motorcycle rate. Keep in mind that we are limited to the number of permit rates we can have because of the GTNs in the payroll system. We are limited to five. We know we will have a motorcycle permit rate that is not reflected here. We can minimize the issue with the number of GTNs by instead of having a different rate for ZEVs we have dedicated spaces. But I think we are going to have to have a different rate for ZEVs. If we look at it right now we have five. Keep that in mind. The other option that we could discuss is Le Grand and North Bowl 1 are the preferred rate and North Bowl 2 falls more in line with Prof. Walle's email. Then P3, which is further and not covered, would follow the \$45. In that scenario we would have preferred at \$82, P4 Quadrant 3 at \$82, and North Bowl 1 at \$82. North Bowl 2 could follow the rate increase and would end up at \$58 in 2019.

Andres – That seems low in that case.

Karin – That is a little more than what you see in P4 at \$45 but still is closer in proximity than what P4 Quadrants 1 and 2 would be. That is an option. We would add another line. Reserved \$109. Preferred, which would be Le Grand and North Bowl 1. Looking at 2019. Preferred \$82. Preferred 4 at substantial

completion in 2019 would be \$82. North Bowl 2 would be \$58 which is what Prof. Walle proposed. Then P3 and P4 Quadrants 1 and 2 would be \$45.

Andres – The concern there is going to be the preferred being not just Le Grand but now North Bowl too and the fight for the spaces. I like the simplicity of this here. Not the rates necessarily, but the simplicity.

Katherine – But that makes it more of a fight because they are all the same price. Of course everyone will be fighting for the closest lot.

Andres – Not at 7:30 in the morning when I get here.

Katherine – Not you, but the rest of the population.

Andres – There are quite a few who get here early. I understand the spill-over effect, but honestly that is why a lot of people choose preferred. In case there's not space, they have options to park other places.

Karin – I don't see that happening until 2019.

Andres – I agree. It's not an issue now, but we will have to revisit.

Karin – Remember that these are recommendations. When I met with VC Reese I impressed upon him the importance of getting this to him, this recommendation for the next three years so that he can make a decision, take it to cabinet, make his decision, and then communicate this to the campus community. We are talking about the immediate need to make a decision at a minimum for 2017. These are our recommendations for the next three years. A lot can happen in three years. We may see new senior management come in and say that they don't care what was said before, this is how we are going to move forward.

Andres – Can we maybe recommend 2017 and leave the rest as proposed? Not as approved, just proposed. One of the concerns I'm getting from commuters like myself is the new gas tax about to hit. I think that's something to bring up when we discuss 2019 in more detail.

Karin – But the permit rates shouldn't be reflective of the gas tax.

Andres – But in terms of the final rates. Keep it as proposed and up for more discussion with more information needed. Like you said, everything could change in a couple years anyways.

Karin – If you look at 2018, North Bowl 1 and 2 goes from \$50 to \$65. In the case that we are talking about North Bowl 2 in 2019 at \$58 the recommendation would then be to separate those two in 2018, not just 2019 and North Bowl 2 would be the \$55. I would agree that these are our recommendations. We understand that there will be ongoing changes that may impact on how we allocate parking and rate structure but the important thing is that we have to raise rates. We've had the rate freeze so we have to get this moving.

Andres – I have some staff that will still want the commuter permit. Will that still exist?

Karin – Yes, and that's how we started this with the \$5 restriction. We are phasing out the LEV. We are losing money. We've grandfathered in the existing LEV holders. We no longer offer a student LEV permit. We will be phasing that permit out completely. Currently the LEV is a lower rate. We have two options for LEED credits. Either offer a lower permit rate or provide closer in, dedicated parking. For zero emission vehicles we would have dedicated parking because that would be where the charging stations are. I've talked to my colleagues at the other universities and they handle it different ways. They either include the rate for charging in the price of the permit or they have a rate for parking and they charge for charge time. It would be more simplistic to include it in the permit rate. In this case we could say that you are paying for dedicated parking because that is where the higher level, level 2, charging is located. Then those that are level 1, trickle charge, would be farther out. When we opened the campus we had a flat line rate structure, very simple. We've been trying to get away from that and it's been more challenging from an administrative perspective. We are in a position where we are pushing parking further out and charging more. I brought that to my colleagues at the conference and I don't yet have the completed matrix, but in discussing rate increases, they are having these conversations UC system wide. Right now UCSB is the only one with a lower rate. We are right in line with Riverside and the other

campuses. We are not outpricing ourselves. The other campuses are doing away with low emission. They are seeing the same concerns we are. How we handle low emission vehicles, hybrids, ZEV, and PEV is a discussion that is happening at the other campuses. That is why we are including the word proposed would speak to the fact that we still need to figure out how we are going to handle parking for those. And I don't know if we will still be bound by the five GTNs in 2019. That could increase. There are a lot of variables that speak to why this is still proposed.

Edmundo – I'm confused. Are we going to talk about the LEVs?

Karin – At some point, yes. So now based on our conversation and this chart. You need to have this in the back of your mind before we make the final vote on this. Based on what is on the board, do we have a motion to approve and proceed with a formal notification to VC Reese this week?

Maryam – We have to add motorcycles to this, correct?

Karin – What you see there is what we need a motion to approve.

Katherine – Motion.

George – Second.

Karin – All in favor? All. None opposed. We will draft and send the notification to him this week. Now let's talk about motorcycle rates. Currently it is \$27. We'd discussed having it follow the same rate structure as the commuters. \$38, \$43, \$45.

Raj – Can they park in the preferred locations?

April – We only have Student or Faculty/Staff motorcycle permits. Students can only park in the student commuter lots. Faculty/Staff can park in any motorcycle space in any lot.

Karin – One would say that they have to pay \$45 for a motorcycle but they have availability to park in any preferred location. Library lot 1 still has spaces and there are several in Le Grand.

James – There are 27 spaces in Le Grand. There are motorcycle spaces at the end of each row.

Karin – I don't see that those spaces are currently taken. We may see more motorcycle permits with the gas tax, but there is a lot of availability. Do we have a motion to approve the motorcycle rate?

Katherine – Motion.

George – Second.

Karin – All in favor? None opposed. That will be on the notification to VC Reese as a second line item. Let's talk about LEVs. There are no more for students. A couple meetings ago we agreed to extend the existing permits even if the rates increase. If you are here in the fall semester and you have a LEV permit you can retain it. In fall 2018 we will no longer offer the LEV. The rate structure will be set up so that it's not based on vehicle type, but where you park. We will no longer offer the LEVs starting at the next permit distribution which is proposed to be in spring 2018. Faculty/Staff LEV will be obsolete starting in spring 2018. April, what are we currently charging for those who are using the ChargePoint? We currently have two trickle charge in North Bowl 1 and two ChargePoint, which is the fast charge Level 2, in Library Lot. To park in either of those you have to have a valid UC Merced parking permit to charge, but to use ChargePoint, what is the charge for those locations?

April – For the first 3 hours we charge \$2 per hour and after that it's \$5 per hour.

Raj – Are we planning to increase EV charging in the future?

Karin – Absolutely. There is a mandate that by 2020, per the governor's mandate, 25% of our fleet vehicles, not commuters, have to be zero emission. By 2025 50% must be ZEV. So really the direction state wide is to get away from the hybrids and go to ZEV. That is the push. We are also required to have a certain number of spaces that are charge capable based on the number of spaces we have on campus. If

we just look at phase 1 of P4, those 1,800 spaces, we will be required to having charging capability for at least 150 vehicles. That doesn't have to be ready by fall of 2017 when that lot is delivered but that is the mandate that we will have to meet. Placement of those is dependent on the level of charge. The quick charge will be closer to the academic core. In P4 it would be in quad 3. Its quick charge. You plug in and do your business and an hour later your vehicle is charged and you move on. The trickle charge are placed farther out because it takes longer. You park, you charge and you go about your business for the day. When we look at the design of the 2020 parking we are keeping those considerations in mind as well.

James – North Bowl, type 1, current rate \$0 to charge. Le Grand has spaces dedicated as ZEV only, because it is a preferred lot, currently at \$0 other than their standard permit rate. Library Lot 1 is the direct to customer, ChargePoint, is \$2 per hour for the first 3 hours and \$5 per hour thereafter. Because it is a high mobility lot and typically you won't be there very long.

Karin – We are also discussing if we will continue with ChargePoint machines. There are other options out there in regards to stations. Some UCs are saying that they won't bother with level 1, putting in an actual station any more. They will just put in a plug. They have the infrastructure and an outlet, but not an actual station. In Library Lot 1 we have the ChargePoint and you have to become a member. I am working with Peter Sherman in Research and Development Services. We are looking at multi-jurisdictional partnerships within the community and the outlying areas. We are trying to connect with programs to obtain funding for charging stations through grants. There is a possibility of securing charging stations through a grant. If we are successful in the partnership then we would not be going forward with the ChargePoint stations. There is a manufacturer that has the inventory to date and we are trying to leverage a partnership with Green Commuter that we could obtain, through a grant, these charging stations. In that event we could say that we wouldn't necessary have an upcharge for the time you charge but rather if we are going to have these quick charge stations in the preferred locations the rates would absorb the charge rates. Then at some point if we see that we are actually losing money then we could decide to introduce and additional charge for charge time. We've received a lot of feedback from our existing customers about the upcharge. It's been both positive and negative.

James – The response we've gotten for the Library Lot specifically is that yes it's a faster charge, but the price is high. But that is because it is a high mobility lot. When those fees were established we found that we were in alignment with other UCs. What we saw was we are even low compared to some locations.

Katherine – Does that bill go to their student account?

James – No, it's directly charged to their credit card when they set up their account with ChargePoint.

Karin – For today's meeting and what talking point we want to include on the notification to VC Reese regarding LEV, PEV, and ZEV. We could say that we understand that those current Faculty/Staff permit holders are grandfathered in. Then starting in fall 2018 we will no longer offer the LEV and a ZEV permit would be introduced and the rate is still being discussed. I feel like we need to have more discussion about that.

Maryam – Do you have a fair idea of how many of those special vehicles are here on campus? Do you a prediction?

Karin – We have a general idea but I'm not comfortable making a decision without concrete data. Between now and the next meeting we would do an analysis of what we have today and talk to other campus.

Maryam – Could we survey the students? Do you have one of these types of vehicles or are you planning on purchasing one? Just a quick two or three questions.

Karin – Why just students?

Maryam – Because that is the biggest population, but it could be sent campus wide. And you won't have 100% participation.

Karin – We could collect that data in a survey but I think that the number will remain small because the cost of those vehicles is still pretty high. I see more motorcycles.

Andres – Yes, motorcycles or scooters. I'm hearing that people are thinking about scooters.

Karin – Can we make a separate line item about LEVs? It should read that they will be grandfathered through the next permit distribution because VC Reese could come back and say that we are going to leave them through 2017/2018. LEVs current is \$27 and \$56. What we would say is they would hold it, but the price would change based on their location. Then it would \$38 and \$50? That was one of Prof. Walle's concerns, going from \$56 to \$74.

April – The price of ALEV would go down?

Karin – No. Ok, let me ask. If I have an ALEV I can park in Le Grand, right? And pay \$56. If we look at 2018 North Bowl 1 is \$65. What if we say \$65 for ALEV?

Andres – I think that is fair with the other increases. And will be better received then getting rid of them completely.

Karin – Ok, than in 2018 that goes away and it's just based on where you are parking and at that point we will have dedicated spaces.

Andres – Dedicated for which type of LEV? ZEV?

Karin – Correct. At least for where we are current in 2017 that would be the rate.

Andres – I think it's fair based on it's been frozen for a while.

Karin – Then in 2018 there is no more LEV, just ZEV.

Andres – Would I still get an A permit when the LEV goes away?

Karin – This is grandfathered in because it's based on location. The concern that Prof. Walle and others had was the hit going from \$27 or \$56 to \$74 or \$79. This follows the phased increase. If you are paying \$56 today, in 2017 you pay \$65 but you are grandfathered in and still have that permit. Then in 2018, if you still want to stay in preferred you pay \$79.

Andres – I think that's fair.

Karin – So phase out LEV starting in 2018.

James – Those who are LEV will receive a permit based on the location they already have.

Karin – LEVs current is \$27 and \$56 and in 2017 it would go to \$38 and \$65. That is five GTNs so we are ok.

Raj – So the 2017 rate increase will happen in fall?

Karin – Yes, you'd see the new rate on your October paycheck.

Raj – So phased out in summer 2018?

Karin – Yes, you'd see that deduction in October 2018. Do we have a motion to approve?

George – Ist

Katherine – 2nd

Karin – Those in favor? All in favor. None opposed. Ok, that will be a separate line item on the notification to VC Reese. What else do we need to include? Tibor?

Tibor – I don't have anything to add. I thank the committee for having a good in-depth discussion about this.

Karin – I will include a note that the committee will continue to discuss how we will handle ZEV and how it will fall in line with what we are mandated by the state.

Maryam – Are you adding anything about transportation?

Karin – Not to this notification. I would like to share with the committee that how we've established rates historically is basically been to cover the parking operations and includes the debt payments for the lots. We've used a business model that would keep us in a position where our debt ratio to cover the financing to build new lots was at 1.25. Tibor has mentioned that with 2020 parking there will be a much leaner parking ration. We have just completed our last campus built parking lot, which was North Bowl 2. P4 is a 2020 developer lot. So anything going forward is their responsibility. The budget office has requested a much more aggressive payoff schedule for the existing parking so that is really a big impact to our bottom line and reserve. For example, our financing model for long term, or permanent, lots like North Bowl 1 or Lake Lots typically have a 15 years payoff schedule. The budget office wants us to pay North Bowl 2 off in 5 years. Where that would run us annually a cost of less than \$100,000 it's now up to \$600,000 additionally per year that comes out of our reserved. That in addition to our payments to the developer puts us in a position where we have to raise rates. That is also a talking point that will be included to VC Reese. You bring up transportation. Typically we want to build up reserves from parking and any revenue from Parking Enforcement to subsidize transportation. I have a meeting this afternoon for our transit RFP which is just about ready to go out to the streets. Included in that are specifications to include alternative fuel types. We have done a thorough analysis of our existing routes and we have the capability of potentially having an all-electric fleet. We just have to figure out the business model and the financing for that. Buying an electric bus upfront, the capitol for that is much greater than clean diesel. What we have currently are used buses so that is a lower cost. We are trying to figure out the financing model and how to phase electric buses into our existing fleet. Another reason why we should be looking at and recommending these rate increases because of the aggressive payoff schedule, we want to change the mindset and parking patterns we want to them to use alternative transportation.

Katherine – I have issues specifically about the bus system. When is a good time to bring those up?

Karin – I want to talk about parking enforcement at this time and what to include to VC Reese. With rate increase we have to say that yes we are raising rates and we want to do everything possible to protect the integrity of these spaces. We currently have \$45,000 outstanding from people with 5 or more citations. How do we collect that? Right now we have a collection agency that sends notifications. We've had situations where we have worked with student affairs. And I'm saying students because of a couple of specific situations but really it's across the board. In talking to my colleagues they pass it on to the student fee bill. They hold transcripts. They can't walk.

Katherine – Other institutions go with just one.

Karin – Scofflaw is 3 or more and are subject to having your car booted or towed. Right now in the parking office if you come in to buy a permit and you have any outstanding citations past due we are denying them. If you are a student who decides to not buy a permit or are carpooling we need to collect that debt. We need to protect the integrity of those spaces that are now looking at a rate increase. I'm looking for a recommendation from the committee that we include in the notification to VC Reese that we will be holding transcripts and get support from student affairs that perhaps they would not be able to participate in commencement. Or we pass that on to a student fee bill or if they have money on their CatCard we could take that

Raj – Maybe without stating action, we could state that we are allowed to take initiatives to collect. Instead of saying that we will hold grades or take it from CatCard just make an open statement that we will collect debt.

Karin – I think VC Reese will want to know specifically what we want to do. I asked at the conference how they handled that. I mentioned that they could say that they know they have unpaid citations and they don't care and will just buy a kiosk permit and we can't collect from them.

George – When you cite someone you are citing the vehicle not the person. So the registered owner has registration even if it's not their car.

Karin – Typically mom or dad.

George – I view it as that if I had something owed, something is held from me.

Katherine – That's the way it was at other institutions I was at.

Maryam – Taking it from the CatCard is a harder blow since that's how they get fed.

James – It depends on how that CatCard bank is set up. You can't take their dining funds.

Karin – Speaking from both sides, we will have points made that our student population being low income or whatever but there rules are rules and there are consequences tied to that. I will tell you thought that in parking services we will offer payment plans and we will work with them. That's not just students, across the board. Even if it's \$5 per month we will work with you, but the moment you default on that the payment plan is void and now you are obligated for the full balance including late fees.

Drew – Seems fair.

George – Have you had many occasions where you've gone to student judicial affairs?

Karin – Yes

Drew – It's not like it would be a surprise. They would have been notified along the way.

George – What's their stand on it?

Karin – Le'Trice has been very supportive. In the past, Sr. management, which is not the same leadership we have today, was not in support of booting and towing or keeping them from walking or graduating. We are trying to button up our policies and we are very ethical on how we manage our business. We had a public services request recently for information on Parking Enforcement budget and how we run our operations. Once we presented it to them they said it was fair. It's not a money making business, it's to protect the integrity of those who are parking.

Andres – I like what you are saying. If we are asking people to pay more then they should have that space and not someone who doesn't have a permit or has the wrong permit.

Karin – Ok, we will include in the statement to VC Reese that we are going to take these steps to enhance enforcement. Do I have a motion that we include this?

Drew – 1st

Katherine – 2nd

Karin – All those in favor? Any opposed?

Raj – I just want to make sure we aren't too harsh on the students.

Karin – We aren't even talking about booting and towing yet.

Maryam – That would be discussed with the new chief of police, right?

Karin – Yes, and I know they are going through the selection committee right now. We will continue to collaborate with them.

Maryam – Is there anything the student body can do to bring out more information when the decisions are made.

Karin – I would like to be invited to ASUCM again. I was there in the fall and I think it is very important. Please go back and ask that they add me to the agenda.

Kathrine – I've heard from both a grad student and a faculty member who told me that services for disabilities services when they can't make it from the parking lot that it has been very problematic to try to get a cart to take them from the parking lot to a building. Is there a way of handling that?

Karin – We offer a medical permit.

Katherine – I was told that they have to flip over backwards. They said it was so much of a problem to try to get that.

Karin – We also offer a service in addition to the medical permit, where if you have a temporary disability you can sign up with dates, times, and location where you need to be. This is our CART program, modeled after other universities, where they sign up for cart service and we assign a driver to come pick them up.

Katherine – They have to be predefined schedules. What if they have to be picked up on a different day?

Karin – You'd notify our office and if resources allowed we would work with that person to meet their needs.

Katherine – They said it was so difficult that a professor said they couldn't get to class.

Karin – We recognize that that happens and certainly with P4 it will be an ongoing concern. The service is Monday through Friday 9 to 5. We do have limitations with staffing.

Katherine – So if they need something in the evening that is not available?

Karin – Correct. George, does PD offer that after hours?

George – For carts, it depends. Sometimes we are able to use a cart for escorts. If they have an injury or something we may have a cart available. They just have to call dispatch.

Karin – I want to add that it's an agreement from both sides. We want to accommodate our customer but there are some requirements as part of this agreement. If we show up and they aren't on time or don't show up. We are looking for them to be reliable. If something comes up we certainly understand if you notify our office. But just not showing up 3 times then we will no longer provide that service. In addition if we are not timely we want to hear that as well. It's a partnership on both sides.

James – The program is very well described on our website. The details on requirements and they need to be able to get in and out of the cart on their own. It's called Cart Access to Road Transportation under Alternative Transportation on the website.

Katherine – As far as the buses I've had complaints from students, especially grad students. For example, during spring break there were no busses and some students still needed access to campus but had no way to get here. Someone was mentioning the idea of using the buses that run to the resident lots. But they are able to because they aren't part of the housing. Because those run much more regularly.

Karin – We have to reduce service because we don't have funding to run full service year round. During spring break we do reduce service.

James – We base in on a couple of things, especially for off-campus housing. If it's campus closer, we reduce service. We base the service on what library and dining hours are.

Katherine – But the grad students who live in that same area but aren't official housing residents can't get on the buses.

Karin – If there is space available they can. Priority is for the residents, but if the bus is only half full they won't be turned away.

Katherine – The other idea is extending the bus routes farther out.

Karin – That I'm going to table because that is part of the transit RFP and ongoing discussions.

Roundtable

George – You’ve seen the traffic direction on Tuesdays and Thursdays. We’ve heard mixed. Some say it’s going well. I think regardless of what is going on, be careful especially this time of year when everybody is thinking about May 15th.

Drew – Back to the CART program. I’ve had a couple students who had casts and had trouble when going into the office because they don’t have a doctor’s note yet. Asking for leeway.

Karin – There should be leeway with that. If someone has a cast and they show up then absolutely. There was one incident that came up with that where we were trying to follow policy, which I respect, but I think there can be exceptions.

Jessica – No updates.

Raj – Nothing.

Karin – Want to talk about changes to systems? UC Path

Raj – Maybe next meeting I’ll do a presentation.

Andres – As I always say, the intersection at SSB and when class gets out, students cross the road, not in the cross walk and don’t pay attention.

Drew – It’s not just students.

Andres – No it’s not. It’s just when class gets out there is a crowd moving.

Karin – It’s going to get worse. With P3 opening there will be more cars.

Andres – It’s not so much that there is a wait time for the drivers, it’s the people with headphones and those not paying attention. It’s a safety concern.

Raj – We will talk about ZEV pricing?

Karin – ZEV yes, and we’ll talk about our new parking management system that by 2019 or 2020 will take us to LPR, license plate recognition, and permit-less, where you don’t need a physical parking permit.

Tibor – Nothing more.

Next Meeting

1. Date: May 9, 2017 from 10:30AM-12:00PM
2. Proposed agenda topics
 - a. Parking operations & systems, kiosks
 - b. NuPark Slide Show (from dir. Conference)
3. Action Items

Meeting adjourned at 12:02pm

	Permit	Current	2017	2018	2019	
Reserved	X	96	101	106	109	
Preferred	A	69	74	79	82	
Preferred P4 - Q3	A	-	-	-	82	
Preferred Low Emission	ALEV	56	65	-	-	Grandfathered thru next permit distribution
North Bowl 1	B	33	50	65	82	
North Bowl 2	B	33	50	55	58	
Commuter P3	C	-	38	43	45	
Commuter P4 - Q1 & Q2	C	-	38	43	45	
Commuter Low Emission	LEV	27	38	-	-	Grandfathered thru next permit distribution
Motorcycle	M	27	38	43	45	
Zero Emission Vehicles	ZEV	-	-	TBD	TBD	