

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

February 10, 2015

10:30AM – 12:00PM

Facilities Services Building A Conference Room

**Attendees:**

Karin Groth, TAPS (non-voting)

Martin Reed, Director of Residential Life

Coty Ventura, Staff Assembly Representative

Emily Wilson, GSR Representative

Kathleen Coburn, TA Representative

Tibor Toth, (non-voting)

James Nardello, (non-voting)

Michael Reese, VC for Business & Administrative Services

**Attended via Ready Talk:**

Sergeant George Gongora, UCMDPS

Drew Shelburne, Disability Services Coordinator

Arokiaraj Panneer Selvam, Remote Site Representative

Alex Khislavsky, Lecturer

Sonia Johnston, Chief of Staff, VC Business & Administrative Services  
Donna Birch Trahan, Communications

**Old Business**

**Approve Meeting Minutes**

Meeting Minutes for January were approved by Coty Ventura and second by Eric Walle.

Meeting Minutes for December were approved by Alex Khislavsky and second by George Gongora.

**New Business**

**Discuss feedback on the proposed Parking Permit Renewal process**

The committee was tasked to share the proposed parking permit renewal process with their constituencies for fall 2015.

Coty Ventura - Staff Assembly is requesting a better description of seniority based and will the seniority of other campuses follow. Staff Assembly is sending a survey out. Once it’s complete she’ll be able to share the information. The deadline for the survey is Friday.

Emily Wilson – There are TA union concerns, with graduate students not having equal rights. What are the guidelines? The general understanding is that parking can change as long as there is some element of good will that we’re trying to accommodate a little. If I have to park in the Lake Lots I would reconsider coming here. I see it as a challenge. We do understand that there are worst situations, but it’s important to keep communication open as to why things have to change. The key is how to communicate why these shifts need to occur.

Karin Groth – What are your thoughts about sending this back to the schools. Letting the schools determine who has seniority.

Emily Wilson – It would be a good way and it would also give us an opportunity to carpool.

Karin Groth – How would we allocate these parking permits?

Emily Wilson – It would be done by seniority or by TA assignment, example if they teach first thing in the am and buses are not available they should eligible.

Karin Groth – When are TA assignments defined?

Emily Wilson – It can be right before the semester or far time in advance. Depends upon the school. Fellowships know many months in advance.

Emily Wilson – The biggest challenge will be those TA’s who come in teach and leave, maybe high mobility spaces for those type so that high priority space is not taken all day. Also GSR’s that stay on campus for 18+ hours.

Karin Groth – I want to bring to the table the Competitive Fellowships, making this group automatically eligible. What does that number look like?

Emily Wilson – I will need to ask the grad division, it might be a good way to encourage students to get on these and show them that they are a priority, but I still feel TA’s will be the most challenging group.

Tibor Toth- what’s population of TA’s, are we talking about.

Emily Wilson was tasked to get a breakdown of TA’s, competitive Fellowship, by school and if they would need parking all day or a high mobility spot. She will also look into setting up a meeting with GSA that Director Karin Groth can attend.

Coty Ventura – What about research units, not TA’s but Post Docs. We hire our own that don’t go through the schools because it’s grant funding.

Tibor Toth – Are they represented?

Coty Ventura – Yes, on the academic side.

Coty Ventura was tasked to get a number of how many Post-Doc there are.

Eric Walle – how would this work if sent to the schools? A staff member is going to determine hierarchy of who gets all these permits based on a number of different priority schools?

Karin Groth – What I have gathered from my colleagues at other universities is that they put the honest on the schools to decide who they believe should be eligible. We don’t know what their business needs are or what they’re challenges are as to why they should have in closed parking. The schools would select a panel and determine who is eligible.

Coty Ventura – We have students that started as under grads and now they’re TA’s and above. We really have to define that, where does the seniority start?

Michael Reese- we had independent research at the seniority question and no other UC campus uses seniority as a factor. So I urge you to look at the precedent and you come back to me with a recommendation that seniority not be a consideration.

Currently TAPS can provide parking for everyone right now, the issue is where to park.

Michael Reese – so it’s perfectly feasible to do automatic parking permit renewal.

Karin Groth – that is correct.

Michael Reese – asked the faculty representative his thoughts on the seniority factor?

Eric Walle – As long as it’s clear I think it would be alright, but I think if you start parsing it different ways there would be a lot of factors to consider. Is it the steps that you are at or the actual number of semesters you’ve been here? It can be done, but there has to be clear rules.

Michael Reese – wonder’s how other campuses do it, if seniority is not a factor.

Eric Walle- are there enough spaces where faculty can park in the lot where they want. You can put seniority into it, but if you don’t need to why? If space is not an issue for faculty.

Karin Groth – You have faculty/staff/grad who want preferred parking that number exceeds the preferred parking spaces we have available.

Eric Walle – What about excluding grad and staff, is there enough preferred parking spaces for faculty?

James Nardello – We don’t have that information, we need time to analyze that.

Michael Reese – That is a very important question and would like it analyzed just for the sake of an argument.

Karin Groth – how many of those faculty prefer to have in close parking because you might have those faculty that don’t care to preferred parking.

James Nardello – another component is a faculty member coming in 3pm to 5pm, but the rest of the day it’s an open space because we determined that space is for faculty. That can be construed as not enough time to take a parking space. We need to look at that. There is a lot of different schedules.

Michael Reese – my concern is making promises today that I have to break next year. Even if we were able to guarantee faculty a space in their preferred lot and I don’t think I can keep that promise.

Eric Walle- that was the biggest feedback I got was predictability. It was the most important factor.

Michael Reese- Right and I can’t provide that. So what is an acceptable alternative?

Karin Groth – informed the committee that she’s been invited to the next DivCo meeting which is next week. I also agree that we can’t guarantee because of the state that we’re in and the transiting this campus is going through. There was a recommendation of the possibility of extending the current permits through December 2015.

Michael Reese – please explain the December date, the first option would be to do automatic renewals, yours is an alternative proposal. So why that versus automatic renewal.

Karin Groth- we want to make sure we have the resources available that systems will allow for automatic renewals. We know there’s issues with grad students and payroll deductions.

Arokiaraj Panneer Selvam was tasked with providing a timeline as to when this can be done.

Michael Reese – Sounds like I won’t be getting a recommendation today. I would also like to understand collective bargaining units.

Karin Groth – Addressing faculty, staff, Post-Docs

Tibor Toth was tasked with getting information on the collective bargaining units.

Alex Khislavsky - I’m scheduled to have a call today with our lecturer union representative so I should have that information later on today. Will try to include Karin Groth.

Martin Reed – I came from Western Washington University same size campus, only a few grad students. Parking was very limited, agreement with the city, you could purchase an unlimited annual bus pass for $50. Their system was based on seniority. You had your fist, second and third choice. People were not happy because you had managers that had to park far away and custodians who had close in parking. It took about a year or two to get your preferred location. The system worked. At other UC’s like UCI and UCB is more likely supply and demand, what to park close to your job you pay more. UCB is close to $100.00. What is our goal to provide parking for everyone or obtain sustainability? It should depend on your job requirements and the Vice Chancellor’s should be able to decide that.

Karin Groth – to have a good balance of parking, we don’t want an abundant of spaces to sit unoccupied, but also grow and have a mature good transit program to reduce the number of single occupancy vehicles and encourage carpooling and establish park and rides.

Arokiaraj Panneer Selvam - There can be an issue with yearly appointments because they are hired every year.

Michael Reese- That is true. You also have those who transfer from other campuses, what would be your hire date. I don’t like it, we might have to do something different for faculty.

Alex Khislavsky – Maybe the recommendation can be to abandon the seniority option and see if we can do the automatic renewal.

Michael Reese- I will change my deadline and would like a recommendation at the next meeting in March.

Arokiaraj Panneer Selvam - Add more on hire date or seniority factor. Instead of going by the hire date we can go by how long they’ve been with UCM, OP has this information. Also some do 100% and some do 60% of their FTE.

Eric Walle – No faculty brought up any concerns with seniority.

Karin Groth – What other concerns were brought up?

Eric Walle – The renewal process, some were on sabbatical or on leave and they didn’t get a current permit or receive notification.

Karin Groth – we talked about renewing in the spring, sending out communication for those who would not be here and setting aside a number of permits for those purposed as an option.

Eric Walle- the biggest thing is predictability and I get a lot fear of walking a long way

Tibor Toth - Is the fear of not get a parking spot or not getting a preferred parking spot

Eric Walle - I think it’s both.

Tibor Toth - Do you think the campus community is aware that there are enough spots more of a question of preferred location

Eric Walle – Not enough spots

Arokiaraj Panneer Selvam – I agree, people think there are not enough lots, we need more communication, provide some incentive parking in the Lake lots by reducing the price and raising it for preferred.

Karin Groth – there is a price differential between commuter versus preferred parking. There is also another rate raise increase for the fall. It might be a good time to look at close in parking to be raised to $75.00.

Michael Reese- We need to know what the future is going to look like. Hopefully in a month or two we will know.

Karin Groth – is there any feedback from those on the phone.

Eric Walle – Is there any short term for pact of not having the Le Grand lot.

Michael Reese- we won’t know until October. The three finalists will be coming forward with their master proposals and we will have a quick glimpse of what it will look like. Short term 2017-2018. We’re trying to come up with short-term remedies.

Meeting adjourned 11:21am

**Next Meeting**

1. Date: March 10, 2015 from 10:30AM-12:00PM
2. Proposed Agenda Topics
3. Recap of Action Items