



OE RESOURCE REQUEST APPLICATION

University of California, Berkeley

1. SPONSORSHIP

A. Initiative

Initiative	Student Services		
Initiative Manager	Anne De Luca		
Phone	642-2261	E-Mail	OESStudentServices@berkeley.edu

B. Sponsorship

Sponsor Name	Director of Parking and Transportation		
Sponsor Signature		Date	
Sponsor Name			
Sponsor Signature		Date	
OE Program Office Signature		Date	

C. Give the title of the resource

Moving Away from Fleet Cars Toward Car Sharing
--

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT/CASE FOR CHANGE

A. Identify and describe what needs the proposed solution is seeking to address.

1. Currently there are more than 550 University owned vehicles on campus of which over 40 vehicles are driven an average of 2,200 miles a year or less and used only hours a week at a total cost of more than \$180,000 year. These 40 vehicles could benefit from a campus wide car share program. The vehicles are owned and operated by individual departments, the campus does not have a common fleet of vehicles for general department use, a campus wide car share program would provide campus access to a shared fleet of vehicles.
2. Reducing the number of department owned vehicles and employing the services of a car share vendor increases vehicle utilization and should reduce costs for participating departments and shift liability costs to car share vendor.
3. Currently any department that owns a vehicle must cover all costs: purchase, maintenance, fuel, parking, and insurance, for an average passenger vehicle this cost is \$4,800/yr. This does not include the hidden cost of general liability for a self insured organization.
4. Of the 550 vehicles currently owned by the University, this project has identified 40 vehicles that would be benefit from this program, the remaining vehicles are specific use vehicles (Campus utility trucks, Police cruisers, campus parking enforcement vehicles) which are not candidates for a car share program.

B. Describe the solution that is being proposed to meet the identified need(s).

Parking and Transportation would manage a campus-wide CarShare program. CarShare vendor would provide the vehicles, CarShare vendor would lease parking spaces from P&T, the program would be open to all faculty and staff. The vehicles would be for UCB exclusive use from 8am-5pm, M-F, and the vendor has use of the vehicles after 5 and on weekends. Vehicle availability levels would be determined during the implementation phase and service levels would be managed through vendor/campus service level agreements. Any registered staff member may reserve a vehicle online, since drawing from a larger pool, high likelihood of available vehicle when needed. Vehicle costs to department would only be for time used, estimated rate of \$6/hr.

C. Describe the alternate approaches you evaluated in the process of developing this proposal and why those alternatives were not selected.

The only alternative evaluated was status-quo. The status-quo leaves vehicles under-utilized, keeps insurance costs within departments, and keeps liability exposure with the University, instituting a CarShare program shifts the liability to the vendor and eventually reduces the campus vehicle insurance costs, increases vehicle utilization, provides departments with more flexibility when it comes to vehicle usage

III. IMPACT AND STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

A. Describe how the proposed solution aligns with the OE goals:

- Reduce administrative costs and enable the campus to direct more resources to teaching and research
- Advance an effective and efficient operating environment
- Instill a culture of continuous improvement that leads to high quality performance and outcomes

Solution reduces individual department costs associated with vehicle ownership and usage, especially potential high costs of insurance.

Reduces administrative overhead associated with vehicle ownership, all vehicle overhead managed by car share vendor

Reduces the overall demand for limited parking spaces on campus by converting 40 individual spaces assigned to individual departments to 25 Car Share spaces assigned to the common car share program, freeing 15 spaces which may be re-purposed for general permit use

Creates an efficient operating environment where individual departments no longer need to manage their campus vehicle yet vehicle availability improves.

Exposes staff to the values of a car share program and opens up the possibility of staff using car share vendor instead of a traditional rental car agency when traveling for University business.

B. Identify any other anticipated benefits in implementing the proposed solution.

Reduces the demand for department reserved parking spaces, freeing those spaces to help accommodate lost space due to campus construction.
May help defer the need to build more parking spaces on campus.

C. Identify the risks of not implementing the solution.

Not implementing the solution leaves the vehicle management and vehicle overhead inside each individual department. Would continue to see underutilized vehicles on campus and staff time and resources used to manage vehicles.

D. Describe the constituency that is intended to benefit from the proposed solution (e.g. students, faculty, staff, 1-many units)

We see any constituency that currently uses a department vehicle for passenger or light duty use could benefit from this program. Currently there are more than 30 units on campus that have department vehicles that may benefit from this program.

E. Describe the extent to which this proposed solution is a collaborative effort either within campus or with external partners.

This proposal is a collaboration between Parking & Transportation, a 3rd party car share vendor, and any campus department that participates.

F. If applicable, describe how the proposed solution may enable additional projects to be considered.

It may provide a test case for other shared resource models. If departments can see this work and managed well, there may be additional resource sharing opportunities.

G. What is the impact of the proposed solution on the existing systems and processes? Does it eliminate the need for existing systems and processes?

A car share program should ease the burden on individual department staff who must manage a vehicle, maintenance, insurance, fueling, parking. It will shift some of that management to P&T, but P&T may be better equipped to deal with the overhead and by consolidating resources it will also leverage economies of scale.

H. What is the impact on the proposed solution on the workload?

Profile/Impact in hours	Current Workload	1-time workload requirement	Ongoing workload requirement
Student			
Staff	Added duties to TDM staff		TDM Staff manages entire program
Faculty			

IV. WORK PLAN AND PROPOSED SOLUTION DESIGN

1. Provide a statement of:

- Deliverables — results the solution must deliver to achieve the stated objectives.
- Constraints — factors that may limit the options for providing the solution (e.g., an inflexible deadline).

Constraints:

- Inflexibility of departments to adopt the idea of a car share
- Departments not wanting to give up the perceived control of having their own department vehicle.

Deliverables:

- Efficient means for departments to reserve and use a vehicle
- Less cost of utilization for vehicles, must cost department less than they are paying now
- Must provide enough vehicle time to meet demand, governed by service level agreements.
- Vendor must lease enough parking spaces from P&T to accommodate the program
- P&T will hire a TDM manager for a number of other TDM programs, the car share program will be 25% of the TDM job duties.

2. Provide a work plan for the proposed solution with high-level steps to complete the solution, including timeline. (Try to limit your plan to no more than seven steps.)

	MILESTONE	TIMELINE
1.	Consult departments to verify demand	June 2011
2.	Map location for preferred vehicle distribution	July 2011
3.	Issue RFP	July 2011
4.	Hire TDM Manager	August 2011
5.	Work with departments to remove existing vehicles	August 2011
6.	Install car share vehicles	Sept 2011
7.	Train/market program to campus	Sept-Dec 2011

3. What are the data requirements for the proposed solution?

<p>Ability for departments to link car share accounts to current BFS chart of accounts for direct billing.</p> <p>Ability for departments to easily reserve and utilize vehicles in the program.</p>
--

4. What are the technical requirements for the proposed solution?

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vehicle reservation system will be provided by car share vendor. 2. Will need to integrate payment model with current BFS program to make it as efficient as possible for departments to pay for vehicle time. 3. Detailed usage reports from vendor

4. What are the greatest risks for the proposed solution and the plan to reduce or eliminate the risks.

	RISK	MITIGATION PLAN
1.	Not enough demand to warrant	Do not implement the plan, do not create false demand
2.	Dept do not buy-in to program	Directives from campus leadership to adopt program
3.	Vendor cannot provide efficient program	Work with vendor to refine any kinks found in the system.
4.		
5.		

5. How does the proposed work plan allow for evaluation and course correction to ensure the outcomes meet the campus needs?

The TDM manager for Parking and Transportation would manage the program and work closely with departments and the vendor to make sure the program meets the needs of campus. Having a single point of contact through P&T ensures the best chance for success. If the program were managed through each department it would be very difficult to assess and evaluate the program for effectiveness. Car share vendors have very good technology for tracking usage, costs, utilization and all other necessary stats so ongoing evaluation should be relatively easy.

V. CHANGE MANAGEMENT

1. What is the change management plan to successfully implement the outcomes of the proposed solution?

- A. MANDATORY: all units or individuals within a category must participate in the solution or change. An example is organizational restructuring in the first phase of Organizational Simplification. Mandatory solutions may be well advised if there are large benefits to be realized through scale, or if the solution or change is beneficial to all parts of the campus.
- B. This program works with an economies-of-scale model, if units have the opportunity to opt out, the program may not be sustainable.

2. What incentives and/or disincentives are proposed to influence behavioral changes necessary for the successful outcome of the proposed solution?

- A. Less cost for department to have a vehicle, positive financial incentive
- B. Increased availability of vehicles across campus
- C. Less administrative overhead to manage vehicles on campus
- D. Reduced vehicle liability which eventually translates into lower insurance rates in the years to come.

E. Who has been identified as the change leaders and implementers to carry out the changes necessary for the successful outcome of the proposed solution?

Director of Parking & Transportation
Physical & Environmental Planning (support of TDM projects for campus facility planning)
Campus Fleet Services

VI. FUNDING MODEL AND BUDGET

A. Could the proposed solution move forward with partial funding? If yes, describe the revised scope, including the associated savings impact.

There is no funding request with this proposal. Entire program will be self funded through RFP with car share vendor, departments pay only for direct use of vehicles. P&T will cover the management overhead for the program.

B. What is the plan for sustainable funding to support ongoing operations of the proposed solution?

Self funded from the beginning.

C. Please download and fill out the OE Resource Request Budget Template located at [location] and follow the instructions on the first worksheet in the workbook to complete the budget and line descriptions. Include both completed sheets with the Resource Request.

VI. ASSESSMENT PLAN

Please use the table below to detail your metrics.

METRIC CATEGORY	SPECIFIC MEASURE	MEASURE BASIS	DATA COLLECTION METHOD	DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY	FUNCTIONAL OWNER OF DATA COLLECTION	LARGER GOAL TO WHICH METRIC RELATES
EXAMPLES:						
FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE						
1 Reduction in average price of office supplies	Avg price	Per item	Look at vendor catalogs	Quarterly, first day of each quarter	Procurement Director	Overall reduction of 15% in average price of office supplies
OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE						
1 Reduction in average processing	Avg person-	Per transaction	Survey of transaction	Semi-annually	Director of Billing	Reduction of 20% in average

<i>time per transaction</i>	<i>hours required</i>		<i>processors</i>			<i>transaction processing time</i>
FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE						
1	Hrly rate for a vehicle	Per hour	Vendor reports	Qrtly	Vendor	Reduced costs for vehicle operation
2						
OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE						
1						
2						
PRODUCT / SERVICE QUALITY						
1	Customer Satisfaction	Quality Rating	Online Survey	Qrtly	P&T	
2						
EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION						
1						
2						
CUSTOMER SATISFACTION						
1	Is program meeting operational needs		Online survey	Qtrly	P&T	Operational Efficiency
2						
PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY						
1						
2						
SUPPLIER PERFORMANCE						
1	Vehicle Availability	99% availability	Vendor Reports	Qrtly	Vendor	Operational Efficiency
2	Satisfaction with Vehicle	Clean, functioning, proper type of vehicle	Online Survey	Qrtly	P&T	Operational Efficiency