



Categories > Staff Assembly Committee > TAPS Survey

This form was created to allow staff to voice their opinion regarding a proposal that has been submitted to the Transportation and Parking Advisory Committee on the annual Parking Pass renewal process.

(Items with \* are required.)

**Staff Assembly has been asked by the Transportation and Parking Advisory Committee to provide feedback on the below proposal for renewing Parking Passes.**

1. All permanent employees including postdoctoral fellows with multiple-year contracts shall have automatic renewal of their current permit in August, unless the employee opts out by informing the parking service after being notified of the automatic renewal by email.
2. Anyone can opt out the parking permit any time.
3. Establish a waiting list of permanent employees for the parking lots with high demand, but priority should be given based on seniority for both faculty and staff. Founding faculty and staff should be given highest priority in recognition for their years of service.
4. The employees with annual or temporary appointment such as GSIs, GSRs, undergraduate interns and other temps will not have automatic renewal of the parking permit. Upon confirmation of the appointment in August, they will have higher priority for parking permit than the students without employment.
5. The students without campus employment will be given the parking permit on the first-come first-served basis.

**Comments \***

(Items with \* are required.)

Submit Cancel

Submission Date	Comments
Feb 20 2015 2:31PM	This makes sense. Automatic renewal is a convenience.
Feb 20 2015 1:47PM	In the past. The renewed parking permits had to be picked up. There have been times when I have been ticketed while waiting for the renewal permit. Tons of your procedures have cost me time & money (work & personal). I don't buy annual permits anymore.
Feb 20 2015 11:34AM	In my experience with TAPS, the current process works. Students, staff, and faculty are notified well in advance that of the opportunity to select their parking preference. So, I'm not sure the process should change because people don't respond in a timely manner and where they choose to park is no longer an option for them - just my thoughts.
Feb 20 2015 8:44AM	Sounds fair to me.
Feb 19 2015 2:47PM	I'm happy to hear about automatic renewal. Since I have an ALEV permit, it would be nice not to have to make a special trip to TAPS every year to show them my registration. I think when it comes to deciding who from the staff and faculty are given priority for the higher demand lots, there should also be some consideration of their job function. There are those of us who have offices on campus but are frequently attending meetings off-campus throughout the day. It would be a big increase of travel time should those staff/faculty have to go back and forth to one of the outer lots all day.
Feb 19 2015 11:26AM	I agree with this amendment to the parking program renewal process with one main caveat. As a 2007 (therefore early-ish staffer), I do not agree with the priority for years of service part of the wait list (item #3). It's not clear enough as to how the faculty and staff part of that would be implemented. Also, why should newer staffers and faculty be penalized due to cronyism? Long term staffers (excepting, thus far, the Merritt Writing Program staffers) earn better pay and have also earned extra vacation time, that should be recognition enough. Does all of this mean that some to many students may not have access to parking on campus? If so, that needs to be addressed more equitably. Otherwise, again, I concur with points 1 and 2 with my further reservations about point 4. Please send me any questions you might have. Thank you, Linda Hart Tolley (lharttolley@ or x4143)
Feb 19 2015 9:29AM	The renewal process should include carpool passes as well.
Feb 18 2015 8:41PM	#1 - No. First come first serve. #2 - Agree #3 - Agree, especially Founding Faculty except that employees with disabilities should be given priority over other staff. #4 - No automatic renewal. First come first serve. #5 - The whole purpose of our existence is students! Do you want to chase your revenue base away? All students should be given access to parking. Build more parking lots!!!
Feb 18 2015 5:29PM	I especially appreciate #1.
Feb 18 2015 4:56PM	Sounds good!
Feb 18 2015 4:35PM	Some of these suggestions make sense. Why should founding members be given priority? Permanent employees that drive for functions off campus for work need their cars more than staff who remain on campus. Staff, faculty, and students who have young children attending the ECEC need parking as well, as do disabled individuals. Individuals who commute do not have options for transportation as well.
Feb 18 2015 4:00PM	Yay
Feb 18 2015 3:53PM	I am in favor of this proposal. The only question I have is if the employee decides to change his/her permit type from one year to the next, how is that communicated in the system and does that remove the employee from automatic renewal?
Feb 18 2015 3:38PM	Great proposals!
Feb 18 2015 2:16PM	Agree
Feb 18 2015 2:09PM	I agree.
Feb 18 2015 1:46PM	OK, should make the process easier for staff and faculty.

Feb 18 2015 1:31PM I recently moved off campus and turned in my parking permit, so I no longer have a direct stake in this issue. With that said: I like the idea of automatic renewal for parking permits. However, what if someone currently has a commuter permit and wants to upgrade to a preferred permit? And, are lecturers covered in this proposal? Do they fall under those listed in No. 4 (employees with annual appointments)? I also like the proposal to establish waiting lists based on seniority. That seems fair.

Feb 18 2015 1:24PM A very reasonable proposal.

Feb 18 2015 1:14PM I like the automatic renewal. I do not think priority should be given to seniority staff and faculty. It should be a first come, first serve purchase basis. Parking is not recognition for years of service; maybe give a discount instead. Stop giving Grad students staff parking slots in the Le Grand and North Bowl Lots.

Feb 18 2015 1:07PM Collective bargaining agreements and other employment policies may define and determine "seniority" differently, thus developing a waiting list for "high demand" parking lots using "seniority" may not be efficient and could increase liability. In addition as the campus' physical footprint changes and locations expand to additional or alternative downtown locations the list of "high demand" parking lots will more than likely change.

Feb 18 2015 1:07PM This is fine with me

Feb 18 2015 12:53PM I support this proposal.

Feb 18 2015 12:50PM Does this really mean I don't have to apply for a new permit and all that craziness every year right as students are returning and being told I might not get a permit after 9 or 10 years. Wow amazing. I am so Happy.

Feb 18 2015 12:42PM I agree with #1, that would make things much simpler, especially for those that work shift work and may not be working when they go on sale.

#3, the waiting list should be on a first-come first-served basis.

Feb 18 2015 12:30PM I think #1 is a good idea. I appreciate the opportunity to opt out if I choose after notification, and to automatically renew my permit.

I don't have an issue with the rest of the proposals but I'm wondering which parking lots count as being high demand? If I have a parking permit in North Bowl now would that go away if someone with more seniority than me wants it? (I hope not! :) )

Feb 18 2015 12:27PM Makes sense.

Feb 18 2015 12:23PM It sounds fair and reasonable to me.

Feb 18 2015 12:18PM Parking lots with high demand should be first come first serve for wait list instead of seniority. The rest looks good.

Feb 18 2015 12:16PM I am a founding staff member, and I do not see the logic in giving privileges for being part of the founding team. Staff recruitment and staff retention are not easy, and we should honor every staff member equally when it comes to parking access.

Feb 18 2015 12:01PM Much better.

Feb 18 2015 11:54AM I'm okay with automatic renewal of current permit in August

Feb 18 2015 11:44AM This is good news and something that we have needed for some time. I would add that parking pass types should be overhauled with access to certain lots for specific pass types only - most of our sister campuses differentiate between Faculty and Academic Appointments, Staff and Student permits. Not only does this make sense to give priority to faculty and staff who need to go off campus for meetings, etc during the day, it makes parking reciprocity clearer at our sister campuses (e.g. having a B Carpool permit at UC Merced between myself (staff) and spouse (faculty) leads to confusion at UCSF where the B permit is not viewed as a faculty permit!

Feb 18 2015 11:43AM Regarding number 1: do staff have the flexibility of changing which permits they purchase (A or B) from year to year? Example: what if somebody who has a B permit is tired of walking from the North Bowl lot and wants to purchase an A permit for the Library lot the next year?

Regarding number 3: I do not believe founding staff and faculty should receive priority. This process should be equitable across all staff and faculty.

Feb 18 2015 11:37AM no comments

Feb 18 2015 11:37AM I support this proposal.

Feb 18 2015  
11:35AM

#1 - Yes. Thank you. Finally.

#2 - Makes sense.

#3 worries me. It creates a definite system of "haves" and "have-nots". It, in fact, as worded leaves a very bitter taste in my mouth. All full time faculty and staff work hard and being able park in a reasonable time frame should not be an impediment to this. How do you define founding? Anyone here before start of term 2005? It just reeks of preferential treatment.

#4 - I'd need more clarity in relation to the process for these folks as it exists now.

#5 - This is how it is now, yes?

#4 and #5 lead me to think it might also be helpful, in general, to provide a "before and after" to better help explain the process as it exists and how it will be going forward for these items.

Regardless, these are, at best, stop gap solutions to a campus issue that has never seen a real remedy or plan of action. I'd hope that bundled with this proposal is a realistic long term parking plan for the campus. Otherwise, we run the risk of temporary becoming permanent as the case has been for most things during my almost 10 years working here.

Feb 18 2015  
11:33AM

This proposal is poorly written, has lack of clarity, and does not address many common scenarios.

1:

While it seems like it would be helpful and simplify the renewal process, it also seems like it would prevent staff and faculty from ever being able to upgrade to a priority lot.

And when does it start? Does it mean whomever got lucky enough to get priority parking (A or B) this year is just going to be able to keep that and prevent anyone who didn't from being able to get priority parking?

What about faculty and staff hired throughout the year? Are they simply out of luck for ever receiving priority parking? How would speciality permits like carpools and LEV be handled?

2:

Fine as is, anyone should be able to opt out or downgrade parking at whatever point they choose, though it should still be done on a monthly basis, so TAPS doesn't have to do prorating or back pay for anyone who opts out mid-month.

3:

This is ridiculous. What does this say to new faculty and staff but UC Merced doesn't care about you if you're new? How do we attract quality staff and faculty when we tell them they are lesser and can't have any perks like priority parking?

Founding staff and faculty: what does that mean? When's the cutoff? Campus opening? Year after campus opening? Prior to campus opening? Long term staff and faculty already get many other perks, priority parking doesn't need to be one of them.

Again, this process would prevent new hires or employee from ever having a shot at priority parking, it's stupid. A waiting list absolutely should be established, but TAPS should be clear in how it is maintained and how sports are granted, and when. Also, again, what about new employees? Are they simply out of luck until enough current employees leave?

4. Not enough clarification here. Is this all undergraduate student employees and graduate students or just those in research positions? Why do student employees in general or research students in particular need priority in parking? This seems to imply that we are prioritizing research over instruction, which is a horrible stance for a UC to take.

5. All students should have parking permits based on a first come, first served basis. So should staff and faculty, really. How else can you be fair?

When developing this proposal, did anyone on the committee look at the parking policies for other UCs? This seems far different from the other UCs I have been at. Perhaps we should use the experience of other UCs to help inform our own policies.

Feb 18 2015  
11:33AM

Sounds fair.

Feb 18 2015  
11:31AM

Agree with 1, 2 3. Ambivalent re 4 and 5.

Feb 18 2015  
11:31AM

I like this idea. Waiting in line for at least an hour last year was not the best use of my work time.

Feb 18 2015  
11:30AM

Automatic renewals are a great idea, as is generating a wait list. Thanks!

Feb 18 2015 11:28AM seems legit.  
We should encourage all staff to bike to work always.

Feb 18 2015 11:26AM I agree with this improved method. I've come to accept having to pay to come to work. I still resent having to give up a good deal of personal time every month to the distance I need to walk to afford parking.

Feb 18 2015 11:24AM Automatic renewal of current parking permits in August is much more convenient and easier.

Feb 18 2015 11:23AM This sounds like a reasonable solution to me.

Feb 18 2015 11:22AM I think this is a great idea and think this would streamline the process for all involved.

Feb 18 2015 11:20AM # 1 - agree  
#2 - agree  
#3 - disagree, 1st come 1st serve  
#4 - agree  
#5 - agree

Feb 18 2015 11:25AM I endorse this proposal! Having to actively select and renew a permit each year has created many issues for faculty and staff. I do wonder how effective the wait list will be and how the process for assigning the high demand lot permits will be established. This seems like the only area of potential concern in this process.  
  
Thanks so much for addressing this issue and for the opportunity to provide feedback!!!

Feb 18 2015 11:22AM While I think that seniority is an important thing to consider, I also believe that need and usage is more relevant. If you have someone who has been here since day one but rarely needs to park in the most desired lot then it would not make sense to give them that pass just because. If you have someone who have two years of experience but is constantly in and out of the buildings near the most desired lot would it not make more sense to allow them to use it?

Feb 18 2015 11:20AM RE: #3 - Giving seniority to longer serving employees seems strange. I've been employed here since 2005 but don't see that I'm any more important than someone employed here for less time. Perhaps it should be first come first serve with wait-lists purged and reopened at some fixed time each year.  
The other four seem reasonable. In fact, employees with the permit referred to in #1 should have a permit that doesn't expire. That would save the cost of printing and re-distributing permits each year.

Feb 18 2015 11:19AM Teaching assistants should be given the same priority as staff members and should also be allowed to keep their seniority even if they take a semester off. I work in the school of natural science in instructional support and work with a lot of TAs where the way they are scheduled makes it very important that they have access to a parking pass. The reason for this is the change over times between labs is very small and our TAs might have time constraints related to weather, required breaks, office hours, classroom visits, ect.  
  
Also undergraduates with jobs on campus should have priority over non-employed undergraduates, my job has 8 student workers and without them coming to work on time there is a chance of a lab not running on time which would affect the PLOs for a student lab course.

Feb 18 2015 11:19AM This plan only works with a stable number of parking passes. With TAPS constantly taking parking slots away, it will soon be greatly out of balance (people vs slots).

Feb 18 2015 11:17AM 1- This is acceptable as long as TAPS has a system in place to ensure that employees on leaves during the auto-renewal period remain eligible for the parking permit they want with priority, but are not charged for that permit if they have submitted the proper notification to TAPS. I have heard of issues related to employees being on leaves and being charged by TAPS in the past, even when they have notified the office, with that already being an issue I expect auto-renewal would be a problem.  
  
2- Clearly define what opting out of a parking permit at any time means, will the employee receive money back for a month that they have already paid for if they choose to opt out in the middle of the month?  
  
4- Student employees are eligible for priority parking? What do hiring managers need to submit to you to ensure their current student employees receive priority?  
  
5- Does this continue to only make them eligible for the current student lots?

Feb 18 2015 11:17AM Agreed in General with some comments

On 3 --> Waiting list priority to be defined based on staff/faculty service credit with UC Merced.

On 4 --> will GSIs and GSRs get higher priority than regular staff as defined in #3. If so then staff/faculty with higher service credit are not given fair chance.

Feb 18 2015 11:16AM This proposal is a reasonable, scalable solution to ending the chaos that occurs during the current renewal process.

Feb 18 2015 11:16AM I like the auto renewal and seniority proposal. The system totally jammed up last August when it opened. Really a mad scramble.

Feb 18 2015 11:16AM I don't know what "GSIs" and "GSRs" are--abbreviations should not have been used.

Feb 18 2015 11:15AM I agree with this proposal. As a founding staff member, I especially like the fact that we will be recognized for our years of service.

Feb 18 2015 11:15AM #3 - priority should be given to years of service at UCM. No credit for other UCs, otherwise people will get bumped out of permits.

There should also be a priority for people that must park on campus. I am a single mom and my children are in daycare. I get in at 8:30 because I have to drop them off at school so I have to stay until 5:30. Daycare closes at 6. I cannot take the bus and get there by 6. This parking permit situation is literally a "I must have a parking permit or I don't work here" situation. I've tried the rideshare program and it has never been successful. There needs to be a "hardship priority" category, that is used on a case by case basis. I hardly see the reason why someone that has worked here 10 years should be given a permit over me, when they could ride the bus and I literally can't. Any why someone that has worked here for 10 years should affect my ability to work here.

Feb 18 2015 11:14AM I like it. It will eliminate a lot of headaches, but I'm sure it won't eliminate all of them. Complainers will find a reason to complain.

Feb 18 2015 11:14AM

1. yes
2. yes
3. no
4. yes
5. yes

Feb 18 2015 11:13AM I agree with all.

Feb 18 2015 11:10AM I don't think priority should be given for seniority.

Students first! They won't get parking? I think this sends the wrong message.

Feb 18 2015 11:10AM This seems fair to me. I think automatic renewal for permanent employees will save time and resources as well.

Feb 18 2015 11:10AM I like the idea of having automatic renewal. The only problem I foresee is how we are to find out that we lose our high demand parking permit, or are eligible.

Feb 18 2015 11:10AM Ok

Feb 18 2015 11:09AM I agree!