

1 **Parking Ratepayers Board**
2 **May 30, 2008**
3 **Minutes**

4
5 **Members Present:** Kostas Goulias, Marguerite Bouraad-Nash, Dan Givens,
6 Kate Deutsch, Corey Huber, Richard Church and Joe Harkins

7
8 **Members Absent:** Stephanie Brower and Perrin Pellegrin

9
10 **Staff Present:** Marc Fisher, Robert Defendini, Jamey Wagner, Cindy Smith,
11 Dolly Smith and David Ruiz

12
13 **Guests:** Vic Cox (Editor 93106)

14
15 **Minutes:**

16 The minutes from the May 22, 2008 meeting were approved unanimously as
17 written.

18
19 **New Chair**

- 20 • Board member Church was nominated as the new Chair. The Board voted
21 and passed the nomination unanimously.

22
23 **TAP Parking**

24 TPS Staff member Wagner distributed "In Vehicle Parking Meter Hours &
25 Coupons Used" (please refer to Attachment "A").

26
27 Staff Member Wagner stated

- 28 • The hours used by tap members to park on campus is given as a
29 complimentary perk to those who use alternative forms of transportation,
30 such as by foot, carpool, vanpool, bus or train.
31 • There was a recommendation that a quarter million dollars should be
32 divided between Transportation Alternative Board and the Parking
33 Operations Program.
34 • Last year chair Kendall came and spoke about the money being split
35 between TAP and Parking Rate Payers. A rough calculation yielded
36 \$51,000 as the cost of the Transportation Alternative Programs (TAP)
37 hours.

38
39 Board member Deutsch inquired:

- 40 • What are the requirements students must meet to enroll in TAP?

41
42 TPS Staff member Wagner reported:

- 43 • Undergraduate students must not have a parking permit, specify the
44 alternative modes of transportation they use to get to campus, such as
45 walking, bike, carpool, vanpool, bus, or train to commute between home
46 and UCSB and must live out side of a two mile radius of campus.

- 47 • Graduate students are divided into two categories. Those who are
48 employed less than 45 percent by the university have the same rules as
49 Undergraduates. Those who are employed 45 percent or more, by the
50 university do not have to follow the two mile housing radius restriction.
51

52 *Chair Goulias reviews Attachment A to the board.*
53

54 Staff member Wagner noted that:

- 55 • Perhaps people who park the most currently pay the least per day when
56 they park everyday.
57

58 Board member Church stated:

- 59 • This formula does not work because we have excess parking spaces and
60 we do not have peak hour loads.
61 • There would be a large impact on others if drivers had higher parking
62 rates on certain days than others (example: faculty members do not come
63 to campus on Fridays, so no office hours that day for students).
64

65 • TPS Staff member Wagner stated:

- 66 • The university is however expecting growth of 5,000 students and 1,000
67 Faculty/Staff.
68 • We are also adding 7,000 housing units in the Long Range Development
69 Plan (LRDP) so the time will come that our campus parking situation will
70 become tight.
71

72 Board member Bouraad-Nash stated:

- 73 • There is no guarantee that all the projects in the LRDP will happen.
74 • The Board will consider increase funding to TAP or building more parking
75 if there is a parking shortage.
76

77 Board member Deutsch states:

- 78 • She has the option to take the bus for free as a student, and she has a
79 parking permit.
80 • Why take the bus, and reduce flexibility when she can take 10 minutes to
81 drive her car because she has a parking permit.
82 • A pro-rated parking permit would be an incentive to take the bus or other
83 form of alternative transportation some days of the week.
84

85 Board member Bouraad-Nash stated:

- 86 • With the excess of parking availability, why should we not allow those
87 enrolled in TAP to obtain parking permits?
88 • The administration should consider bus service a high priority on the
89 campus.
90 • It needs to be done to help those that cannot afford to commute via
91 vehicles because of gas.

- 92 • There should be a Blue Ribbon committee established to come up with a
93 general transportation plan for the campus.

94 TPS Staff member Wagner responded:

- 95 • There is a cost incurred for those who use TAP, so TAP currently
96 concentrates its resources on those who commute using alternative
97 transportation modes.

98

99 **MTD in Relation to Campus Needs**

100 Board member Church stated:

- 101 • An increasing amount of bus use would make sense if there were good
102 bus alternatives, for those living a modest distance away from the
103 university however there does not seem to be good bus service to UCSB
104 from many local areas.
- 105 • He had a grant from Partners in Transportation to analyze how accessible
106 areas are using mass transit. He shared his findings with MTD and
107 showed the MTD buses did not serve many enclaves of UCSB's staff,
108 faculty, and students well.
- 109 • MTD was surprised that he found the university is not well served; MTD
110 believed the university was one of the places they served the best.

111

112 AVC Fisher stated:

113

- 114 • The UCSB administration currently meets with MTD bi-monthly.
- 115 • We currently subsidize the 6 and 11 bus lines; we are talking about
116 enhancing other routes as we develop other parts of campus, mainly the
117 North West quadrant.
- 118 • UCSB and SBCC will work with MTD together to discuss the issue of
119 SBCC students being picked up on campus and SBCC involvement with
120 funding transit improvements.
- 121 • MTD states that more service requires more funding.
- 122 • In line with the LRDP, we are looking at ways to best fund transit
123 enhancements.
- 124 • TAB is considering a ground rent on non-state landed buildings to be used
125 toward alternative transportation needs.
- 126 • Invites a joint meeting between the Parking Ratepayers Board and
127 Transportation Alternative Board, to create a new sub-committee to
128 explore funding options.
- 129 • We are “under-parking” our future housing, at 1.5 cars per household,
130 industry standards call for approximately 2.4 spaces per unit. With under
131 parking our housing, we must put funding into alternative transportation.
- 132 • MTD will not make service improvements out of the goodness of their
133 hearts; they have other issues to deal with as well.
- 134 • Is it more cost effective to fund a part of a \$20,000,000 intersection or use
135 those funds for alternative transportation programs. The draft LRDP needs
136 to consider how much traffic is generated by campus.

137 Board member Deutsch Stated:

- 138 • Where does the money come from? Ratepayers?

139

140 Chair Goulias Stated:

- 141 • We need to work with MTD for direct grants.

142

143 AVC Fisher Stated:

- 144 • The community has not said no to the growth of UCSB, and they want
145 financial compensation for impacts associated with development.
- 146 • The question is how much value do we place on the ability to grow?
- 147 • There will be an Isla Vista shuttle.
- 148 • We will get to pay entitlement fees for the LRDP.
- 149 • \$132 million was requested from the County.
- 150 • We should look at The Stanford model. Stanford taxes capital projects to
151 improve infrastructure and fund alternative transportation. This may be an
152 option for UCSB

153

154 Board member Bouraad-Nash stated:

- 155 • There is not a transportation plan for the campus. There is no committee
156 to study the problem and to provide specific proposals and push for
157 grants.

158

159 AVC Fisher Stated in response:

- 160 • TAB has started to create a funding plan for alternative transportation
- 161 • Housing rents/lease will include parking fees.
- 162 • Stanford made a huge commitment to alternative transportation that we
163 can look to as inspiration.
- 164 • Ground rent for Housing, non-state funded buildings that goes in part to
165 fund alternative transportation could be an affective model.

166

167 Chair Goulias stated:

- 168 • There needs to be integration for circulation to the campus and inside the
169 campus.
- 170 • Funding streams for transportation, circulation, operations.
- 171 • There are different options: taxing at the beginning once, and taxing
172 incrementally over time.
- 173 • Who will implement, manage, operative and maintain? These details need
174 to be discussed.

175

176 Director Defendini stated:

- 177 • We need to try to work with SBCC and MTD on the line 15x
- 178 • (IV-UCSB-SBCC).
- 179 • Currently the 15X stops running during summer months, this causes
180 issues with faculty, staff and students of UCSB who use the line to
181 commute between home and campus.

182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207

208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225

Board member Bouraad-Nash stated:

- She has been sitting on various parking committees for over 20 years and has never seen from the administration a solution to parking, except to rely on Ratepayers for the money.
- The rate payers do not have deep pockets, and she has never seen a grant proposal.

In response AVC Fisher stated:

- TAP has secured well over \$300,000 in grant money over the past few years from state and federal grants.
- Every private and public university in this nation is dealing with the issue of funding.
- The communities surrounding universities ask for mitigation fees from universities. In 1990, the campus agreed to pay mitigation fees to the County for our planned growth.
- In the state of California, we now have legislation that states we must pay our fair share to local services because of our impacts.
- Rather than build intersections, we could put the money into alternative transportation.
- The LRDP EIR includes the impacts of the campus development.
- The board will recommend to the Vice Chancellors that as we look forward we need to have a balanced conversation between the 1990 model, of just pay, and the 2008 model which includes how much it will cost for alternatives.
- The EIR for the new LRDP is based upon what actually happens, monitor it, and then decide how to best allocate funds to mitigate improvements.

Reply to the Board Recommendations to the Chancellor about Parking Rate Changes

Director Defendini stated:

- The Resident Hall rates proposed were approved. These were the second set of rates.

AVC Fisher stated:

- Vendor permits were approved, this new permit model is a great thing because it will increase revenue and help keep trucks off sidewalks and minimize unsafe campus environment.
- Carpool and reserved rates were a concern for the senior officers.
- Carpool rates should remain at \$18 to encourage carpooling.
- Reserved permits were recommended to \$90 rather than the recommended \$100.

Board member Bouraad-Nash stated:

- Reserved spaces are reserved 24/7.
- Most people with reserved permits can afford it.

226 Board member Harkins Inquired:
227 • Are the reserved spaces being used?
228

229 Director Defendini stated:
230 The reserved spaces are kept to the minimum, only about 30 throughout
231 campus.
232

233 Chair Goulias stated:
234 • State law currently prohibits parking fees to be tied to salaries. We would
235 need a state change to link parking rates to salaries.
236 • The Board agreed that the carpool permits staying at \$18 was acceptable,
237 and they will not change their recommendations.
238

239 Board member Church stated:
240 • Structure parking spaces cost approximately \$23,000, per space.
241 • If we have spaces in parking lots that we are pushing people away from,
242 we must put some spots in parking garages which would cost an
243 estimated \$100 per month, for the new spots.
244 • In comparison, \$100 a month for a reserved parking spot seems like a fair
245 trade off.
246

247 **Proposed Parking Citations Rate Changes**

248 Director Defendini stated:
249
250 • TPS has presented a proposal to TAB regarding an increase of the
251 citation fine rate from \$40 to \$45 for the most commonly issued citation
252 types.
253 • This higher rate was also suggested by the city of Santa Barbara and after
254 some push back they only raised their rate from \$40 to \$41 .
255 • Parking representatives are issuing courtesy notices (warnings) to first-
256 time visitors to campus, so only second offenses get cited.
257 • The proposed \$45 fine will be for several types of citations, the most
258 common ones issued on campus.
259 • The other violations, including parking in disabled spots, fire lanes, and
260 emergency lanes, rates will coincide with the City of Santa Barbara which
261 are higher than the current campus citation rates, these violations do not
262 come with a courtesy warning.
263 • Vendor permit regulations will also be reassessed.
264 • With the courtesy notice program, citations will be more enforceable and
265 less likely to be overturned on appeal.
266 • We encourage the increase to \$45 for the standard citation.
267

268 AVC Fisher stated:
269 • When the Vendor permit is implemented, vendors will be cited for parking
270 on sidewalks or other unsafe behavior on campus.

- 271 • Vendor permits will help deter actions of vendors that impact the safety of
272 pedestrians.
273 • Vendors will also be given a special vendor parking permit for \$10 a
274 month and a map will be provided special loading areas with limited time
275 frames for parking.
276

277 Board member Bouraad-Nash stated:

- 278 • She believes it is better to match the city at \$41 and not push for a raise to
279 \$45.
280 • It is more palatable if we match the community, this will help with our
281 public image.
282 • In addition vendors may decide not to serve our campus if we make them
283 buy vendor passes and restrict their actions.
284

285 Board member Deutsch stated in response:

- 286 • The community does not provide a free one-time warning for parking
287 violations. So this might be good reason to have the fee raised to \$45.
288

289 Chair Goulias in response, stated:

- 290 • The community allows the first 75 minutes free, which UCSB does not.
291

292 AVC Fisher stated:

- 293 • TAB must look for other fund sources, using fines and forfeitures is an odd
294 model that exemplifies a predatory behavior.
295 • TAB agrees that cites are not a sufficient funding source for TAP.
296

297 The Board agreed that the revised citation amounts are reasonable.
298

299 **Carpool Discount Permit for Graduate Students**

300 Board Member Deutsch inquired:

- 301 • Why are grad students ineligible for the carpool program?
302

303 Director Defendini stated in response:

- 304 • He needs to discuss this with the administration with consideration to the
305 expense and impact upon the department.
306

307 Board member Bouraad-Nash Stated:

- 308 • She moved to recommend that TAP eligible, graduate students working
309 45%, or more, be treated like all the other discount carpool permit holders.
310 Allowing graduate students to participate in the carpool discount program.

311 *The vote passed unanimously.*
312

313 **Budget**

314 Director Defendini distributed "Parking Operations Budget 2008-09" (please refer
315 to Attachment "B")
316

317 Director Defendini stated:

- 318 • The report is a first draft, and does not yet include the year end close outs.
319 • The year to date budget shows that there should be enough revenue to
320 cover costs and put some funds in reserves.

321 *Meeting adjourned: 11:10am.*