

Advisory Committee on Transportation

13 December 2023, 3:00 PM EST

Minutes

Call to Order: 3:02 PM

Slide 2: Agenda

- Parking Allocation Process
 - Existing Process
 - Recommended Changes
- “Path to BOT” Approval
- Next Steps
 - Next ACT January 17

Slides 3-6: Reflection

- Spring 2023 Goal – Inform, Educate, and Listen
 - “Discovery Phase”
 - Launched Campus Survey and received over 4,000 responses
 - Conducted focus groups with stakeholder groups
- Summer 2023 Goal – Refine and Develop Initial Recommendations
 - Analyzed campus feedback for key themes and potential plan action items
 - Developed draft strategies based on feedback that reflects the needs and wishes of the campus
- Fall 2023 Goal – Inform, Listen, and “Close the Loop”
 - “Collaboration Phase”
 - Presented initial strategies for feedback from ACT
 - Developed funding scenarios for ACT to consider for system needs and enhancements
- Ongoing Goal – Educate and Finalize
 - Inform campus MOUs about recommended programmatic and funding changes to the plan
 - Finalize the plan for BOT presentation
 - Once approved by the BOT, official plan rollout

Slides 7-21: Allocation Process

- Parking Allocation Formular and Process Feedback
 - Campus Survey – 45% of people who park are unfamiliar with or do not understand the allocation process
 - Key Themes: Waitlist; Prioritization; Long Walks; Confusion; Need for Simplification; Equity; Resource Management

- Current Allocation Formula
 - Transportation and Parking allocates permits to departments per formula
 - Assumes number of employees represents demand
 - 3-Step Process
 - 80% of total permits available are allocated based on the total number of employees in each department
 - 20% of total permits available are allocated based on department's total state service
 - Total Parking is allocated to a department
 - Assumptions:
 - 3 departments total
 - 100 parking permits available to be allocated
 - English – 10 Employees | 7.41% of Employees | 100 Years of Service | 14.29% of Service
 - Science – 40 Employees | 29.63% of Employees | 250 Years of Service | 35.71% of Service
 - Medicine – 85 Employees | 62.36 of Employees | 350 Years of Service | 50.00% of Service
 - Total – 135 Employees | 100% of Employees | 700 Years of Service | 100 % of Service
 - Step 1: Allocate 80% of permits based on total employees
 - $100 \times (80\%) = 80$ total permits to be allocated to departments
 - English – 10 Employees | 7.41% of Employees | 6 Parking Allocations
 - Science – 40 Employees | 29.63% of Employees | 24 Parking Allocations
 - Medicine – 85 Employees | 62.36 of Employees | 50 Parking Allocations
 - Total – 135 Employees | 100% of Employees | 80 Parking Allocations
 - Step 2: Allocate 20% of permits based on total employees
 - $100 \times (20\%) = 20$ total permits to be allocated to departments
 - English – 100 Employees | 14.29% of Service | 3 Parking Allocations
 - Science – 250 Employees | 35.71% of Service | 7 Parking Allocations
 - Medicine – 350 Employees | 50% of Service | 10 Parking Allocations
 - Total – 700 Employees | 100% of Service | 20 Parking Allocations
 - Step 3: Sum of Step 1 and Step 2 for total Allocation
 - English – 5.928 Allocation based on employee total | 2.858 Allocation based on state service | 9 Total
 - Science – 23.704 Allocation based on employee total | 7.142 Allocation based on state service | 31 Total
 - Medicine – 50.368 Allocation based on employee total | 10.00 Allocation based on state service | 60 Total
 - Total – 80 Allocation based on employee total | 20 Allocation based on state service | 100 Total
 - *Number of employees no longer equates to demand as it did when the formula was created*

- Future Allocation Formula
 - Employee headcounts based on the MOU employee's schedules and those who will park regularly – Full-Time Equivalent Parkers “FTEP” determined by:
 - Work Location (on or off campus locations)
 - Days of the week reporting
 - Hours of the day reporting
 - Bi-annual assessment of MOUs Parking FTEP counts + 100% of total permits available are allocated based on department's FTEP employee count = MOU Parking Allotment
 - Benefits
 - Equitable distribution of parking resources based on real parking demand
 - Stabilizes resource availability for MOUs
- Current Permit Allocation Process
 - Transportation and Parking allocates permits between
 - 18 consolidated MOUs
 - 153 Departments within 13 MOUs
 - MOUs vary in number of departments and employees they oversee
 - Consolidated MOUs have flexibility to allocate permits as units shrink and expand with little impact to overall employee assignments
 - Smaller departments within an MOU do not have this same flexibility
 - Medical School MOU | 65 Departments | 4,541 Employees
 - UNC Hospitals MOU | 1 Department | 10,695 Employees
 - Arts & Sciences MOU | 56 Departments | 1,527 Employees
 - *Existing system creates arbitrary discrepancies in consistency, flexibility, and resource management*
- Current Allocation Process
 - MOU's that are consolidated have one criterion for issuance
 - MOU's that are not consolidated - each department handles allocation differently
 - Allocation methods include longevity of state service, department seniority, department role, full time status, on/off-campus responsibilities
 - Asian Studies | Primary Allocation Policy – Total state service | Secondary Allocation Policy – Extenuating circumstances
 - Biology | Primary Allocation Policy – Department Seniority | Secondary Allocation Policy – Faculty teaching commitments & Staff total state service
 - Communication Studies | Primary Allocation Policy – Hours worked per week | Secondary Allocation Policy – Medical need, safety working at night
 - Women's Studies | Primary Allocation Policy – Proportional between number of faculty and staff | Secondary Allocation Policy – Department seniority
- Case Study: UNC School of Medicine (SOM)
 - Formed a larger MOU during the 2021-2022 school year

- SOM Parking Assignment Priorities
 - Leadership role
 - Faculty by Total State Service (TSSD)
 - Staff by TSSD
- SOM Parking Program Administrator is the main point of contact
 - Manages allocation and works closely with T&P and SOM
- Proximate parking offered based on allocation availability
- Consolidated 65 departments to 1 MOU with consistent allocation criteria for all 4,541 employees
- Future Allocation Process
 - Recommendations
 - Consolidate department allocations into the larger MOU
 - Currently 18 MOU's already allocating parking at MOU level (18,226 permanent employees)
 - 153 departments consolidated into 13 MOUs (4,890 employees)
 - Case Study: School of Medicine (consolidated 65 Departments into 1 MOU)
 - Discontinue University waitlist (permits do not renew annually)
 - Allocate all available parking to MOUs for assignment
 - Allow waitlist within MOU for permanent upgrade of parking
 - Allow MOUs the ability to assign and cancel parking permits in real time directly in the parking system (technology improvement)
 - Benefits
 - Equitable and consistent assignment criteria
 - Clearly defined assignment criteria
 - Reduced movement of users once assigned a parking permit
 - Waitlist opportunity that provides a permanent upgrade
 - Simplify allocation process
 - Standardize distribution methodology across MOUs
 - Minimize annual changes to assignments
 - Allows MOU representative to see and update parking assignments in real time
- Student Allocation Process
 - Student representatives determine the number of permits available to each class for the undergraduate/graduate lottery process
 - First year undergraduates are not eligible for campus parking per the Ordinance
 - Remaining students register for permits based on class and residential/commuter status
 - Following the lottery process, any remaining permits in S11 (student commuters) or RR (student residents) will be made available through Online Services

- Some nuances in student representation and allocation processes between undergraduate, law, business, and medical school affiliation. Processes determined by school and student representatives.
 - [Academic Year Parking Registration - Webpage](#)
 - Hardship Allocation Process
 - Student-managed process: [Student Joint Code of Government – Chapter 5](#)
 - Students must demonstrate qualifying circumstances where commuting demands cannot otherwise be met through lottery registration or other available commuting options
 - Students must first apply to standard student lottery and explore all transportation options
 - Students must then collect detailed documentation
 - Medical Mobility Accommodations
 - Application process through T&P Accommodations Committee (TPAC)
 - TPAC reviews applications for mobility and student non-mobility accommodations and provides transportation solutions based on mobility limitations or commuting medical access needs.
 - Temporary (shorter than six months) needs do not require committee approval
 - Extensions to temporary accommodations require committee approval
 - [Medical Mobility Accommodations](#)

Slide 22: Questions and Answers

Topic: Parking Allocation Formula and Process Feedback

Katie Musgrove Response: There is understandably a need to amend the parking allocations process because there has been so much turnover in many departments. Parking coordinators have often changed so often that even knowing who to go to is hard.

Topic: Current Permit Allocation Process

Katie Musgrove Response: Consolidating MOUs is where most of the confusion and inequity arises in the allocation process.

Topic: Future Allocation Process

Evan Yassky Question: How does geography overlay in the existing permit process?

Cheryl Stout Answer: Core allocation will be in a department's location, but we no longer know departments' total locations. This is meant to create a more reasonable management of the data and maintain accuracy.

Cam Enarson Response – At the Medical School, a parking task force was developed, made recommendations, and collected endorsement relative to the allocation consolidation. I think that discontinuing the waitlist would work to our benefit. Additionally, it may be beneficial to change how we currently manage employees.

Topic: Current Allocation Formula

Katie Musgrove Question: What was the rationale behind the historic allocation model of 20% of total permits available are allocated based on department total state service?

Cheryl Stout Answer: The modelling created in the 1980s and created by a previous Transportation Planner. It was intended to be a nod to the idea that departments might have varying years of service. For example, if a department had 500 total years of service compared to a department with 300, the department with 500 years would get more permits. Getting down to on-campus demand by MOU ensures consistent management of the parking resource.

Topic: Case Study – UNC School of Medicine

Katie Musgrove Question: To clarify, relative to the School of Medicine’s case study what is the parking assignment priority between faculty and staff?

Cam Enarson Answer: There is a balance between units and assignments, all staff are considered valuable.

Katie Musgrove Response: Faculty appears to be prioritized over staff in the case study language, which seems arbitrary.

Cheryl Stout Response: It is not only about teaching faculty, but also about patient care as it relates to faculty and staff distinctions. Patient-care positions are often given priority in parking assignments.

Katie Musgrove Response: I would recommend guiding departments away from the faculty over staff distinctions.

Cam Enarson Response: Cheryl raises a good point. This format fits what our needs are and individualization at the MOU level is important.

David Samba Response: As it relates to MOUs, Transportation and Parking will offer guidelines to ensure that there is a baseline for MOU development and by extension parking assignment priorities.

Cheryl Stout Response: School of Medicine worked diligently on re-allocation in the best interest of the department. Ideally, it will create a better resource management process for the needs of individual departments if the MOU works collaboratively to develop the criteria.

Katie Musgrove Response: The consolidation of departments into a singular MOUs is helpful, but it is necessary to have the staffing structure and resources to support this system.

Cheryl Stout Response: There are 18 existing MOUs with 18,000 employees being managed, so this is more of a question for the 4,900 who aren't being managed.

Topic: Future Allocation Formula

Cam Enarson Question: Is it possible for the group to approve the consolidation of departments into MOUs first and then refine the data as it pertains to the application of the future allocation formula implementation?

David Samba Answer: Yes, we can certainly address it in this way.

Cheryl Stout Answer: Yes, we must complete this process in a phased approach for resource management and accuracy.

Topic: Student Allocation Process

Laszlo Balint Question: Are postdocs considered as employees or students in the current and proposed allocation process? Which rules apply to us?

Cheryl Stout Answer: Postdocs have an allocation for parking. As temporary employees, they are not in the current department permanent employee counts for allocation. A department can assign postdoc parking out of the department allocation as well.

Slide 23: Path to BOT Approval

- January 2024
 - Present initial recommendations to ESG
 - MOU Outreach
 - Additional ACT Group Outreach
- February 2024
 - Draft Ordinance Changes
 - Finalize Recommendations with ESG
- March 2024
 - BOT Presentation

Slide 24: Outreach

- Winter Outreach
 - T&P outreach with MOUs to educate faculty/staff and employees on recommended changes to the plan
 - Student Engagement
 - Separate Roll Out Engagement Plan to be developed
 - Implemented after BOT approval/Plan finalization

Slides 25-26: Next Steps

- 5-Year Plan Process Timeline
 - Outreach: January 2023 – May 2023
 - Recommendations: September 2023 – November 2023
- Next steps
 - MOU Outreach
 - Executive Sponsor Group Meeting – January
 - Preparation for BOT Approval
 - Next ACT Meeting: January 17
 - 1 hour Meeting; Virtual

Attendees

Katie Musgrove – Employee Forum Chair

Clint Gwaltney – Senior Associate Athletic Director

Rick Steinbacher – Senior Associate Athletic Director

Jeff Watson – Parking and Transportation Manager, UNC Hospital

Laszlo Balint – Post-Doctoral Research Associate, Cell Biology and Physiology

Darin Padua – Associate Provost, Academic Operations

Cam Enarson – Vice Dean of Strategic Initiatives

Michelle Meyer – Associate Professor, Emergency Medicine

Logan Grodsky – Student Body Treasurer

Dan Lehman – Vice President of Operational Support & Professional Services

Alan Marsh – Associate Director, Postdoctoral Affairs

Lauren Hawkinson – GSPS President

Keith Hines – Employee Forum Vice Chair

Martin Johnson – Associate Professor, English Comp., and Literature

Evan Yassky – Executive Director, Facilities Services

Joe Singer – Director, Carolina Union

Rahsheem Holland – Police Captain

Gordon Merklein – Associate Vice Chancellor for Real Estate & Campus Enterprises

Transportation and Parking

Cheryl Stout – Executive Director

Cha'ssem Anderson – Associate Director

Wil Steen – Associate Director

Abigail Hall – Project Coordinator

Candace Lindo – Executive Assistant