

TSAC Minutes
December 7, 2016

Present:

Dr. Fuller Bazer
Mr. Mike Caruso
Mr. Ralph Davila
Mr. Joe Dillard
Ms. Susan Edmisson
Mr. David Glockzin
Dr. Zachary Grasley
Dr. Eleanor Green (Ms. Misty Skaggs)
Dr. Angie Hill Price
Mr. Peter Lange
Dr. Clint Magill

Dr. Rajesh Miranda
Mr. Chris Nygren
Mr. Robert Pottberg
Ms. Flora Reeves
Mr. Landon Woods
Ms. Deborah Wright

Guests:

Mr. Christian Trevino

Absent:

Mr. Ja'Cory Clark
Dr. Bob Strawser
Dr. C.J. Woods

1. Dr. Clint Magill opened the meeting at 11:47 am, and asked for a review of the minutes from the November 2, 2016 meeting. Mr. Christian Trevino moved to strike Mr. Nick Page from the list of attendees present; Mr. Chris Nygren seconded. Motion passed. Mr. Chris Nygren moved to change the wording on item 3.2 from "Mr. Chris Nygren asked if there was the potential to remove the reserved numbered spaces from parking lots." to "Mr. Chris Nygren asked for an update on reserved numbered spaces." Motion received a second from Mr. Landon Woods, motion passed. Mr. Joe Dillard moved to approve the minutes as presented with changes; Ms. Flora Reeves seconded; minutes approved.
2. Dr. Magill welcomed Dr. Rajesh Miranda, a designee of the Speaker of the Faculty Senate, and asked the committee members to introduce themselves.
3. Ms. Therese Kucera gave a presentation, "Proposed Waiting List Process Changes," which can be found here: <http://www.transport.tamu.edu/About/tsac.aspx#presentations>
 - 3.1. She mentioned that the Transportation Services Customer Service office is trying to work out a reliable process for Departmental Parking Representatives (DPRs) to report how many employees are expected and when they are expected to report. She mentioned one organization that added 75 employees as needing spaces after permits were issued. A new process would help alleviate a situation like that.
 - 3.1.1. Mr. Robert Pottberg asked if we can change the status of employees who were once students, and are now full time. Ms. Kucera said we have programs that sort this type of thing, but sometimes they slip through. At the end of spring semester, we know students' status each year.
 - 3.2. Ms. Kucera discussed slide 4, "Concerns with the Current Process," and slide 5 (examples) about how the current system sets unrealistic expectations by allowing customers to sign up for many waiting lists for lots they have no chance of getting.
 - 3.2.1. Dr. Magill said it seems that some of the problems might even out with normal attrition.

- 3.2.1.1. Ms. Debbie Hoffmann said that was true, and we do see patterns that help with anticipating waitlist movement. But this fall we had three to five times more new employee parking requirements than in the past – another reason to have a better system for DPR reporting.
- 3.2.2. Mr. Joe Dillard asked if the “end of the year” mentioned on the slides is the end of a calendar year.
 - 3.2.2.1. Ms. Hoffmann said it meant the end of the parking year. The last waitlist move for staff is in June, and for students is before registration opens in April.
- 3.2.3. Dr. Zachary Grasley suggested an idea to free up parking spaces. He gave an example of an employee who paid full price for a space, but only used it two times a week. He suggested a space-sharing system for someone to use the same space the other three days a week.
 - 3.2.3.1. Ms. Hoffmann said we have discussed ideas like this. Only a few other universities in the country have implemented such an idea, and it might be something we would like to implement in the future.
 - 3.2.3.2. Dr. Grasley followed up by asking if there is an option to only purchase partial permits if someone is on a sabbatical (or working a semester overseas).
 - 3.2.3.2.1. Ms. Kucera said if the employee notifies us, we have process for handling such a situation, which includes processing a prorated refund.
 - 3.2.3.2.2. Mr. Peter Lange said that everything Dr. Grasley was suggesting was “spot on,” and the future of university parking will be managed that way. We would like to move in that direction, and the TTI Mobility Study road and parking network scheme gets at some of those issues and potential efficiencies.
- 3.2.4. Dr. Rajesh Miranda asked if we could consider incentives for people to *not* bring cars on campus.
 - 3.2.4.1. Mr. Lange said there are innovative programs like this across the country. For example, Stanford has a parking buyout program in which they pay people to not bring cars onto campus. However, all of these ideas and incentives need to be put together into a very comprehensive package.
- 3.2.5. Mr. Woods asked if someone is on a waitlist and receives the desired lot, how much time they have to accept it.
 - 3.2.5.1. Ms. Kucera said one week, unless it occurs over the holidays, in which the process is extended somewhat.
- 3.2.6. Ms. Kucera mentioned that we already have a process to assign permanent disabled or executive-level administrator spaces. And we have a process in place for when entire offices move to add them to a waiting list in months of service order.
- 3.2.7. Mr. Trevino asked about the current waitlist for Cain.
 - 3.2.7.1. Ms. Kucera answered that there wasn’t one now, but there will be one next year.

3.3. Ms. Kucera asked the committee for feedback on the proposed changes to the waiting list procedure by our next meeting, February 1, 2017, so we can communicate a new, updated plan.

3.3.1. Dr. Angie Price said the only big change she observed in the proposed plan is for those who didn't register or want to change registration during the year.

3.3.1.1. Ms. Kucera responded that was true, with the exception of students coming to later New Student Conferences. We know who they are and can handle their requests. Ms. Hoffmann mentioned that during registration we get so many requests and fill lots so quickly that anyone who adds themselves after registration has no chance to receive certain lots – thus the need for a new processing system.

3.3.1.2. Dr. Hill Price asked if it would help to give students three choices instead of six.

3.3.1.2.1. Ms. Hoffmann said we have discussed it, but have decided six was the right number.

3.3.1.2.2. Mr. Lange said an exception might be made for resident students, to give them two choices and if they don't receive their choice we would assign them West Campus Garage.

3.3.1.2.3. Ms. Hoffmann said when students are registering we can't immediately tell if they will or won't be residents, because Residence Life hasn't assigned housing yet. Therefore, we cannot offer the two choices at that time.

3.3.2. Mr. Lange said the point of the waiting list procedure change is to help manage customer expectations of the process.

3.3.2.1. Dr. Miranda noted that it seems like there needs to be a lot of information integration to share across many domains.

3.3.2.1.1. Ms. Hoffmann commented that we do integrate data; however housing isn't finished with assignments when our process is going on.

3.3.3. Mr. Pottberg wanted to know if we wipe out the waitlist every year, Ms. Hoffmann said we do.

3.3.4. Dr. Grasley asked if it is students telling Customer Service that they are disappointed in the process.

3.3.4.1. Ms. Kucera said for the most part it was the students reporting disappointment.

3.3.4. Mr. Dillard asked if students know their position on the waitlist when they place themselves on one.

3.3.4.1. Ms. Hoffmann said they do not know during registration, because we are only collecting data, then we assign permits. Anyone not receiving their first choice at that time finds out their position on the list. Beginning August 1st, anyone who adds themselves to a list knows their position immediately.

3.3.5. Mr. Dillard reiterated the point that faculty and staff need to be proactive to let their DPRs know about employees leaving and those expected for the next year.

3.3.6. Ms. Hoffmann recapped the goals of the proposed waiting list changes, which will:

- Make much more parking available for purchase for employees online, without having to go through their DPRs, and in turn, waiting for a response from our office.
- Shrink the list of lots on wait list to what is realistically available.

4. Mr. Lange presented “Where Does Your Parking Dollar Go?” which can be found here: <http://www.transport.tamu.edu/About/tsac.aspx#presentations>.

4.1. He mentioned that we’ve sold 1,500 permits in Cain Garage; with most of them as lateral moves from West Campus Garage. Several hundred others came from Lot 100. What was surprising is that about 200 who did not have a permit before opted into the system when they purchased a Cain permit. Mr. Lange said that 99% of the permits sold in Cain are to commuter students. We would like to have 400 transient/visitor spaces. If the current ration holds, we can sell 2,000 Cain permits and keep 400 transient spaces. He also noted that the parking guidance system is working well and keeps people parked efficiently.

4.1.1. Ms. Deborah Wright asked about the maximum number of spaces is in Cain Garage, and Mr. Lange responded 1,426.

4.2. Mr. Lange made the point that 58-60% of our inflow comes from permit holders, whereas other universities depend on that revenue much more, at about 80%.

4.3. Mr. Lange said the quantity of fines are decreasing with the decline of citations. This can be attributed to:

- Compliance (people are buying into the parking rules)
- Our enforcement officers are pulled in many directions

4.4. Mr. Lange mentioned that we are seeing visitor parking being used as an “à la carte” method of parking instead of buying a permit, or in addition to buying a permit.

4.5. Mr. Nygren asked where our parking profits go.

4.5.1. Mr. Lange responded that profit goes into a parking reserve account.

4.5.1.1. Dr. Magill asked what is required for the reserve.

4.5.1.2. Mr. Lange responded that we are required to have 90 days of operations plus 15% of our annual debt service.

5. The meeting concluded at 1:05 pm.

Next TSAC Meeting: Wednesday, February 1, 2017, Rudder, Room 410