1. Mr. Peter Lange opened the meeting at 11:40 am and asked for a review of the minutes from the October 4, 2017 meeting. Mr. Chris Nygren motioned to approve the minutes as presented; Mr. Mike Caruso seconded; motion passed, minutes approved.

2. Mr. Lange gave a brief update about the Polo Road Garage, (still determining Public-Private Partnership delivery method) the Bizzell Hall Demolition, and the new Student Services Building (SSB) to be built in its place (scheduled for completion in spring 2020). Some have asked if Lot 19 will still be available after the SSB is complete. It will still be available, but with reduced parking availability for several reasons. A new fire lane will come around the building and meet Lot 19, which will affect some parking. Another focus in Lot 19 will be accessibility for our ADA customers. Mr. Lange also mentioned that we’ve invited Campus Architect Lilia Gonzales to attend TSAC meetings when she can, so she can help us keep the Campus Master Plan in view of our discussions, and hear about the issues we discuss concerning policies and construction.

3. Updates:

3.1. Ms. Debbie Hoffmann presented follow-up information to a question from last month’s meeting about the right-turn markings at Bizzell and Ross Streets. We reached out to our contracted engineer about the design and markings, and were assured that the right lane on Bizzell Street at the intersection traveling southbound is properly marked, as it is an unrestricted lane. See diagram below.
We are also conducting a reeducation plan for the Dutch Junction, from November 1st - December 15th, through social media outlets and our website: http://www.transport.tamu.edu/Alternative/bicycles/greenpaint.aspx

3.2. Ms. Hoffmann also addressed a concern stated at last month’s meeting about dangerous bicycle and pedestrian traffic in the area of Ross Street and Bizzell near Wisenbaker. We contacted the UPD and asked for enforcement in that area. We were told a directed patrol would be initiated. Dr. Angie Hill Price asked if we could request a directed patrol along Ross Street from Military Walk to Bizzell.

3.3. Ms. Hoffmann gave an update on mandatory bicycle registration. Registrations are going well. We have extended the free registration deadline from October 31st to November 17th.

3.4. Ms. Hoffmann reported that she and other members of our team met with the president and vice president of the Texas A&M Motorcycle Club and with Jett Black (Student Senate representative on TSAC) about the motorcyclists’ parking concerns. They had a productive dialogue, and were able to brainstorm some creative short and long-term solutions. One long-term solution is our recent addition of 21 motorcycle spaces to the easternmost aisle of Lot 50. We will add 22 more spaces to the southern curb of lot 30d, and add 21 more spaces to Lot 23 between the Chemistry and Francis buildings. Another solution is to offer zone/area parking lots during registration.

4. Mr. Kenny Kimball gave an update on retiree permit usage. We are only able to capture usage data from our gated facilities, but we feel it is a good representation of frequency of use. See presentation: http://www.transport.tamu.edu/About/tsac.aspx#presentations pp. 2-6. (Departmentally Purchased Permits). We learned that 50% of Retiree permit holders access a
garage two or less times each year. (747 of the total issued accessed these facilities during the year). Mr. Kimball asked if the committee thought it was realistic to expect general permit holders to pay for the cost and logistics of providing retiree permits which are not used, in addition to subsidizing those which are used frequently.

4.1. Dr. Hill Price said there is no faculty support for charging a fee for retiree permits, no matter how infrequently they are used. Mr. Lange reiterated the point that the majority of retirees are not using this benefit.

4.2. Mr. Kimball asked if there was support for charging those retirees who use their permits frequently. Ms. Therese Kucera stated that we have about 10 retirees who come to campus and park every day.

4.3. Dr. Hill Price mentioned that part of the privilege of being an Emeritus faculty member was the use of teaching facilities and resources, which includes parking. She also noted that the Emeritus faculty generate income for the university.

4.3.1. Dr. Zachary Grasley made the point that we are trying to come up with a solution for how to address those who abuse the privilege, not the Emeritus faculty. He suggested that Transportation Services could verify a true retiree by getting a letter from an administrator in the retiree’s department.

4.3.2. Mr. Bill Cox said the abusers are not those in Emeritus status. His suggestion was to find the abusers and limit their use somehow, perhaps through identification and feedback from the DPR.

4.3.3. Mr. Nygren suggested a separate hang tag for Emeritus faculty.

4.4. Dr. Hill Price suggested that if a retiree is rehired, that going back through the Departmental Parking Representative (DPR) should be part of the process, so that a status change could be reported.

4.5. Ms. Hoffmann made the point that our department subsidizes permit processing at a cost of about $4.00 per permit. Ms. Kucera made the point that we are also losing revenue on the parking spaces used.

4.6. Mr. Mike Caruso asked if the current instructions to retirees stated the rules. Ms. Kucera said that our instructions are inserted with the permit, and the information says “occasional use.” Mr. Caruso suggested limiting the number of times a permit may be used. Ms. Kucera responded that we can’t capture how frequently retirees use surface lots.

4.7. Mr. Caruso asked if we would limit parking to garages, or if we were also looking to limit parking at west campus and Research Park as well. Mr. Lange responded that the retiree usage “map” looks a lot like business usage, clustered on main campus. He made the point that we don’t hear retirees asking for more access in other locations. They mostly use the UCG for events and meetings.

4.8. Dr. Price reiterated her position that we should have good perks for those who have sacrificed, given to the university, and paid for parking throughout their careers. Mr. Lange responded that those sacrifices are exactly what we have recognized. However, is it worth it to subsidize moving forward?

4.8.1. Ms. Kucera asked if other departments provide perks to retirees. Dr. Hill Price made the point that most other departments don’t have resources that are critical for an employee to go to work. She said the libraries provide computers, books, and other resources, and other departments provide office and lab space.
4.9. Mr. Kimball asked how the committee thought we should approach solutions to the problem of abuse of retiree permits.

4.9.1. Dr. Hill Price suggested that we determine the mailing address of the high-frequency users and see if they live in the area. If they don’t live in the area, that might be an indication that they are allowing others to use their permits.

4.10. Mr. Cox suggested that Emeritus faculty parking privileges be listed at the university HR page as a higher level “perk” than retiree privileges. Reference: https://employees.tamu.edu/benefits/retirement/privileges/

4.11. Mr. Joe Dillard said when we only capture retiree parking in garages, we have the challenge of ascertaining the impact of the permits on parking campus-wide. Since we can’t capture surface lot use, we don’t have a good tool to forecast the impact on who is being displaced, opportunity cost, etc. Mr. Lange responded that we are able to extrapolate reliable data from garage use, since that is where the retirees want to park and park most often.

4.12. Dr. Julie Harlin suggested we survey the retirees concerning their use of the permit.

5. Mr. Kimball thanked everyone for their feedback about retiree permits, and presented information about departmentally purchased permits. See presentation: http://www.transport.tamu.edu/About/tsac.aspx#presentations pp. 7-12.

5.1. Mr. Kimball noted that many departments pay for employees’ permits, depending on type of employee/permit, etc. Other departments do not pay for any permits for employees. He wondered if anyone was concerned that it wasn’t equitable across the entire university. No one on the committee was concerned; all reported that this type of inequity occurs in many areas across different departments.

5.2. Mr. Kimball mentioned we need to come up with solutions to alleviate how much time our department spends to process permits departments pay via IDT. He mentioned that we also need to address the problem of departments paying for all the permits, but putting each in individual employees’ names. When employees terminate, the departments expect a refund. This causes accounting problems for Transportation Services.

5.2.1. After general discussion among committee members about the different solutions offered in the presentation, Ms. Shelly Janac suggested that departments provide employees a parking permit allowance each month as part of their pay. The employee would then purchase the permit with pre-taxed salary, and choose to pay for it on a monthly basis. The allowance would be taxable, but the rate would be negligible. When an employee terminates, there would be no need to provide the department a refund. All agreed that this sounded like a reasonable solution.

6. Mr. Lange commented that we were able to come up with good discussion and brainstorming, and thanked the group. He concluded the meeting at 12:55 pm.

Next TSAC Meeting: Wednesday, December 6, 2017, 11:30 am, Koldus 110-111