



## PARKING & TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Spring 2023:  
Monday, May 1, 2023**

**Attendees:**

**Dave Machado**-senior director of facilities operations

**Tyler Masamori**-Emergency Planning Campus Safety

**Philip Beltran**-Director of Campus Safety

**Leah Nakasaki-Peterson**-Assistant Director for Parking & Transportation Services

**Jacob Malae** -Assistant Director of Campus Safety

**Chelsi Whiting**-Parking & Transportation Services Office Manager

**Laura Ellingson**-professor in the communication department and representing the disability & chronic illness network (DCIN)

**Josue Hernandez-Perez**-Center of sustainability

**Ixtlac Duenas**-Staff Senate

**Stephen Diamond**-faculty of the law school

**Kenneth Park**-Associated Student Government

**Bianca Terry** -Vice Provost for Graduate Programs

**Joshua Phillip**-graduate programs representative

**Dave Machado**- They briefly reiterate the composition of the committee, consisting of five faculty and staff representatives nominated by the faculty senate, staff senate, and SCU disability & chronic illness networks, as well as six student representatives recommended by ASG, the center for sustainability, and the graduate program. Additionally, representatives from parking and transportation services and campus safety are present to provide insights and data. The speaker emphasizes the committee's role is advisory rather than decision-making, expressing a desire to make recommendations that influence the decision-makers on campus. They manage expectations, highlighting the implementation of ideas may not always be within their jurisdiction. They discuss the importance of the committee's work in the shared governance process and mention topics suggested by Jeanne Rosenberger, Vice Provost for Student Life.. An announcement is made regarding the enforcement of parking in the Guadalupe Hall parking lot starting July 1st. The speaker clarifies that any parking permit will be valid in the lot, despite it being designated as an F permit lot. They invite participants to share this information with their constituencies and address any questions or concerns. The speaker concludes by recognizing Laura, who has their hand raised.

**Laura Ellingson**- Acknowledges they are aware of being able to park in the lot with a B permit, however, they express concern about the confusion that arose in the OSHER program during the past winter regarding parking. They request assurance that someone will be working with

the OSHER program to address the issue because the program participants believe they shouldn't have to pay for parking in that lot.

**Phil Beltran**-The speaker addresses Laura's question and asks if there are any other thoughts or questions about the Guadalupe parking lot. They mention that while they have specific topics to focus on, they are open to exploring other ideas related to parking and transportation. The speaker gives an example of food insecurity and suggests that different fee structures could be explored. They encourage participants to keep these topics in mind as they discuss the next two agenda items. They then introduce the first topic and mention that documentation has been shared for further review. Another participant raises a question about the rationale behind the decision to enforce parking in the lot. The speaker admits that they didn't provide a detailed rationale initially, but when faced with pushback, they explained that it was necessary for maintenance, security, and the addition of EV charging stations. They mention that the decision was discussed years ago, starting with Father O'brien, but due to transitions and delays, the information may not have been properly communicated. They emphasize the importance of reiterating announcements during leadership transitions to alleviate confusion and questions.

**Leah Nakasaki-Peterson**- states that their office is taking action by reaching out to Andrea and Grace, specifically addressing the OSHER program's concerns. They aim to ensure that OSHER participants are informed about the need for permits in that particular lot and the process of obtaining them. Additionally, Leah mentions that a pay station will be installed in the lot in June to facilitate daily parking. She concludes her response by thanking the speaker.

**Dave Machado** acknowledges Laura's question and comment about the program predominantly using the Guadalupe lot and asks if anyone else has thoughts or questions about that lot before moving on. He then mentions that the next two topics were specifically mentioned by Jeanne and emphasizes that there may be other ideas or issues related to parking and transportation that they can explore, however, he cautions against taking on too many topics to avoid spreading their resources too thin. Dave suggests that topics related to campus insecurity, beyond food insecurity, could also be of interest, such as different fee structures. He encourages everyone to keep these possibilities in mind as they discuss the next two topics. Dave also mentions there are some shared documents for them to review outside of the meeting. He notices someone has raised their hand and acknowledges their intention to speak.

**Ixtlac Duenas** raises a question regarding the rationale behind the decision to enforce parking regulations in the Guadalupe lot. They mention that they have been searching through their emails to find the original communication regarding the decision, hoping to find a detailed rationale. Ixtlac emphasizes the importance of transparency, accountability, and ensuring that people are well-informed about the reasons behind such decisions in order to foster better understanding of the decision-making process.

**Leah Nakasaki-Peterson** acknowledges that a detailed rationale was not provided when the

decision to enforce parking regulations in the Guadalupe lot was made. However, in response to the pushback received regarding the re-stripping and enforcement, they informed individuals that the enforcement is necessary to ensure the safety and security of the lot. Leah explains that maintaining the lot, including aspects such as patrolling, security, installing EV charging stations, improving lighting, repavement, and overall upkeep, requires funding. Therefore, enforcing parking regulations in the lot is essential to generate the necessary revenue for these maintenance activities, similar to other parking areas on campus.

**Phil Beltran** provides a historical perspective on the decision to enforce parking regulations in the Guadalupe lot. He explains that the idea was initially introduced by Father O'Brien some time ago, and he announced that a transition would take place, although it was postponed for a few years. The process of considering this change has been ongoing for several years, and Phil mentions that he is the only one in the meeting who was part of the committee as an ex-officio when the discussion and decision took place, however, he acknowledges that the information regarding this decision may not have been widely communicated to the SCU community.

**Ixtlac Duenas** agrees with the points raised by Phil Beltran about the historical perspective of the decision. They emphasize the importance of clear and reiterated announcements during leadership transitions and delays in order to ensure that people are well-informed and can recall previous information. This would help alleviate the influx of questions and inquiries that committee members like Leah may receive.

**Dave Machado** asks if there are any additional points or thoughts regarding the Guadalupe lot from the group. After addressing any remaining comments on that topic, he transitions to the next agenda item, which is EV charging and pricing policies for permit holders. He then defers to Leah and Phil to provide context and background information on this issue.

**Phil Beltran** shares the historical perspective on EV charging stations. He mentions that the committee recognized the future demand for EV charging stations about eight years ago and secured some free stations from Tesla and grants, however, they knew they would have to build a comprehensive EV charging system on campus. The issue arose when non-community members were using the charging stations, depriving the campus community of access. Phil emphasizes the need to enforce sharing and expand the charging infrastructure. Unfortunately, the pandemic disrupted their plans, and the transportation department had to be rebuilt. He expresses gratitude for the current group's involvement and believes they are on the verge of making a significant decision for the university. He mentions the importance of sustainability representation and acknowledges the group's collective effort in supporting Leah and her team. Ultimately, Phil emphasizes the urgency of implementing the charging system and ensuring compatibility with the various types of vehicles that will be utilizing it.

**Leah Nakasaki-Peterson** presents a price proposal for EV charging stations. The policy is as follows for all SCU permit holders:

All permit holders can enjoy up to **four hours** of access to the chargers each day.

1-3 Hours- \$3 per hour (subsidized rate)

3rd hour- \$5 per hour (standard rate)

Following 5+ hours-\$20 per hour (surcharge)

She explains that during the pandemic, no costs were implemented for charging, but now it is necessary to address the issue of people using the stations for extended periods of time after their vehicles are fully charged. Leah emphasizes the importance of implementing the proposal sooner rather than later and seeks the group's input on the rates. She mentions that they have conducted an analysis of local rates and collaborated with Kevin Jenkins, Climate Action and Energy Manager on establishing the rates. Additionally, they are working with Silicon Valley Power to assess potential locations for new charging stations on campus. Leah acknowledges the frustration within the campus community regarding the availability of charging stations and invites the group to share their insights, even if they do not currently own electric vehicles.

Laura Ellingson asks Leah about the usage of charging stations by individuals outside of the campus.

Leah Nakasaki-Peterson clarifies that non-campus individuals can use the charging stations if they have a permit, such as a visitor permit or have purchased a daily permit, which needs to be displayed. There are currently no restrictions on how long they can stay at the station. Leah mentions that the majority of their charging stations are from ChargePoint, which alerts users when their vehicle is fully charged, however, whether or not they choose to move their vehicle after charging is their decision. She further explains that senior administration has instructed them not to issue citations at the moment. She acknowledges Laura's concerns and agrees to look into the specific regulations regarding shared ADA EV spaces and the implications for individuals with disabilities. She understands the importance of clarifying the policy to ensure that there is flexibility and accessibility for disabled parking. Regarding enforcement, Leah explains that the intention is for self-enforcement rather than relying on citations. The goal is to incentivize EV users to share the charging stations and not occupy them for longer periods than necessary. The proposed pricing structure, with higher rates for extended parking, is designed to discourage users from staying beyond their charging needs. The aim is to create awareness, promote sharing, and discourage external users from taking advantage of the charging stations. She emphasizes the importance of education, collaboration, and communication with various campus stakeholders, including faculty senate, staff senate, and ASG, to ensure everyone understands and supports the goals of the EV charging policy. The committee is open to suggestions on how to effectively communicate and encourage sharing without relying on strict enforcement measures.

Laura Ellingson asks Leah when she is hoping to have this policy approved?

Leah Nakasaki-Peterson informed the advisory committee that their votes would drive the approval process for the proposed policy on EV charging and pricing. She emphasized the importance of the committee's input and expressed confidence in their diverse representation. The committee's main consideration was determining a fair price point for electricity that would cover the costs of additional charging stations while ensuring affordability for the campus community. Leah mentioned that once the policy is approved, communication efforts would begin in the summer to prepare for implementation in the fall. She confirmed that there were no infrastructure obstacles preventing the department from moving forward with the implementation process, and Chargepoint, the provider of the charging stations, was ready to reprogram the machines accordingly.

**Kenneth** sought clarification on the pricing tiers to ensure he understood them correctly.

**Leah Nakasaki-Peterson** clarified to Kenneth, who drives an electric vehicle, about the pricing structure for EV charging. She confirmed that for the first three hours of charging, the cost would be three dollars. After the third hour, the price would increase to five dollars per hour. If the vehicle continues to stay beyond the fifth hour, the charge would be twenty dollars.

**Joshua Phillip** raised a question about the possibility of someone taking a full-day pass and manipulating the charging session by unplugging and replugging their vehicle at the third hour mark to restart the charging cycle. She expressed concern about potential abuse of the system and sought clarification on how this scenario would be addressed.

**Leah Nakasaki-Peterson** acknowledged the concern raised by Joshua about the potential for users to manipulate the charging system by unplugging and replugging their vehicles to restart the charging cycle. She mentioned that there have been discussions regarding this issue, and one possible solution is to track account numbers to identify any attempts to circumvent the system, however, she also mentioned the challenge of distinguishing between legitimate cases where two cars are being charged and instances of abuse. Leah expressed her belief that the majority of the community would understand the importance of sharing the charging stations and that appeals to goodwill would be more effective in promoting fair usage. In cases where abuse is identified, she suggested issuing warnings and reminding individuals of the intended purpose of the system. She would look into the matter to ensure that the charging system is linked to the user's chargepoint account. She mentioned that while the university has a representative with chargepoint, they don't have the same level of access or control over the Tesla charging stations, which were donated to them. Leah also mentioned that they are considering the possibility of exploring new vendors for EV charging stations due to some issues they have encountered with chargepoint, but currently, chargepoint remains their primary vendor.

**Joshua Phillip** proposed the idea of linking the visitor parking pass or parking code to the EV charging system. He suggested that when a visitor purchases a pass, it would be associated with a specific charging duration or fee structure. He wondered if this kind of integration could be implemented with the chosen vendor, whether it's chargepoint or another company.

**Leah Nakasaki-Peterson** acknowledged Joshua's concern and agreed to ask chargepoint about the measures they have in place to prevent misuse or attempts to circumvent the intended sharing of EV charging stations. She acknowledged that there may be firewalls or safeguards in place that they haven't considered. Leah also noted that the significant price difference between the three-hour and twenty-hour charging periods could potentially incentivize some individuals to try to find ways around the system. She assured Joshua that she would address these questions with chargepoint to ensure the integrity of the charging system.

**David Machado** proposed that the committee should take more time to review the policy proposal and discuss it further at the next meeting. He mentioned the need to clarify language regarding ADA parking and ensure that it is clear to all members of the campus community. He also suggested revising the requirement for owners to display a valid SCU permit to instead specify "any" permit to avoid potential confusion for residential students. David recommended

that committee members review the policy proposal and come prepared with comments and feedback for the next meeting, where a determination can be made on whether to endorse the policy as a committee. The proposal was met with agreement from others in the committee.

**Phil Beltran** shared a historical perspective on the issue of permits and ADA parking. He explained that in the past, the goal was to prevent people from across the street from using the parking spaces by requiring any permit coupled with a disabled placard. The approach was influenced by looking at other private properties and considering the California vehicle code, which typically allows ADA parking in any designated spots. Phil mentioned that the local police department or parking control usually handles ADA parking enforcement. However, he acknowledged that the committee is open to exploring better ways to handle the issue and mentioned the potential use of license plate recognition (LPR) technology as a future solution.

**Laura Ellingson** highlighted a couple of issues related to permits and accessibility. One concern is that some staff and faculty members choose not to purchase an annual permit. If they are injured and need temporary disability accommodation, what is the best approach to accommodate these individuals? This raises the question of how to best handle temporary accessibility needs. Laura suggested providing temporary campus placards that would allow individuals to use designated spaces for a specified period of time, as recommended by their doctor.

Another issue is the confusion surrounding parking meters and permit requirements for people with disabilities. Laura mentioned that people with disabilities are not required to pay meters for municipal parking, but they may not realize that an SCU permit is still necessary for designated campus parking areas. She proposed better signage and clearer communication to address this

issue. Additionally, Laura suggested that enforcement of permit requirements should be relaxed after 6:00 p.m. and on weekends when older or disabled relatives often visit for events and performances. Overall, Laura emphasized the need for compromise and better signage to avoid misunderstandings and ensure accessible parking for all visitors to campus, including those with temporary accessibility needs and disabled individuals. She suggests that the duration of temporary disability accommodations should determine the fee structure. For shorter recovery periods, she suggests complimentary or prorated fees, while for longer periods, a percentage of the annual disabled parking fees could be charged. She acknowledges that people who don't experience disability firsthand may not fully grasp the complexities and expectations around parking accommodations. Laura shares her own experience of negotiating with the parking office each year and highlights the need for clearer communication and awareness regarding the requirements for disabled parking permits on campus.

**Phil Beltran** clarifies that obtaining a separate placard from the school would not replace the state-issued placard for parking in a Blue Zone or disabled parking spaces. He emphasizes that individuals would still need to have a temporary placard from the state in addition to any campus-specific permit. This would allow for more convenient and extended parking accommodations for those dealing with disabilities for several weeks. Phil expresses appreciation to Laura for providing clarification on this matter.

**Laura Ellingson** discusses the need for flexibility in providing parking accommodations for individuals with temporary disabilities or mobility limitations. She suggests considering a

program where individuals with specific needs, such as being closer to their building, can provide a doctor's note and receive designated parking spaces nearby. Laura acknowledges that obtaining doctor's notes may be a complicated process as they need to be directed to HR rather than the parking office. She emphasizes the importance of having designated spaces near buildings where accessibility is limited. Laura also raises the issue of transportation services, expressing the need for alternative options beyond parking, such as golf cart services or other means of assisting individuals in getting from parking garages to their desired buildings. She suggests that if transportation services are not provided, ensuring the closest available parking becomes crucial as the only alternative for those in need.

**Leah Nakasaki-Peterson** acknowledges the increasing need for accommodations and mentions the importance of exploring options to address those needs. She suggests looking into outside agencies or alternative transportation methods to better accommodate individuals with temporary disabilities or mobility limitations. Leah appreciates the idea of golf carts or electric vehicles as a means of transportation and expresses her openness to implementing such solutions if they become feasible.

**Phil Beltran** shares an idea he has been considering, which involves hiring students to provide transportation services on campus. He suggests utilizing the existing SCUttle vehicles and having students available to give rides to individuals who need assistance getting around campus. Phil sees this as an opportunity to engage students in campus safety and transportation efforts while addressing the need for accessible transportation. He mentions the challenges of staffing but emphasizes the potential benefits of employing students who are already certified in golf cart training. Phil plans to bring up this idea at the diversity forum and explore possibilities for funding and implementation.

**Leah Nakasaki-Peterson** expresses her support for the idea and agrees that engaging students in this way could benefit the entire community.

**Chelsi Whiting** shares an incident where a woman working on campus required assistance on specific days. To accommodate her, Chelsi provided her with specific day permits, although it is not the standard practice to issue day permits in advance.

**Phil Beltran** shares his historical perspective on the parking committee's role in addressing issues, problems, and recommendations brought forward by different constituencies. He emphasizes that the committee is open to discussing and considering various ideas and solutions. Phil also mentions an example of a previous request related to faculty members over the age of 50 not needing to display their permits, which was ultimately not implemented. He encourages the committee members to be prepared for the diverse range of issues that may arise and assures them that their role is to be a voice for their constituents and contribute to the committee's discussions and decision-making process.

**Dave Machado** suggests scheduling another meeting before the end of the quarter and asks the committee members for their input on the frequency of future meetings. He acknowledges that the end of the academic year is approaching and that everyone may have limited capacity. Dave proposes meeting once more this quarter and then going on hiatus during the summer, with plans to reconvene in September.

**Ixtlac Duenas**-inquires about the most recent revision of the parking and transportation plan on the parking and transportation services website.

**Leah Nakasaki-Peterson**- explains that the parking and transportation plan is currently being revised section by section. The current version is at least 20 years old and contains outdated information. She mentions the need to update sections related to the main drive into campus,

ADA parking, and the inclusion of newer modes of transportation such as electric scooters. The revisions aim to incorporate new ideas and address emerging issues.

**Ixtlac Duenas** raises a concern about the accessibility and visibility of information in the “Parking and Transportation Plan”, particularly regarding citations and fees. They suggest that this information should be communicated in a better way, as it can be challenging for staff and faculty to find the relevant details. They propose making the plan more accessible on the website, similar to the staff manual, so that individuals can easily reference specific policies and provide input or ask questions. They also emphasize the importance of ongoing communication and email correspondence between meetings, as well as the possibility of calling for special meetings to address urgent issues. Over the summer, they expect updates on the progress of the parking plan revision and anticipate a more comprehensive and informative plan for the community.

**Leah Nakasaki-Peterson**- expresses her willingness to review Section 7.1 of the parking and transportation plan during their upcoming meeting. She acknowledges the importance of making information about citations and fees more visible and accessible to employees. They have been focusing on reviewing sections that are most relevant and timely, such as commencement vehicle storage, however, they will prioritize the review of Section 7.1 and make necessary updates during this week's meeting.

**David Machado** opens the floor for any additional topics or issues that the group would like to discuss in future meetings. He encourages members to send an email to him or Chelsi with any suggestions, and they will ensure that those topics are added to the agenda. If there are any relevant supporting documents from the past, they will also be shared with the group ahead of time.

**Laura Ellingson**- raises the importance of making information about disabled parking spots more visible and accessible. Specifically, she suggests adding a link to a map on the disabled parking app that shows the location of disabled parking spaces. She also mentions that one parking lot is currently out of service, which reduces the number of available disabled spots in that area. Laura emphasizes the need for updates on closures and changes to parking availability, as this information is crucial for individuals who rely on disabled parking.

**Leah Nakasaki-Peterson**-acknowledges Laura's suggestion and informs her that the parking map has been updated to reflect the closed lot. She also mentions that she will review the disabled parking map to ensure that it accurately displays the ADA parking spaces. Leah proposes adding a link to the disabled parking map instead of creating new materials, allowing users to access the map and see the designated spaces. This way, individuals can easily find the necessary information about disabled parking.



**Dave Machado** summarizes the key points discussed in the meeting. He mentions that the committee has agreed to meet at least one more time during the quarter, and Chelsi will coordinate a suitable date and time. The update on the Guadalupe Lot and the need for increased transparency in announcements are noted. Dave emphasizes the importance of transparency as a potential theme for the year. The group also discussed the implementation of EV charging and the need for feedback on the proposed policy. Dave encourages committee members to review the policy and provide comments or concerns for the next meeting. ADA parking and permit requirements were also discussed, with ideas emerging for temporary disability parking and improving signage and policy clarity. The topic of transportation from parking lots to specific locations was mentioned as a potential solution to alleviate ADA parking issues. Further discussions and updates on these topics are expected in the future.