

# Transportation Services Advisory Committee

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

## MINUTES OF MEETING

February 21, 2008

**ATTENDEES:** Mike Caruso  
Cheryl Hanks  
Ann Wallingford  
Lallah Howard  
Dr. Howard Kaplan  
Dr. Mike Messina  
Ruth Mullins  
Dr. Sherry Yennello for Dr. Joe Newton  
Dr. Dave Parrott  
Rich Pontious  
Robert Pottberg  
Dr. Angie Hill Price  
Hunter Bollman  
Beth McNeill  
Rod Weis

**ABSENT:** Sheila Amos  
John Summers  
Dr. Alan Love

**GUESTS:** Doug Williams  
June Broughton  
Debbie Hoffmann  
Peter Lange  
Kenny Kimball  
Rose Berryhill

---

### 1.0 Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1 Dr. Price called the meeting to order
- 1.2 All members introduced themselves; 2 two new members Ann Wallingford replacing Cindy Havner and Hunter Bollman replacing Lauren Barron
- 1.3 Requested for members to read the draft minutes and a motion to approve the January 24<sup>th</sup> minutes
  - 1.3.1 Ruth Mullins made a motion to approved minutes as written
  - 1.3.2 Hunter Bollman 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion
  - 1.3.3 No objections to the minutes; approved 15-0

### 2.0 Business

#### 2.1 Visitor Parking Plan

- 2.1.1 7 elements to the plan; day time rate increased, night time rate decreased, consistency in rates, charging in lot 72 at night, additional visitor spaces in lot 50, moving business and campus permits above the gates in UCG and NSG and allowing the departmental reservations about the gates in UGC and NSG
- 2.1.2 Presented to Student Senate and in the parking fee forums on February 18<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>

- 2.1.2.1 Compromised with the student senate to split lot 72 at night; north lot and south lot
  - 2.1.2.1.1 North lot requires a valid TAMU permit
  - 2.1.2.1.2 South lot will continue to be a pay area after 5pm
- 2.1.3 Rich Pontious reported that the student senate overwhelmingly approved the new plan last night; 54:1
  - 2.1.3.1.1 Hunter stated that he informed the Student Senate Members about the forums if they wished to express an opinion about lot 72 or if did not agree with the vote
- 2.1.4 Day time rate increase; ran proformas to see if increased day time rate and addition of pay visitor spaces in lot 72 at night would offset the revenue loss of a lowered night time rate. The proforma indicates it would offset the difference
- 2.1.5 Addition of lot 50 visitor spaces; still in discussion about the exact spaces that should be converted and would have negligible impact on the levels of permits issued to the lot. If we convert some of the unused HCAP spaces to reduce or eliminate impact on lot 50 permit holders
- 2.1.6 Visitors gaining access to upper levels of NSG – can do it. Need to continue to talk about how it would work, and set rules
- 2.1.7 Newton reservation system – developed a prototype and tested proof of concept in UCG that allows access using driver’s license and have ordered equipment for NSG. Equipment has been ordered as of about 5 weeks ago.
  - 2.1.7.1 Could you install a reader that would scan a barcode on a PDA
- 2.1.8 Looking at ability to communicate and implement over the summer for a fall implementation. Committee would like to see a communication and conversion schedule to include warnings for first couple of weeks (in lot 72) after conversion. Focus on education to students about new configuration and rules in lot 72 – in communication, tell students about all the other lots, near lot 72, that are available for night parking with a valid TAMU permit.
- 2.1.9 NSG reservation system, as soon as the equipment is received, installed and tested; around 8 weeks. Likely will need to implement new business permit parking rule with the beginning of the permit year.
- 2.1.10 Suggestion made to call it Amendment to the Current Visitor Parking Plan
- 2.1.11 Dr. Price called for a motion to endorse this plan
  - 2.1.11.1 Ruth Mullins made a motion to endorse the Visitor Parking Plan
  - 2.1.11.2 Motion seconded by Mike Caruso
  - 2.1.11.3 Committee approved; 15-0

**2.2 Conversion of RNS in the University Center Garage**

- 2.2.1 Committee felt that the initial survey was too wordy; email a 5 sentence blurb
  - 2.2.1.1 Ms McNeill stated that faculty would want more information than t his
- 2.2.2 Place the information in the email; state the amount of time it will take; then survey
- 2.2.3 Voting for a preference rather than a survey; last statement should read, if you are affected by the chosen plan, you will be contacted for parking spot options
  - 2.2.3.1 Is it possible the customers to pick their parking spot preference at the same time?
- 2.2.4 Mike Caruso requested for it to state that we are eliminating 50 RNS
- 2.2.5 Debbie Hoffmann asked for clarification on what she was hearing
  - 2.2.5.1 Short section divided by line; additional information below; with an option to take the survey between the two
  - 2.2.5.2 Committee member asked if it was possible for them to provide feedback with the preference choice
- 2.2.6 Debbie will rework the survey and email it to the members

**2.3 Business Permits**

- 2.3.1 Debbie Hoffmann presented the information that business permit holders received with their permit
- 2.3.2 Discussion
  - 2.3.2.1 Mike asked, then abuse is partly because customers are buying the least cost permit and parking in closer lots
  - 2.3.2.2 Perception of business permit holders is that there will always be a space
  - 2.3.2.3 Maybe we just need to re-educate them?
  - 2.3.2.4 Getting passed the gates, in the garage, will help the teaching faculty
  - 2.3.2.5 Parking passed the gates, will then relieve visitor parking needs in the garages?
  - 2.3.2.6 Institute time limits on street UB spaces
    - 2.3.2.6.1 How would you do this?
    - 2.3.2.6.2 What we know as chalking, in the handhelds we can time the vehicle's stay, just like we do in the 30 minute spaces
    - 2.3.2.6.3 Could this be done first to the vehicles parked in UB street spaces first since these are the ones that are most abused.
    - 2.3.2.6.4 Could this new process be communicated in the flyer that you place with the fall permit?
    - 2.3.2.6.5 Rod explained the issues with a time approach; officer chalks the time; goes back chalks again; goes back in three hours issues the citation; people want the car towed by now; creates chances for confrontations
  - 2.3.2.7 Ruth suggested to consider a two tier program where one business permit provide surface lot business parking and a higher priced business permit also provides parking in the garages
  - 2.3.2.8 Mike recommended that customers know the changes in rules before they request for the next year UB permit
  - 2.3.2.9 Ruth suggested a UB54 and UB55 permit; and make lot 54 and 55 not a regular UB lot
  - 2.3.2.10 Mike asked to include asking the departments what exceptions they see for their department
  - 2.3.2.11 Mike asked if could send out communications to let holders know that we are studying the use of UB permits
  - 2.3.2.12 Send notification to the custodians indicating that we will be studying instances of abuse and a reminder of the rules
  - 2.3.2.13 Send a proposal to the current Business Permit custodians and request their feedback if they feel the new rules will prevent any of their staff from accomplishing their business
  - 2.3.2.14 Mr. Weis explained this issue with identifying each permit with stickers; is labor intensive; takes hours to hand place the stickers on permits
  - 2.3.2.15 Dr. Parrott asked we could set some type of method/rules for abuse
    - 2.3.2.15.1 Dr. Price recommended notifying department heads
  - 2.3.2.16 Dr. Price asked for suggestions for changes
  - 2.3.2.17 Dr. Parrott liked Mike Caruso's ideal to send out communication that we are studying the abuse of UB permits
  - 2.3.2.18 Dr. Price asked if Rose could send the notes that she has typed to the member so that they could prepare some rules for use
    - 2.3.2.18.1 Members could come up with a language for rules
    - 2.3.2.18.2 This was agreeable with the committee members

## **2.4 Resident Student Parking**

- 2.4.1 Peter Lange stated that he and Rod had met with Student Senate, and this morning with the Resident Hall Association President, Michelle Berry
- 2.4.2 Commuters are not moving from four resident parking areas when they move from the dorms; 1400 spaces utilized by students that do not reside on campus
- 2.4.3 Dr. Parrott said that this would have a great impact on students living on campus, being closer to the dorms, it would be safer for the students
- 2.4.4 Asked if Ron Sasse knew about these numbers
- 2.4.5 Ruth requested that she have time to present this to the Graduate Student Council before the committee voted to pass it
- 2.4.6 Peter explained that we would like to have the committee support; they are not voting to pass; Needs to also have a resolution from the Student Senate and a memo from RHA showing support.
  - 2.4.6.1 Then request for assignment changes would then need to go on up
- 2.4.7 Dr. Price asked for a motion to support changing the permit assignment process
  - 2.4.7.1 Dr. Parrott made the motion to change the permit assignment process
  - 2.4.7.2 Hunter Bollman suggested waiting until next meeting so that he can have time to get student input
  - 2.4.7.3 Deferred until the next TSAC

- 3.0 Dr. Price asked for a motion to adjourn
  - 3.1 Rich made a motion to adjourn
    - 3.1.1 Motion seconded by Hunter Bollman
    - 3.1.2 Committee agreed

Other Topic(s):

### **Tasks to be completed;**

1. Finalize the student assignment process
2. Parking for University Vehicles
3. Visitor Validation Process
4. Vehicles parking on sidewalks

Next TSAC Meeting, March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2008 at 11:30 a.m., MSC, Room 206