

Parking Ratepayers Board

December 8, 2008

Chancellor's Conference Room , Cheadle 5123

1:00pm-3:00pm

I. Roll Call 1:00pm

II. Introduction of Guests

III. Approval of Minutes

IV. Message from the Chair

V. Discussion of policy proposal for reserving parking lots

VI. Staffing of the University Plaza Kiosk

VII. Future Agenda Items

VIII. Public Comment

(Any member of the public may address the Board for up to 5 minutes on a Ratepayer related item not scheduled elsewhere on the agenda)

IX. Adjournment 3:00pm

1 **Parking Ratepayer's Board**
2 **December 8, 2008**
3 **Minutes**

4
5 **Members Present:** Rick Church, Marguerite Bouraad-Nash, Sandra Featherson, Victoria Wing,
6 Kate Deutsch, Charlie Arreola and Eric Mills (proxy for Vickie Scott)

7 **Members Absent:** Vickie Scott, Dan Givens, J.P. Primeau

8 **Staff Present:** Robert Defendini and Leslie Mancebo
9

10 **I. Roll Call**

11
12 The meeting was called to order at 1:05pm. Board members Vickie Scott, Dan Givens and J.P.
13 Primeau were unable to attend, Vickie Scott sent Eric Mills, the Senior Public Events Manager
14 from the Department of Theater and Dance on her behalf.
15

16 **II. Introduction of Guests**

17
18 There were no guests in attendance.
19

20 **III. Approval of Minutes**

21
22 The Minutes from the October 24, 2008 meeting were approved unanimously with the following
23 corrections:

- 24 • Line 167 was changed to indicate that the recommendation made was specifically to
25 address parking for the parents of children participating in after school or summer camp
26 programs at the Recreation Center.
- 27 • On Line 182 Board member Kate Deutsch's name was misspelled
- 28 • Line 268 was changed to indicate that Robert Defendini, not Sandra Featherson,
29 reported that Transportation and Parking Services was given the task of staffing the
30 University Plaza Kiosk.
31

32 **IV. Announcements from the Chair**
33

34 Chair Church reported that he attended the last Transportation Alternatives Board meeting on
35 Friday, December 5, 2008 and shared with the Parking Ratepayers Board some of the points of
36 interest to the PRB:

- 37 • The Transportation Alternatives Board has requested an overview of approaches used
38 at other campuses within the context of Alternatives Transportation as well as a broader
39 overview of parking rates and how parking money is spent on other campuses. We are
40 the only campus that has separate entities representing the Parking Ratepayers and the
41 Transportation Alternatives.
- 42 • Chair Church also explained that the Transportation Alternatives Program is primarily
43 funded from the Fines and Forfeitures budget of Transportation and Parking Services
44 after the Fines and Forfeitures unit meets its own needs such as paying staff and
45 purchasing equipment. The Transportation Alternatives Program does not end up
46 receiving enough money from Fines and Forfeitures to meet their budgetary needs while
47 continuing business as usual.
48

49 Robert Defendini reported that the amount of money generated by the Fines and Forfeitures unit
50 is slightly on the decline because the Fines and Forfeitures unit is understaffed and that the
51 existing staff is spread thin.
52

- 53 • Chair Church also reported that the Transportation Alternatives Board is actively seeking
54 alternative sources of funding such as vanpool sponsorship by local businesses. TAP
55 staff is working with the Office of Development to work within University policy to
56 formulate a vanpool sponsorship program.
- 57 • Even with the help of innovative solutions such as vanpool sponsorship the
58 Transportation Alternatives Program will need to continue to find a steady source of
59 funding and the discussion is headed in the direction of asking for a share of parking
60 fees, especially in light of funding models used on other UC Campuses such as UCLA in
61 which parking ratepayers are charged in excess for parking and revenue from parking
62 permit sales are shared with alternatives programs. Chair Church added that the TAB is
63 aware that there are other models for funding alternatives programs and is looking at
64 Universities outside the UC system like Stanford in which there is another tax that pays
65 for programs like the Transportation Alternatives Program.
66

67 Victoria Wing asked if the Parking Ratepayers Board has ever considered sharing a portion of
68 Parking Permit sales revenue to help fund the Transportation Alternatives Program.
69

70 Marguerite Bouraad-Nash responded that historically on the UCSB campus money was taken
71 from parking revenue to pay for inappropriate uses such as building renovations. The Parking
72 Ratepayer's Board makes sure that Parking money is not being used unfairly and there is no
73 need to tax parking ratepayers to fund alternatives. Board member Bouraad-Nash then noted
74 that the Transportation Alternatives Program would have more revenue if there were more
75 citations being written and upheld, and that TAP should find more grant funding.
76

77 Victoria Wing noted that the Transportation Alternatives Program has applied for grants and
78 Robert Defendini added that TAP has received some gifts and some grants, these are
79 specifically for bicycle infrastructure improvements and that TAP does not currently have
80 enough staff to aggressively find and apply for grants while managing the program.
81

82 Robert Defendini added that the biggest expense of the Transportation Alternatives Program is
83 providing a subsidy for Staff and Faculty monthly bus passes. The Santa Barbara MTD recently
84 announced that bus fares will increase in January and TAP cannot afford a greater subsidy.
85 Director Defendini also asked the Board to keep in mind that within the next few years there
86 may be the need to raise parking rates to address increased costs of maintenance and
87 operations in addition to other budget constraints that Transportation and Parking Services may
88 soon face, such as the possible 4% "fair share" tax on non-state funded departments at UCSB.
89

90 Sandra Featherson brought to the attention of the Board that with the campus wide
91 sustainability efforts the topic of funding for the Transportation Alternatives Program will likely
92 arise again before the Parking Ratepayer's Board.
93

94 Chair Church responded with his final notes from the Transportation Alternatives Board
95 meeting:
96

- 97 • Marc Fisher and Kostas Goulias will co-chair the Chancellor's Transportation Blue
98 Ribbon Committee that will address the need for an all encompassing transportation
99 plan throughout campus, including single occupancy vehicles and alternatives.

- 100 • In response to the Draft Long Range Development Plan the County of Santa Barbara
101 has asked for \$90 million to mitigate negative impacts caused by moving forth with the
102 plan. Chair Church noted that Marc Fisher indicated that although the amount that UCSB
103 will end up paying the County will be less than \$90 million, it will be a hefty amount. A
104 large piece of the mitigation money that the County is asking for is to address added
105 automobile trips to and from campus and that UCSB will need to explore many
106 transportation demand management tools such as adjusted schedules to off-peak hours,
107 telecommuting, etc.
- 108 • Kate Deutsch noted that the added housing on and around campus will address some of
109 the traffic demand management and Chair Church added that the new housing planned
110 for in the Draft LRDP addresses new growth and there will still be a great number of
111 commuters.

112
113 Marguerite Bouraad-Nash asked for an update on the amount of unused parking spaces in lot
114 22.

115
116 Robert Defendini responded that the opening of the new Education and Social Sciences
117 Building will bring more cars into lot 22. Transportation and Parking Services has reallocated
118 some residence hall student parking onto the fourth and fifth levels of lot 22 and raised the rates
119 for residence hall students parking in lot 22 from \$36 to \$54 per month. TPS historically would
120 sell 202 parking permits for lot 30 and reallocated those residence hall student permits to lot 22
121 where they have sold approximately 230 permits at the higher rate.

122
123 Kate Deutsch requested that the Parking Ratepayer's Board receive the report that the
124 Transportation Alternatives Board gets about approaches that other UC campuses use to
125 address parking and transportation alternative needs.

126
127 Chair Church responded that he intends to attend the Transportation Alternatives Board
128 meetings throughout the winter quarter and will report back to the PRB.

129
130

131 **V. Discussion of Policy Proposal for Reserving Parking Lots**

132
133 Robert Defendini reported that before he came to Transportation and Parking Services,
134 departments reserving entire parking lots were paying no more than \$200 for an entire lot,
135 regardless of the number of spaces. In the fall of 2007 Director Defendini changed the rates to
136 reserve a parking lot to \$2 per space reservation policy which has generated more money than
137 the previous rates. The current policy addresses the following:

- 138
- 139 • Departments that reserve all of the lots of campus for a large event now pay much more
140 than \$200, and these events are often on weekends so they generally do not take
141 parking away from everyday users.
 - 142 • Departments staff the parking lot that they reserve
 - 143 • Currently the price to reserve a parking lot does not vary depending on time of day or
144 day of the week.

145
146 Marguerite Bouraad-Nash added that when departments reserve parking lots during regular
147 business hours they occupy spaces that are usually used by long term permit holders and for a
148 greatly reduced cost from the \$8 daily visitor rate. It is not fair for those who pay less to receive

149 a greater level of service and Marguerite called on the Board to take action in recommending a
150 rate increase.

151
152 Robert Defendini asked the Board to consider only recommending a change for the
153 weekday/daytime rates for reserved parking lots and not the nights and weekends rates
154 because the night and weekend price of \$2 per space is currently fair. Director Defendini also
155 reminded the Board that changing the rates drastically and/or without adequate notice will
156 adversely affect departments at UCSB that need to reserve parking lots. He recommended a
157 possible \$2 or \$3 increase at most, because in his experience with the last rate increase he
158 received a great amount of backlash from the campus community.

159
160 Sandra Featherson added that it is more practical to have Transportation and Parking Services
161 generate a reserved parking lot rate table that is feasible to implement and present it to the
162 Parking Ratepayers Board. Board member Featherson also pointed out that it is not realistic to
163 raise the rates by January 2009 because of the impact on departments across campus.

164
165 Robert Defendini responded that he evaluated that rate structure in 2007 and came to the \$2
166 per space rate because he received a lot of negative feedback from departments in response to
167 even a small increase, especially those departments that reserve all of the lots on campus.
168 Some of the events that need all of the parking on campus are Commencement, Parents and
169 Family Weekend and the All Gaucho Reunion.

170
171 Kate Deutsch pointed out that when it comes to parking, users pay for convenience, which is
172 why a long term reserved space costs \$90 per month and it is not logical that a department can
173 pay very little to reserve desirable spaces and limit the parking option of those who pay much
174 higher rates.

175
176 Robert Defendini reported that he and Transportation and Parking Services staff have been
177 formulating a full pricing structure including reserved parking rates. He also noted that he strives
178 to communicate more efficiently to users when parking lots will be closed or reserved for a
179 specific group. Director Defendini proposes that if the Parking Ratepayers Board decides to
180 propose a rate increase for reserved parking lots he would like to see a gradual increase of \$1
181 or \$2 each year so that he can communicate to departments about the rate increase and those
182 departments can budget accordingly.

183
184 Robert Defendini also clarified that there is a separate set of permit sales rates for bulk permit
185 sales in which a department can purchase permits in quantities of 100 or more at a discounted
186 rate of \$6 per day for a daily visitor permit that can be used in any visitor space on campus.
187 When the UC Regents and the UCSB Foundation Board members and other high profile guests
188 are on campus, departments that are hosting such events can choose to reserve a parking lot.

189
190 Chair Church noted that there is a disconnect in the rate structures in that the bulk permits are
191 more expensive at \$6 a piece than the spaces in a reserved lot at \$2 per space.

192
193 Marguerite Bouraad Nash makes a motion to recommend increasing the daily lot reservation
194 rate to \$6 per day starting July 1, 2009 and raise the rate by \$1 each year for the following three
195 years.

196
197 Kate Deutsch asked that the motion be amended to increase the rates beginning at \$4 in July
198 2009 then increase by \$2 each year for the following two years. Marguerite Bouraad-Nash
199 agreed to the amendment. Kate seconded the motion as amended.

200
201 Sandra Featherson contended that without seeing an entire rate structure and knowing the
202 complete current policy that the Board is arbitrarily choosing a new rate and added that
203 Transportation and Parking Services staff can more thoroughly examine the options and find a
204 feasible new rate structure that TPS is able to implement.

205
206 Sandra Featherson added that the customers reserving parking lots are departments at UCSB
207 and that the Board must consider how the new policy will impact already tight budgets.

208
209 Marguerite Bouraad-Nash urged Robert Defendini to recommend figures for increasing the
210 rates.

211
212 Robert Defendini responded that without thoroughly examining current rates and consulting with
213 his staff he recommends an initial increase to \$4 per space beginning July 1, 2009 and a \$1
214 increase the each of the following two years.

215
216 Kate Deutsch noted that in the future the rates for reserved parking in lots will need to increase
217 accordingly with any increase in daily visitor rates.

218
219 Victoria Wing requested that even if the motion on the table is passed she would like to see a
220 table with all of the various parking rates so that the PRB has a full overview of parking rates on
221 campus.

222
223 Robert Defendini agreed to provide a parking rate overview for the Board.

224
225 Chair Church called the motion on the floor to a vote. The motion was passed unanimously to
226 recommend a rate increase for reserving parking in lots during weekdays to \$4 per space on
227 July 1, 2009 followed by an increase to \$6 per space on July 1, 2010 then to \$8 per space on
228 July 1, 2011.

229 230 **VI. Staffing of the University Plaza Kiosk**

231
232 Robert Defendini reported that the University Plaza Kiosk is now being staffed by the same
233 students who were previously staffing the information kiosk inside the Mesa parking structure.
234 The kiosk in the Mesa Structure is now closed. The student workers at the University Plaza
235 Kiosk are paid out of the Guest Services budget, not the Parking Operations budget.

236 237 **VII. Future Agenda Items**

- 238
239
- 240 • Revisit the budget
 - 241 • Review the parking permit pricing structure
 - 242 • Review any information garnered by the Transportation Alternatives Program staff
243 regarding the parking operations at other UC campuses.

244 245 **VIII. Public Comment**

246 No guests were in attendance

247
248 *Meeting adjourned at 2:40pm*