



# Meeting Minutes

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

May 9, 2017

10:30AM – 12:00PM

Location: Facilities Services Building A Conference Room

---

**Attendees:** Karin Groth, James Nardello, Tibor Toth, Arokiaraj Panneer Selvam, Jessica Ross, Coty Ventura, Peter Reschke, George Gongora, Vanessa Hauser, Katherine Shurik, Eric Walle

**Attendees on Zoom:** Sonia Johnston

**Call to order:** 10:30am

**4/11/17 Meeting Minutes approved:** George – Motion to approve. Coty – Second. Approved.

Karin – Vanessa is here for Martin and Coty is here for Andres.

### AVC Updates

Tibor – 2020 project updates. The big topics of discussion are how we will handle circulation for phase 1. The challenge we are having are the roadways won't be ready for phase 1 or 2. We are working with the developer on how will we have pedestrian traffic as well as vehicular and service/support traffic. I'm told that those phased circulation plans will soon be provided. As soon as they are vetted to a reasonable solution I can share that with the committee. In regards to the parking lot solar project, we've been told by the developer that they are having problems obtaining materials to start on time. We are waiting on a schedule from the developer. Apparently there is a worldwide steel shortage that has caused a delay in obtaining the raw materials so they can fabricate the parts. We are working with them on a reasonable schedule that will minimize the impact to the fall semester.

Karin – Do you have an update on the phase 1 delivery of parking? My understanding was that it was on target with August.

Tibor – I don't know the exact timeframe. What makes parking different is that it will be delivered prior to first completion due to them removing other parking spots. All parking has to be delivered by July 2018 but I haven't seen the firm schedule as to when P4-1 would be delivered to campus.

Karin – The schedule I've seen is before the start of fall semester 2017 so as I understand is that P4 phase 1 will be delivered just before the start of fall semester this year. As we know, no change to that piece of it.

Vanessa – What is p4-1 on the map?

Karin – P4 is that entire section. It was originally to be delivered in 3 phases but now the developer has expanded the first delivery to be about 1800 spaces which is the green and yellow on the map.

Vanessa – So we will have that this year?

Karin – Fall this year. In 2 to 3 months.

Tibor – We shared this before, but remember that the developer provided lots will be asphalt drive ways with gravel stalls, similar to Lake Lot 2.

## Parking Updates

Karin – Looking at the board, this is the hard work that this committee has done to come up with permit rates and the phased approach of when they would be implemented. I had the change to present these to VC Reese and he was very appreciative and thought the process was very thorough and well thought out. It seemed to be reasonable with one caveat. Because of the updates that AVC Toth brought up in regards to the delay in the solar project, trying to minimize the impact to parking in the fall semester 2017, as well as the uncertainty of P4 phase 1 and the circulation plan. His decision is that we still maintain this same schedule of rate increases but push it out a year. No rate increases for 17/18 but shift them out by one year. The first increase would occur in fall 2018. We talked about the North Bowl and that that has been a very low rate and should have been a higher rate some time ago. We talked about the discussions we had and about how we came up with that, but given the constraints and challenges of our different projects, he felt it was in the best interest to give the community about a year's notice. Before he leaves in June he will announce to the campus that there will not be an increase yet, but this is what we can anticipate for the fall of 2018.

Raj – This is good.

Karin – Depends on who you are.

Raj – Will this impact any of your projects since this will delay the funds that you may have been expecting?

Karin – From a financial position this pushes us out another year to start getting us into a position where we going in the right direction. I'm working with the budget office and they are working on an auxiliary proforma business model. We will continue to work with them to come up with a complete auxiliary budget to work with. They aren't in the dark as to what our currently challenges are both operationally and financially.

Tibor – To add to the complexity of this is in the past it was up to TAPS to obtain the debt. With the triple P model we are also making developer payments based on the availability of the parking lots. So the complexities of how we forecast expenses is it has significantly complicated the business model.

Karin – I met with the budget office late last week and talked about how our current proforma had us set at a debt ratio at 1.25 to justify future build. We are switching direction now on how we manage our business. With the more aggressive payoff schedule of our debt, the debt to the developer, and the leaner parking ratios, it really changes how we manage our business and how we set up that model for future projections. The budget office understands our concerns. They have brought on some new team members to help and support us.

Eric – Does that mean that we had approved the 2017 increases so they are saying those same increases are now for 2018 and are approved and the 2019 and 2020 are still proposed?

Karin – Yes, we are just shifting.

Eric – Any progress on the citations? There was discussion last time about those who don't pay.

Karin – That isn't a decision that needs to be made by VC Reese but is us being able to present where we are with bad debt. That was part of my conversation with the budget office. They are aware that in order for us to continue and generate more revenue. How do we manage that? Student affairs, judicial affairs, registrar's office and getting them on board. Over the course of the next year, even though we aren't having permit increases, it doesn't mean we will be stagnant on the other initiatives.

Eric – Will we just plan to revisit the 2019 and 2020 rates?

Karin – Over the course of the next year you mean?

Eric – My question is that I was not in favor of those rates that are now the 2020 plan and I didn't know if that was something we would discuss now or if we would wait. Specifically the North Bowl 1 and the

preferred permits being the same as opposed to the North Bowl 1 and 2 being the same and the A being slightly above it.

Tibor – I recommend that we have those conversations at a later date, once we better understand what the new parking locations will be, and what the circulation plans will be and the solar parking lots are actually delivered. We have more time now.

Karin – I showed VC Reese the draft of what we would want him to send to the campus community. What I propose is that the committee agree that we push what was recommended for 2017 to the 2018 rate and that we have the proposed 2019 and 2020 on there as well. Or we could re-word what we want him to say. We have more time. What we see in current is really going to be 2017. What is 2017 is what will be in 2018. Then we can decide what we want included in the notification to VC Reese.

Eric – So we will discuss this today?

Karin – Yes, it could simply be that this is the recommendations for 2019 but we will go through a process in the committee on a final recommendation.

Peter – So what are now going to be 2018 rates, are those still up for discussion?

Karin – No those are approved and passed.

Karin – I want to move on to discussion on to LEV. There have been ongoing questions and concerns about the dissolving of that permit type. None of the other UCs offer a discounted permits for low emission vehicles. That was a recommendation we made two years ago for dissolving those for student and that is what will happen going forward for faculty and staff. The good news is that because we have grandfathered those with existing LEV permits, those will continue to roll over through the next year but we will no longer offer that a year from now.

Peter – When was that decided?

Karin – A couple years ago we decided to stop offering the student LEV permit.

Peter – Do you know the date on that?

James – I'm not sure that would have been a voting item, but instead more of an operational item.

Karin – It was operational. As a campus we can either offer a discounted permit or dedicated spaces to qualify for LEED certification. We are looking at other campuses and what they offer. How do they manage that business? We will continue to have that conversation after we have all the permit recommendations done. I can tell you that there is a mandate that we have a certain number of charging stations. We are looking at what that number is and where we will install those. How many we will incorporate in P4 as well as in existing lots.

James – From my understanding, there is not a single campus that offers a low emissions rate. For those that have it, the rolling over of their rates has been a big benefit.

Tibor – It's important to point out that's in addition to the federal and state credits they get, somewhere in the order of \$10,000.

Karin – There is \$7,500 federal tax credit plus an additional \$2,500 rebate from the state of California. So for those that have those vehicles they are already receiving incentives so at point can the campus stop giving discounts.

Tibor – They also get tax incentives. There are already a lot of tax benefits provided by the community.

Eric – So getting rid of LEV, and going to ZEV.

Karin – And going to ZEV figuring out how to incorporate the charge and parking. I don't have that answer yet.

Vanessa – What is ZEV?

Karin – Zero emission vehicle.

Vanessa – I don't see the H pass, the housing pass. Can we talk about that?

Karin – Sure, so this year for residents, no on-campus parking.

Vanessa – What about fall 2017?

Karin – Currently no on-campus parking but when there is the availability and we can bring it back, the rate will be the reserved rate.

Vanessa – What is the reserved rate? \$96 per month? Currently for them to park remotely that is how much?

Karin – Currently \$27. In regards to the M permit, motorcycle, I do want to have a rate that makes sense. When I look at what other campuses are charging I want to make sure we aren't overpricing it at \$45. I want to bring the data to the table so we can look at it.

Eric – Can they park in any lot?

Karin – There is a student M permit and a faculty/staff M permit.

George – For the semester prices we aren't differentiating between student and staff?

Karin – Same rate, just where you can park.

Peter – We keep hearing that we are comparing our pricing to other UC campus. What is the reason behind that? What makes UC Merced comparable to the urban campuses?

Karin – I've been here since 2007 and all the discussions of rates and violation amounts. When we talk about rate structure, as well as citation amounts, we've done an analysis including what the rates look like in the geographic community. We look at Merced College, Fresno, Stan state, and other UCs. We look at other campuses and consider our demographics and look at that so we don't overprice ourselves. If you look at UC system-wide, we most often compare ourselves to UC Riverside as we are most comparable to them and we are right in line with them.

Peter – I looked at campuses more regionally close to us, Fresno and Stan State, and we are definitely more expensive than they are. I'm wondering what is so different in the cost to maintain a parking system here that makes us more expensive.

Tibor – Keep in mind the rate of expansion. We are going to be doubling the size of the campus in the next three years. In order to pay for future parking spots that revenue comes from people who pay for parking. I don't think those other campuses are growing at the same percentage that we are. Frequently we are asked why we don't have a parking structure instead of a lot. It is simply because we need to have a revenue base to pay for that structure. Likewise, our rates have to be comparable to the rate of growth.

Karin – State schools are different. California State Universities are different than the UC system.

Sonia – That's what I was going to make sure the committee understood.

Karin – Parking services is an auxiliary, we don't receive state funds. We have to be self-supporting. Different than a state or private school. Those institutions are not obligated to pay into the local, county and state funds on paid citations so how they handle their business is different. The regulations are set up differently. You have to consider that also when looking at the rate structure.

Tibor – Does that answer the question?

Peter – That helps, yes.

Eric – Karin, you'd mentioned some concern about the motorcycle, do you think it's too low or too high?

Karin – I think maybe a little bit too high. I thought that maybe to be fair we could bring it back to the table and we could review what that looks like at other campuses and maybe we could reconsider our recommendation.

Tibor – I'm an avid motorcyclist myself and based on the demand, there are a lot of motorcycle spaces available. That tells me that there isn't sufficient incentive to have people want to ride their motorcycles. By lowering the price that may incentivize more people to ride their motorcycles.

Karin – Keep in mind that impacts revenue. I'm trying to see both sides. I want the opportunity, based on looking across the UC system and looking at their proposals for rate increases, to make sure that the motorcycle rate falls in line.

George – What percentage of people that drive also have motorcycles?

Tibor – I'd say there is maybe 7 motorcycles on campus.

James – There's more than that. Maybe 7 faculty/staff and 15-20 student on average.

George – So if we lowered it, do you really think it would incentivize that many more people to ride?

Eric – If you aren't riding one now, this won't make them go buy one to save \$15 per month for parking.

Tibor – I don't know. It's the same way with bicycle, carpool, and vanpool. How do we get away from the single occupancy vehicle?

George – It's really the money you might lose out on if someone rides a motorcycle is really just a drop in the bucket.

Katherine – I know there are carpool parking in the student parking area. Are there spaces in P4 and P3 also? Will there be spaces?

Karin – There will be. Currently Lake Lot 1 is sticker permit only and there are dedicated carpool spaces in Lake Lot 1.

Katherine – What about back here in the graduate student lot?

James – There are 10 carpool spaces in North Bowl and they are in close proximity to the entrance.

Eric – If you ride a motorcycle you get a close spot, right?

Katherine – I think that would be incentive enough for those who are daring enough to ride them.

James – Karin has said in the past that it's not difficult to commute in Merced. No matter where you are coming from it doesn't take long to get to campus. That is why it's hard to get people to carpool.

Karin – When we collect our data and we are analyzing mode share, we are really trying to look at how to manage the rate increase and parking so we don't have overbuild. And we manage our ridership and incorporate bike-share programs and looking at circulation. We are at a pivotal time where we are going to see a lot of shift. As rate increases happen we will see a shift in transit ridership. I wish the transit hub would be delivered in first phase, but it's not. How do we make the circulation less painful in the interim? Where we place the carpool spaces at first delivery of P4 will change when we have substantial completion. At substantial completion we will want those spaces closer. About 4 or 5 years ago we did a study of a bike share program. UC Irvine had the dedicated bike pods, lockers, where you could rent a bike so we looked at the cost and how to bring that to UC Merced. The demand wasn't there yet. As part of the 2020 design and the discussions we've had with the team, with the transit hub we've said we want to have incorporate bike pods and a rental program. We are looking at that as an initiative to help make it a better experience for our customers and help them feel like they don't have to rely on parking. They can use transit to get to campus and there will be options for them to help with circulation. Those are initiatives that are coming over the next few years.

Katherine – What is the situation as far as the bus service? I know there are areas in town that they don't have service. It's a hassle even when there is a nearby stop, due to frequency I guess.

Karin – That is an agenda item and we will get to the transit RFP.

Jessica – What are the motorcycle rates for other campuses?

Karin – I'm waiting for my colleagues to update the matrix.

Jessica – I'm looking at UC Riverside and it's about \$19 per month. UC Davis looks like \$23. So ours does seem high.

Karin – That's why I wanted to bring it to the table. Keep in mind too that something they do is that if your motorcycles is your only vehicle you use to get to campus it is at a different rate versus if you have a motorcycle and a vehicle as a supplement. Before we move on I want to make sure we finalize what we want to send to VC Reese. For the fall there is no rate increase. It will freeze for 17/18. Then the 2018 is now the recommendations. We can give the campus notification a year in advance. Let's please come up with a specific wording for 19/20.

Eric – One option would be to not include 19/20. That would be the simplest but most vague.

Karin – Not my recommendation.

Eric – Another option is to only include one of the years.

Karin – Yes. So 2019.

Eric – We have to really talk about what those numbers really are. For me it's not if we include 2020 or not, it's that I don't agree with those numbers.

Karin – We all agreed on 2019, it was passed and 2020 is where we had disconnect. If we can say that we are going to message up to VC Reese that the freeze will be extended one more year. At 2018 2019 it is the rate structure we worked out is recommended and

Katherine – With further discussion for 2020.

Eric – The biggest sticking point is North Bowl 1 and the A permit being the same. I'm trying to figure out how to make the A permit more expensive than North Bowl 1 without it being a totally separate type of permit. The only way I can see to do that is to make North Bowl 1 and 2 the same. I was curious if that would actually increase revenue because there are more spaces in North Bowl 2. I don't know how many spaces are in each lot but you could actually increase revenue that way.

James – 609 in North Bowl 2.

Eric – Even though North Bowl 1 would be less, North Bowl 2 would be more so it would net an increase.

Karin – You are saying that North Bowl 1 and 2 would be equivalent?

Eric – Yes, but that would impact other people who aren't me. So we'd want to hear from them.

Peter – I'd say keep it how it is that North Bowl is the same as the commuter lots.

Karin – But it's really not.

James – It's really not, especially as you continue to blow out where the parking is.

Peter – It is as it is now.

Karin – But it won't be in 3 months. In 3 months the commuter lot's going away.

Peter – Whatever the commuter lot price is, it should be the same rate but a kept as a separate permit type for faculty, staff and graduate students are closer.

James – But in 3 months the building won't have been completed down at the front of campus whereas here where the core of campus is North Bowl is closer.

Tibor – Can't faculty and staff choose to have the commuter parking lot? That option is available to them. So anyone can choose a commuter parking lot if they want. I do see a strong differentiation between the two but you still have the option to do that one if you don't want to pay for the convenience.

Vanessa – What is the commuter lot? P4?

Tibor – Yes, P4

Karin – North Bowl 1 and 2 will be closer in proximity and considered prime real estate.

Peter – But only until they compete the P4.

James – No because you will still have the north section of campus.

Karin – Your question is valid, it just depends on who you are talking to. For me as staff member who works back here, this is prime. P4 at substantial completion, none of that is attractive to me. It may be a point where we start saying that where you work means you are required to park in a certain area. We've done that before and we can have those discussions about allocation.

Peter – I think that makes sense. Right now, for the bulk of graduate students the closest parking is Le Grand or North Bowl.

Karin – If you look at our grid, P4 quad 3 at substantial completion will be a higher rate because it will be closest in proximity to the new build. It will be like North Bowl 1 and 2.

Vanessa – Does Evolution lot exist right now?

Karin – It does right now, but when they deliver P4-1, all of Lake 1, Lake 2, Evolution Valley lot, and Evolution Valley Road will be taken.

Vanessa – What you'd said was P4-1 is being delivered this fall, which means that Lake 1, 2 and Evolution Valley is gone by fall of this year.

Karin – Yes.

Tibor – It may be a phased approach rather than all at once.

Karin – Originally yes, but they've come back and said no. If you look at what they are doing with Lake Lot 2, at substantial completion it becomes P5. It exists but it's redesigned.

Vanessa – So Lake Lot 2 goes. So when you park in P4 how do you get to campus?

Karin – That is what Tibor was talking about with circulation plans. There have been discussions that pedestrian traffic would be routed to Lake Road then up that path. There were safety concerns with that plan. Then they talked about where they could incorporate a pedestrian pathway in the area of Mammoth Lakes Road. There are different options on the table. Safety is the number one concern and making it less painful if possible.

Vanessa – Will that will be considered the commuter lot?

Karin – Yes.

Vanessa – Is that also where residents could park?

Karin – Not necessarily. We will have to have those discussions. When P4 is at substantial completion, we are looking at how to allocate parking to include, not only the student commuter base, faculty and staff, but also include charging stations, event parking for the conference center, and where can we put resident parking. Some options have even included that P3 could be resident parking.

Tibor – The other element to consider is the space ratios. Population to the number of spaces is much leaner. There will not be as many open spaces for people to park in which means there will be less permits available.

Vanessa – When you price \$96 per month for the housing H permit, for when those spots come available, we don't know where that is?

Karin – Correct and we will include you in those discussion. Part of what we need to consider with the Bellevue expansion and that roadway, the number of vehicles that will include vehicles, buses, bikes, pedestrians, service vehicles, and deliveries, all using that same roadway. Does it make sense to put housing parking, where it's basically garaging, in that location and minimize the amount of traffic coming in and out, or do we incorporate housing somewhere within those quadrants of P4. These are all things we need to consider when talking about allocation.

Tibor – Does that even make sense to have them on campus when there is such a demand for spaces?

Eric – Do we want to re-discuss that right column?

Karin – We have other topics to address today so I'd like to get through what we feel confident giving to VC Reese so he can make that announcement to the campus community. We have consensus and we know that he has made the decision to freeze rate for 17/18. Then we push those rates to 18/19. Do we have consensus that those rates make sense with the exception of the motorcycle? We will revisit 2020. Do we have a motion?

Eric – Do we want to send VC Reese the proposed increases for 2018 and 2019 as they are on the board?

Karin – The blue 2018 is what the rate will be for fall 18/19

Eric – Then the 2019 will be the rate for the 19/20 academic year. So we are giving customers three years of rates. Next year is the same, the following year will be the 2018 rates.

Karin – Yes, then the 2019. Then we will have further dialogue about 2020.

Raj – So three years out.

Eric – Maybe we could say that the 2019 is proposed. I'd like to have some clause that it is proposed contingent on the 2020 project. Is there anything wrong with putting something vague like that in there?

Tibor – Or we could say forecasted rate.

Karin – Where you are going back to is the North Bowl 1 and 2 \$65 rate. Those were your concerns. Speaking from the financial side it could make more sense to have North Bowl 2 a different rate as it will generate more revenue. I'm not opposed to including that the 2019 rate is proposed at this point.

Raj – When you say proposed, it's subject to change?

Eric – It's just that it's not set in stone. I think if you give the customer a plan without a clause, I don't want them to freak out if it changes.

Karin – Based on my most recent discussions with the budget office, until we can get their model to use for projects, I would support including a statement that says that 2019 is proposed because I know we will work aggressively with the budget office in the coming year.

Eric – And when we passed it on it had that contingent on things staying the same and things aren't going to stay the same.



Tibor – Based upon current conditions.

Eric – I'd want a similar sort of clause for that.

Karin – I can support that.

Eric – Then we leave 2020 out.

Peter – Are the rate numbers up for discussion?

Karin – We've approved the numbers for 2018.

Eric – 2019 is proposed.

Peter – Can we change the proposed numbers is my question?

Eric – For 2019?

Karin – No, we voted and those were approved as proposed.

Eric – We are still sharing them as being proposed which is exactly what was passed.

Peter – When would it be possible to change those in the future? What circumstances would allow us to revisit that? Why can't we do that today?

Karin – Because we don't have enough information.

Peter – What information would be need to solidify or change those numbers?

Eric – I think there are two conversations. One is what we need in this committee and the other is what we want to tell the customers. I'd rather not tell them what we need as a committee and just say that we will revisit it. Because we may get a big backlash.

Tibor – Is the issue you have, when will the 2019 column rates be discussed and finalized as a committee?

Karin – Over the next year.

Tibor – Over the course of the next 12 months the rates will be solidified. The 2019 rates will be finalized.

Karin – Let me use UC Santa Cruz as an example. They are also going through changes on campus and they gave their customers a year's notice of the new rate increase and we are giving them a year notice of the rate increase and two years notice of the proposed increase. If anything changes that still gives them a year's notice. There is plenty of time to prepare for this.

Eric – We are always thinking two years ahead.

Karin – Some campuses don't give a year notice. Some only give two or six months. We are being kind in setting the stage will in advance.

Peter – I doubt their increases are this dramatic.

Karin – Oh yeah.

Tibor – I want to be mindful of our time. It sounds like we've reached consensus that we have the current rates and the 2018 rates. We are going to share the proposed rates for 2019 are to be finalized over the next 12 months. Right now we are giving them actually three years' worth of information.

Karin – Yes.

Eric – I would propose a motion to advise VC Reese to tell the customers of the 2017 rates, which are the same, the 2018 rates that are up there, and that we are also sharing with the customer the proposed rates

for 2019. Those rates are still up for discussion in the committee and will be over the next 12 months as conditions on the ground continue to change.

Raj – Should we fix the time at 12 months or

Karin – Academic year. 2017/2018 academic year.

Peter – Should we have a motion of that column first?

Karin – That is already done and VC Reese has already accepted that.

Katherine – I second the motion.

Tibor – All in favor? Opposed? One opposed. Motion carried.

### New Initiatives

Karin – I want to share with you some of the new initiatives we are currently working on. I will ask April to chime in as she is very involved with these new systems and the same with Raj. Raj do you want to talk about our UCPath?

Raj – Most of you know that there is an UCPath system coming to campus that will process payroll for our employees. This will change between payroll and TAPS. When an employee buys a permit they through ePay they use payroll deductions. We are to UCPath so anyone buying with a payroll deduction that information has to go to UCPath. Right now it goes to PPS. In the future there will be a batch interface to UC Path. Epay, where people go to buy permits, that has been going through changes. We are going to CashNet.

Karin – These are the current systems we have incorporated into our business. StarRez which is housing information, CashNet, ePay, eDocs, and iTAPS is our in-house permit management system. T2 is our current parking enforcement management system. PPS is payroll. Again StarRez gives us resident information, both on campus and heritage. We do a comparison in StarRez to make sure that students are registered and we verify that based on their units where they fall in their standing. The Oracle system we use, we are classifying freshman as 0 – 29 units, sophomores at 30 – 59, and juniors and seniors at 60 and above. One of our challenges with regard to demand is that freshmen are coming in with more college units. They are coming in with up to 30 units which means they are eligible for parking and that further complicated our business. Our UC Merced iTAPS is our in-house permit management system. We've grown that system but we are to the point where we've outgrown that system and we are looking at how we can have a more comprehensive approach. T2 is currently what we use for citations, appeals, violations and customer profiles. It has the capability to expand into permits and events but right now with the challenges we have and the timelines of all these systems we had to reevaluate if it made sense to continue to use all these systems. CashNet is our existing payment posting. EPay is the payment information in conjunction with CashNet for citation payments and permit purchases. EDoc is the in-house service for events, reservations, and permits. PPS will be obsolete with UCPath coming on board. NuPark is our new parking management software application. What we are doing is pulling all those systems and simplify our processes and how we manage those systems in totality. Looking at the calendar we are going to launch NuPark enforcement module in May. T2 will go away and we will handle enforcement through NuPark. Then in July ePay will merge into NuPark for permit management. Then in December 2018 PPS will be absorbed by UCPath. Our goal then by July is to merge iTAPS, eDoc, and Oracle into NuPark and then by 2018 go live with a more simplified approach with technology. With regard to NuPark, the enforcement piece of it. Right now with permits, our goal is by 2020 to go permit-less. With the enforcement piece of NuPark we have purchased the equipment for license plate recognition. That will streamline the enforcement process. With that we can get through 55 vehicles per minutes. If you look at P4, that's almost a 3,000 space lot, we will be able to get through that lot much more quickly. That is where the parking industry is going and we are trying to stay with it.

Raj – That is a big incentive with that new system. You can also construct a virtual system of how the cars are parked.

Karin – In moving toward going permit-less, one way to manage that, looking at P4 and the colored quadrants, those could be specific zones. Our customers would register their vehicle that that is where they will park and the cameras will register that.

Katherine – I'm trying to comprehend how the system will work. Where are the cameras coming from? Does someone have to walk through with them? How does that function?

Karin – It's all based on your vehicle. The cameras will know if you are a commuter student you are allowed to park in Zone 1. There will be cameras that read as your plate as you enter the zone. It will tell enforcement that you are in the right place.

James – There would be an entry camera and the enforcement vehicle will have a mounted camera that read plates as they drive through the lot.

Katherine – If you have a couple that swap vehicles, do you register both vehicles in that case?

Karin – Yes

Raj – And you can't have both of them at the same time.

James – Yes, it will know if there is more than one on campus.

Katherine – Ok, so if one parks, the other one cannot.

Karin – To go back to the question of enforcement. This technological advancements will allow us to have a more efficient process.

Peter – Will this system eventually save money on personnel cost?

Karin – Yes, you can get through a much larger footprint more quickly. In our parking enforcement proforma we have pulled one of our FTE knowing that we will have this advancement in technology.

Peter – For those faculty that have research spaces. What about research participants?

Karin – You can give authorization so they can register their vehicles to park in a particular zone.

Peter – The research I'm involved in, the families come in every week and their vehicles aren't registered in any system. Their vehicles would be flagged on the camera.

Karin – Another piece of this is the kiosk machines. Our existing kiosk machines are antiquated and no longer supported. We've made the decision to change to Cale. These machines have the capability of departmental reservations. The machines will be in the lot we would give you a reservation number that you would communicate to your guest so when they arrive they punch in the number and that would allow them parking edibility in a certain location.

Eric – We couldn't use the personalized permits anymore? I couldn't write them a permit?

Karin – We are trying to get away from that manual process, to go as automated as possible.

Eric – I like this system but this won't work for working families coming to my lab.

Karin – This system will allow for a lot of flexibility and we can work through the exceptions.

Eric – It's a small percentage of people that we are talking about.

Raj – They can go online if you send them a link.

Eric – A lot don't have computers. Or non-English speaker.

Raj – In the demo it is very flexible. They are better than their competitors and if we ask for something they are very flexible.

Eric – It's just 3 spaces but something to keep in mind

Karin – A lot of these changes will be happening over the next year or two. It falls in line with recommendations on permit rates.

### Transit RFP

Karin – The transit RFP hit the streets. Where we are with that is that the deadline for questions was last week. We have provided answers to their questions. Their proposals are due back to us Friday of next week. We will review and award in June. This is CatTracks campus transit as well as charter service. It requires them to address not only the routes, but also at service levels. We currently have 99.8% on-time service rates. We are keeping those standard high. We also have incorporated them to come back with proposals on what the fleet looks like. We have done extensive analysis on electric buses and how we can incorporate them and the analysis we have done shows that given the right electric vehicle we could ultimately incorporate an almost completely electric fleet. We are really looking for the proposals to address the fleet and the routes and the timing. Very much looking forward to what the looks like?

Katherine – Will we meet next month?

Karin – The proposed is June 13<sup>th</sup>.

Katherine – I will be out of the country.

Karin – Given the fact that we have this rate freeze and we may be able to say we can reconvene in August? Or do we want to meet in July?

Katherine – I may be able to call in for July.

Peter – I'm here all summer.

George – I will be out June 19<sup>th</sup> through August 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Tibor – We'd still have sufficient people.

Katherine – You'd mentioned looking at the bus contract. When are you going to sign it off? Will we able to look at it?

Karin – That is done by a selection committee not this committee. June will be premature. July or August?

Eric – July.

Tibor – July it is.

Peter – Is the move due to the mandate to have X amount of vehicles electric?

Karin – The push to go electric is because it's sustainable and where the industry is going. We outsource our transit system and its turnkey. There is still the mandate that by 2020 25% of our fleet is supposed to be zero emission and by 2025, 50%. This is just our campus fleet. UC Irvine just announced they are going all electric a couple months ago.

### **Next Meeting**

1. Date: July 11, 2017 from 10:30AM-12:00PM
2. Proposed agenda topics
3. Action Items

Meeting adjourned at 11:54am