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Outline

• Previous Regulations
  • What was required?
  • What were the problems with the previous system?

• Subcommittee
  • What was our charge, who was on the subcommittee, how did we proceed?

• New Regulations
  • What are the new regulations?
  • How are they better than the previous system?

• Are things better?
  • Did we accomplish our goals?
Previous Regulations

• Required a State Issued Permit
  • State issued Placard or License Plate
  • *Must be issued to the person using the permit*

• *Should* also register with the university
  • E or K hangtag (*both are free of charge*)
  • Yes, this meant **NO-CHARGE** at all for Accessible Parking

• Available Parking
  • Any Accessible Parking space
  • Any non-reserved, non-UT service vehicle space
Previous Regulations – Problems I

• No Connection between State Permit & UT
  • The previous system did not connect the State Issued Permit to the UT registration
  • The previous system did not *easily* connect the State Issued Permit with the *actual permit holder*
  • The previous system did not *easily* connect the State Issued Permit with the UT citizen (i.e., student or staff).
Previous Regulations – Problems II

- **Abuse**: Individuals used State Issued Permits *issued to someone else* like a friend or relative (i.e., not to the person operating the vehicle). Why?
  - *Can park closer to where they need to be*
  - *Can avoid the cost of a permit*

- Obviously this takes away available spaces for those that truly need the access

- Difficult to enforce under previous system. Required:
  - A check with the State first
  - Then a check against the license plate
  - Then a check of UT hangtag to verify that the *State issued permit holder* is a UT citizen
Charge of the Subcommittee

• Traffic and Parking Authority (TPA) Charge:
  • *Improve* the availability and *consistency of availability* of accessible parking for those that have a need
  • Provide a system that would reduce or possibly eliminate fraud and abuse
  • Provide “real data” on the accessible parking needs
    • What is the number of students, staff, and faculty that need accessible parking and where do they need those parking spaces?
Subcommittee

- Dr. Chris Pionke, Chair (faculty, TPA member)
- Mark Hairr (Director, Parking & Transit Services)
- Elizabeth Hamilton (student)
- Dr. William Hart (faculty, TPA Member)
- Annazette Houston (Director, Disability Services)
- Deby Libby – (staff, TPA Member)
  - Advisor
    - Matthew Scoggins (Deputy General Counsel)
Subcommittee Work I

• Reviewed 20-30 other universities
  • Mostly large state supported institutions
    • Alabama, Florida, Michigan State, North Carolina, …
  • Some private institutions
    • For example, Vanderbilt
  • Several Board of Regents Universities
    • ETSU, MTSU, Tenn. Tech, U. of Memphis

• What were their regulations?
  • How were they similar or different from UT’s?
  • How were they similar or different from each other?
Subcommittee Work II

• All of the universities that we reviewed either:
  • Required a *simple* dual registration
    • You must have a State issued handicapped placard or license plate *and* a university issued accessible parking permit
    • A State issued permit was sufficient for a university issued permit
    • **Examples:** Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Texas A&M, ETSU, U. of Memphis, Tenn. Tech
  • **OR** Required a *complex* dual registration
    • You must have a State issued handicapped placard or license plate *and* a university issued accessible parking permit
    • You must **Apply** to the university for a university permit
    • **Examples:** Kentucky, South Carolina, North Carolina, Michigan State, Ohio State, Michigan
Subcommittee Work III

• *All* of the universities required the purchase of a parking permit
  • Most charged based on classification (student, staff, …)
  • In some cases (e.g., Alabama), the charge was based on the lowest cost permit
  • In some cases, student permits were rolled into general fees so there is no direct charge, but everyone still pays

• Remember, UTK did NOT Charge
  • Why?
Subcommittee Work IV

• We decided that the “simple dual registration” was the best method of achieving our goals

• New Regulations – “Dual Registration”
  • Must obtain and display a valid State issued handicap placard or license plate
  • **AND** must obtain and display a UT issued accessible parking permit
    • This ties the UT registration of the vehicle to the State issued placard/plate **and** the individual that actually requires the accessible parking
UT Accessible Parking Permit Process

• Obtaining a UT Accessible Parking Permit
  • An individual can visit the UT Parking Office to complete the registration process in one step and obtain a parking permit
  • OR an individual can purchase the appropriate UT permit (commuter, non-commuter, or staff) on-line and then “trade-it-in” for a UT Accessible Permit at the UT Parking Office
  • Either way, the individual must provide proof of the need through documentation of a State issued accessible placard/license plate issued in their name
UT Accessible Parking Options

• Registered vehicles displaying the appropriate permits as outlined before are allowed to park in all accessible spaces as well as in any unreserved, non-UT vehicle space
  • It should be noted, there may be time limitations that will be enforced like the 2-hour limited accessible spaces by the library

Example of UT Accessible Parking Space Signage

UT Accessible Parking Permit
Must be Displayed on Windshield
Advantages

• An individual would NOT be able to use “Grandpa’s” handicapped placard

• Ticket writers can easily check to see that the UT Accessible permit matches the registered State issued Accessible permit

• UT Parking will have a database of individuals that require access
  • UT Parking will know where the demand is for faculty and staff (and maybe even students)
  • UT Parking can better locate accessible spaces in areas of high demand *(due to the ADA, there are limitations on this, but we will have some flexibility)*
Implementation

• New regulations approved by the TPA on 3/7/16
• Was there any “Push-Back”?
  • Yes, but not as bad as I expected
  • Biggest concern was the “cost,” was this legal?
  • Gave a number or presentations to different UT groups
• New regulations approved by UT BoT in June, 2016
• New Regulations Effective Aug 1, 2016
• I purchased permit SA-0001 on 7/12/16 for $420
• Are the new regulations successful?
  • My favorite engineering answer: It Depends!
Permit Data

• Accessible Parking Permits Sold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>2016-2017</th>
<th>2017-2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Accessible - SA</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Accessible - CA</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Commuter Accessible - NA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Total is steady around 360-380 per year
  • We now have an idea of demand (total and by classification)
  • Can we now use this information to better “allocate” accessible spaces (*more on this in a minute*)
  • And yes, we need to account for “visitors”
Citation Data

• Fall 2015 – Old Regulations
  • 157 at $200 each
• Fall 2016 – First Semester of New Regulations
  • 72
    • A decrease of over 50%
• Fall 2017 – One Plus Years of New Regulations
  • An additional decrease of over 30% from Fall 2016

• Conclusions:
  • Attempts at violating the law have been reduced?
  • Easier to catch violators and enforce?
  • I think yes on both accounts
Problem – Not All Demand is Equal

- UT has over 500 Accessible Spaces
- Total demand is less than 400
- Yet, in some areas it is difficult to get a space after 9:00 a.m.
Accessible Spaces on “The Hill”

Walters Life Sciences 3 spaces
Austin Peay 2 spaces
Dabney-Buehler 6 spaces
Ayres 10 spaces

37 spaces total

Estabrook - 3 spaces
Perkins - 13 spaces

My Office
# Data on “The Hill” Utilization

## THE HILL ACCESSIBLE PARKING LOT COUNTS

| Area                        | CA-1 | SA-1 | SA-2 | SA-3 | SA-4 | SA-5 | SA-6 | SA-7 | SA-8 | SA-9 | SA-10 | SA-11 | SA-12 | SA-13 | SA-14 | SA-15 | SA-16 | SA-17 | SA-18 | SA-19 | SA-20 | AVG OCC BY LOT |
|-----------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------|
| North Side Walters         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | 93%   |
| Life Sciences              |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| (3 spaces)                 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Austin Peay                | SA-2 | SA-2 | SA-2 | SA-2 | SA-2 | SA-2 | SA-2 | SA-2 | SA-2 | SA-2 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | 95%   |
| (2 spaces)                 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Ayres Hall                 | CA-2 | CA-2 | CA-2 | CA-2 | CA-2 | CA-2 | CA-2 | CA-2 | CA-2 | CA-2 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | 98%   |
| (10 spaces)                |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Dabney-Buehler Circle Dr   | CA-1 | CA-1 | CA-1 | CA-1 | CA-1 | CA-1 | CA-1 | CA-1 | CA-1 | CA-1 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | 88%   |
| (6 spaces)                 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Perkins Hall               | CA-5 | CA-5 | CA-5 | CA-5 | CA-5 | CA-5 | CA-5 | CA-5 | CA-5 | CA-5 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | 92%   |
| (13 spaces)                |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Estabrook Hall             | E-3  | E-3  | E-3  | E-3  | E-3  | E-3  | E-3  | E-3  | E-3  | E-3  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | 17%   |
| (3 spaces)                 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |

**Avg Occ. by Date & Time**: 87% 92% 89% 89% 92% 79% 92% 92% 92% 84%

**Key**: CA-Commuter Accessible, NA-Non-Commuter Accessible, SA-Staff Accessible, EMA-Emeritus Accessible, PPA-Paper Permit Accessible (usually for temp staff), E-Empty
Why The Problem?

• Large number of buildings in a small area
  • Parking is in high demand on “The Hill” in general

• An Increase of Commuter-CA parking
  • Students may Not have realized that they can park here

• Is there fraud and abuse still occurring?
  • Very possible
  • Fraudulent attainment and use of accessible permits has increased nationwide. Example:
    • In California in 2016, 26,000 Active Accessible Placards were registered to people that were 100 years old or older
      • The problem: there were only about 8,000 residents of California that were 100 or older in 2016
      • Similar reports have been reported from many more states

---

1California Bureau of State Audits, Department of Motor Vehicles - Report 2016-121
What we (UT) Can and Cannot Fix

• Fraudulent attainment of an Accessible Placard
  • UT can’t fix this
  • Requires legislative action or better control by the medical community

• Reallocation of Accessible Spaces
  • The problem is NOT the total number
  • The problem is the number of spaces in SOME areas
    • We now have data to look at “Location Demand”
    • Doing this analysis this summer
    • We have some flexibility, but not a lot by ADA rules

• Conclusion
  • I think that this is part of the Mobility/Accessibility issues that Smart Cities will need to address
  • How do we provide Mobility/Access and prevent abuse?