

Transportation & Parking Services

Parking Ratepayer Board

January 23, 2008
Public: 3:00-4:00pm
Executive: 4:00-4:30pm
Chancellor's Conference Room, Cheadle 5123

1. Roll Call 3:00PM

2. Introduction of Guests

ACTION ITEMS

3. Approval of the Minutes

4. Approval of the 2007-08 Operations Budget

DISCUSSION ITEMS

5. Update from the Director – Robert Defendini

6. Debt Service and Parking Rates – Bob Silsbee

7. 3 Parking Night & Weekend Usage Survey – Stephanie Brower

8. Lot Surveys – Bob Sundberg and Robert Defendini

9. Parking Lot Safety: Mesa 18 Parking and 16 Parking north – Bob Sundberg and Robert Defendini

10. Scheduling Future Meetings

11. Future Agenda Items – Kostas Goulias, Board

MISCELLANEOUS

12. Public Comment

(Any member of the public may address the Board for up to 2 minutes on a parking related item not scheduled elsewhere on the agenda.)

13. Public Meeting Adjournment 4:00PM

14. Executive Meeting (Board members only) 4:00PM

15. Executive Meeting Adjournment 4:30PM

1 **Parking Ratepayer Board**
2 **January 23, 2008**
3 **Minutes**

4
5 **Members Present:** Kostas Goulias, Marguerite Bouraad-Nash, Kate Deutsch, Joe Harkins,
6 Richard Church, and Perrin Pellegrin

7
8 **Staff Present:** Laura Condon, Robert Defendini, Bob Silsbee, Bob Sundberg, Marc Fisher, and
9 Dolly Smith

10
11 **I. Roll Call**

12 The meeting was called to order at 3:07PM with Dan Givens, Stephanie Brower, and Corey
13 Huber unable to attend. Corey Huber sent Jordan Anthony Killebrew as his proxy.

14
15 **II. Introduction of Guests**

16 The following guests attended:

- 17 • Jordan Anthony Killebrew, Resident Halls Association, proxy for Corey Huber
- 18 • Mackenzie Weinger, Daily Nexus
- 19 • Vic Cox, 93106
- 20 • Kay Chambers, Arts & Lectures
- 21 • W. Doug Morgan, Economics

22
23 **III. Approval of the Minutes**

24 The minutes from the December 4, 2007 meeting were approved unanimously.

25
26 **IV. Approval of the 2007-08 Operations Budget**

27 TPS distributed "2007-08 Operations Budget" (please refer to Attachment "A").

28
29 Infrastructure Project under the Reserves Budget

30 Board member Bouraad-Nash stated:

- 31 • The Board cannot have a vote until the Board agrees on the funding amount to the
32 Multiple Infrastructure Renewal Systems project.
- 33 • The Board passed a recommendation on the project but a funding amount has not been
34 agreed upon.
- 35 • Access roads and reclaimed water should not be included in the formula.
- 36 • The infrastructure project discussion has been put off and put off and has never been
37 provided in the last six months.
- 38 • TPS has not provided enough information to the Board and still needs to negotiate with
39 the Board on this issue.

40
41 Bob Silsbee reported:

- 42 • The proposed funding amount has not been changed since the last presentation (please
43 see Attachment "B" from the [11-6-07 Minutes](#)).
- 44 • The infrastructure project was not a TPS plan; it was a campus-wide decision.

45
46 Director Defendini stated:

- 47 • The infrastructure project was not included as part of the plans of TPS; it was decided
48 external to TPS and handed-down to TPS.
- 49 • The infrastructure is not on the operations budget, it is on the reserves budget. He asked
50 the Board to approve the operations budget component.

- 51 Chair Goulias reported:
- 52 • The funding allocation included access roads to other parts of the campus, which should
 - 53 not be included.
 - 54 • The Board will make recommendations to the Chancellor and he will decide how to
 - 55 handle this.

56
57 Board member Church stated:

- 58 • This discussion indicates that TPS staff has no understanding that this issue has been
- 59 on the Board's agenda.
- 60 • It is included as future agenda items in the 12-4-07 meeting minutes.
- 61 • The information provided to the Board has not been suitable enough for them to make a
- 62 recommendation.
- 63 • The Board has not decided what they would endorse, if anything.
- 64 • The Board had this same discussion at the last meeting and this should have been on
- 65 the agenda today.

66
67 Board member Pellegrin stated the Board needs to find out what is being charged for reclaimed

68 water.

69
70 Board member Harkins stated:

- 71 • The infrastructure project is a massive project that may not be funded by the UCOP for
- 72 the next five-ten years.
- 73 • What assurances does the Board have that other departments are funding this project?

74
75 AVC Fisher stated:

- 76 • Phases 1 & 2 are both approved and funded.
- 77 • There may be some small tweaking on the funding amounts, but it will remain almost the
- 78 same.

79
80 Bob Silsbee suggested a small group from the Board work with Director Defendini, and Alan

81 Williams at the Budget Office, about the infrastructure proposal.

82
83 Chair Goulias inquired what the Board thought about Bob Silsbee's suggestion for a small group

84 from the Board to discuss this with the Director and the Budget Office?

85
86 Chair Goulias or Board member Church, and Board members Bouraad-Nash and Pellegrin will

87 meet with the Budget Office to: review the procedure of allocating the costs of the infrastructure

88 renewal project to TPS and review the assumptions, equation, and outcome.

89
90 Large Group Sales

91 Board member Deutsch inquired:

- 92 • What happened to the line item "Large Group Sales" that amounts to \$120,000 of
- 93 expenses that was included in the last budget presented to the Board?
- 94 • Does any other revenue from parking operations go to pay for events?

95
96 Director Defendini stated:

- 97 • The Large Group Sales budget item was removed from the budget and the expenses
- 98 from salaries was also reduced by \$120,000.
- 99 • TPS is creating a new unit for Guest Services, which will be responsible for their own
- 100 revenue and cover their own expenses.

- 101 • The \$120,000 was allocated to Guest Services, which includes core services (staffing at
102 events) at no cost to departments.
103 • No other revenue from parking operations goes to events.
104

105 Board member Bouraad-Nash stated:

- 106 • The \$120,000 comes from the increase to the night and weekend permits, which had
107 been recommended in order to make sure everyone pays their fair share.
108 • The \$120,000 was supposed to mitigate the costs to ratepayers, but instead it was taken
109 away from the ratepayers to give away “free services” to those that park at night and
110 weekends.
111 • The Board needs to raise a similar amount of money from the night and weekend
112 parking in order to defray the costs of parking so ratepayers are not paying more than
113 their fair share.
114 • There are no freebies on the campus; you use, you pay.
115

116 Director Defendini reported:

- 117 • He does not agree that those that park during the night and weekend are getting
118 anything free; they pay the \$3 to park on campus.
119 • The ratepayers do get the \$2 out of \$3 raised from night and weekend parking permits
120 (built into permit sales under transient revenue).
121

122 Board member Deutsch:

- 123 • The original increase recommendation was for the benefit of all night and weekend
124 parkers.
125 • Now the increase only gives services to those that park at night for events and does not
126 benefit others who pay to park during the night and weekends.
127 • At the last meeting, the Board discussed providing more lighting in the parking lots to
128 benefit all who park in the evening.
129 • What makes it unclear is that it went to the ad hoc committee, who said the “first call” on
130 the extra revenue generated would go to improving services to events; the verbiage is
131 not clear.
132 • She does not believe that TPS can use all this extra revenue however they choose for
133 events; she objects to this interpretation of the ad hoc committee’s phrasing.
134

135 AVC Fisher reported:

- 136 • The \$120,000 allocation Guest Services was the desire of the Chancellor; it was his
137 decision.
138 • A lot of the night and weekend parking revenue comes from those that park for events
139 on campus, so this extra \$1 of revenue was given to events parkers in fairness to them.
140 • This \$1 increase recommendation went through the proper steps: the Board made a
141 recommendation and the Chancellor responded to the recommendation.
142 • The Board is free to make another recommendation.
143 • The addition of lighting in parking lots could be funded through the reserves budget as a
144 capital development project.
145

146 Debt Service and Parking Rates

147 Board member Bouraad-Nash stated:

- 148 • There should not be any extra expenses paid for by the Reserves budget.

- 149 • The Board does not want to have to raise the parking rates unless it is absolutely
150 necessary, TPS should not shift the funding between reserves and operations but then
151 have to raise rates.

152

153 Board member Church:

- 154 • The amount needed to cover the debt also needs to include a sizeable surplus to go into
155 the Reserves budget.

156

157 Operations Budget

158 Board member Church moved to approve the operations budget.

159

160 The motion was not seconded, so the Board did not vote to approve the budget.

161

162 The Board agreed the two issues that needed to be resolved before they voted were: the
163 infrastructure project and the \$120,000 for large group sales.

164

165 **V. Update from the Director**

166 This information item was postponed until a future meeting.

167

168 **VI. Debt Service and Parking Rates**

169 Bob Silsbee distributed "UCSB Parking Net Operating Income-to-Debt Service Requirement
170 Reduced from 1.25 to 1.1 "(please refer to Attachment "B").

171

172 Debt Service

173 Bob Silsbee reported:

- 174 • The 1.25 net operating income-to-debt service requirement is no longer required, there
175 is now 1.1 needed.
- 176 • When the Mesa 18 Parking Structure was re-financed, it was at the 1.1 net operating
177 income-to-debt service ratio.
- 178 • This reduced financing requirement was discovered by Donna Carpenter at UCOP a
179 couple days before the meeting last month.
- 180 • The new requirement of 1.1 net operating income-to-debt service only requires \$270,000
181 be provided over the debt for Mesa 18 Parking (down from the previous estimated
182 \$675,000).
- 183 • 10 Parking Structure's construction costs are anticipated to be approximately \$1.4
184 million less than estimated. This \$1.4 million will be transferred into the Parking
185 Reserves budget.
- 186 • The approval of this 1.1 net operating income-to-debt service requirement is tentative,
187 but it seems likely it will pass by the UCOP Financial Management in the near future.

188

189 AVC Fisher stated:

- 190 • 22 Parking structure has a lingering soil issue (naturally occurring hydro-carbons) that
191 the campus is still trying to deal with; this will hopefully be resolved in the next few
192 months.
- 193 • This will be, at most, under \$1.4 million and may not cost anything if the soil does not to
194 be remediated.

195

196 Parking Rates Recommendations

197 Bob Silsbee stated:

- 198 • He does not believe the Board will have to raise rates by \$4 as he previously stated.

- 199 • He may recommend to the Board a \$1 increase in student, faculty, and staff parking
200 rates or other alternative choices (see bottom of page 2 of Attachment “B”).
- 201 • Associated Student never increased the undergraduate lock-in fee for night and
202 weekend parking permits after it was increased to \$3 in July 2007. The first set of
203 recommendations would address this issue.
- 204 • The second set of recommendations (option #2) includes increasing the resident hall
205 permits B1 and B2.
- 206 • There are currently 96 B1 permits sold to resident hall students to park in 2 Parking
207 (surface lot) through a lottery system.
- 208 • These spaces in B1 are essentially like reserved spaces since there are only 96 spaces
209 in 2 Parking.

210
211 Director Defendini reported:

- 212 • TPS recommends raising these B1 rates to \$72 per month.
- 213 • TPS also recommends that the B2 permit parking spaces (currently 202 spaces) be
214 moved from 30 Parking to 22 Parking.
- 215 • TPS proposes the new rate for B2 permits would be \$54 per month (mid-rate since the
216 distance is half-way between 2 Parking and 30 Parking).
- 217 • The differential rates for B1 and B2 would address complaints about B2’s distance from
218 the Resident Halls and safety concerns; this also better utilizes 22 Parking.
- 219 • B3 parking rates will remain at \$36 per month and are only valid in 38 Parking (by
220 Harder Stadium).
- 221 • He has discussed this with Willie Brown at Housing & Residential Services; Mr. Brown
222 was in agreement that these differential rates would work and are reasonable.

223
224 AVC Fisher reported:

- 225 • TPS has been trying to schedule a meeting with the RHA President, Corey Huber; and
226 AS President, Stephanie Brower about this issue.
- 227 • Opening up spaces in 22 Parking for B2 permits will probably encourage students to
228 park their vehicles on campus and not park in Isla Vista.
- 229 • The student population will change each academic year as students move off campus
230 and new students come onto the campus; this allows for more flexibility of pricing each
231 year.

232 **Board Response**

233 Differential Parking Rates for Resident Hall Permits

234
235 Chair Goulias stated:

- 236 • These parking rate recommendations are absolutely perfect, great ideas.
- 237 • The way of thinking is exactly what the Board was fighting for last year: a change in
238 mentality and how to increase revenues in creative ways.

239
240 Board member Harkins stated:

- 241 • The B1 parking spaces are very valuable due to their close proximity to the Resident
242 Halls and could be sold at even a higher price than \$72 per month.
- 243 • The differential rates will give the students more choices of parking (they can choose
244 what permit to get based on the price and location).

245
246 Board member Deutsch stated:

- 247 • This is a more equitable basis for parking permits; in her experience as a freshman, it
248 was not fair that there was one permit that than allows students to park very close to

249 their residences on campus and another permit, at the same rate, for parking that is in a
250 remote part of the campus.

251
252 Jordan Anthony Killebrew stated:

- 253 • He has also heard complaints about the B3 permits being the same price as B1 permits
254 and how B1 permits are so far from the campus.
- 255 • He thinks that this differential permit rate plan will work and it will be utilized.

256
257 In response to Board inquiries and responses, Director Defendini reported:

- 258 • TPS could add more than the initial allotment of 202 spaces for B2 permits (at \$54 per
259 month) in 22 Parking if there is enough demand.
- 260 • If there is not enough demand for the B1 parking spaces at \$72 per month, TPS could
261 shift approximately 100 parking spaces to 22 Parking at \$54 per month and open 2
262 Parking to Faculty/Staff parking permits.
- 263 • He hopes that there will be enough demand in both 2 Parking and 22 Parking.

264
265 Lot Surveys

266 Board member Church stated:

- 267 • It is a good reason to have a couple detailed lot surveys in order to assess the demand
268 for parking in 2 Parking and 22 Parking, then TPS will know the amount of permits to sell
269 in these areas.
- 270 • If lot surveys are not done, the campus could repeat the past situation of a shortage of
271 parking during the peak day times.

272
273 AVC Fisher reported:

- 274 • 22 Parking will have an increase of vehicles parking there when the Education & Social
275 Sciences Building (ESSB) opens.
- 276 • The Board will need to keep some flexibility in 22 Parking to accommodate the increase
277 in demand.

278
279 San Clemente Graduate Student Parking Structure

280 Board member Church inquired is there a parking structure for the Graduate students housing
281 (San Clemente)?

282
283 AVC Fisher reported:

- 284 • Yes, there is a parking structure will approximately 900 spaces; Willie Brown will
285 manage the parking structure and pay for the debt.
- 286 • In the future, TPS may manage the parking structure but split the operating costs with
287 Housing.

288
289 Board member Church stated:

- 290 • This is the first on-campus parking structure that was built and occupied by a department
291 other than TPS.
- 292 • He is concerned that this parking structure may cause a competition for demand from
293 other parking areas on-campus; Housing may be able to have a reduced parking rate
294 than the rest of the campus.

295
296 Bob Sundberg reported:

- 297 • The Coastal Commission's mandate is that for the first two years, the San Clemente
298 parking structure is limited to residents and staff of San Clemente.

299 Board member Harkins stated it is a storage facility for the vehicles of the residents.

300

301 Housing Parking Lots and Structures

302 AVC Fisher reported:

- 303
- Housing currently manages their parking lots, but in a couple years, the campus could manage these parking lots as well.
 - The Board could make a recommendation to the Chancellor in the future that TPS would manage all of the Housing's parking lots and the San Clemente structure.
- 304
- 305
- 306
- 307

308 Reserved Spaces

309 Board member Bouraad-Nash inquired why has TPS not considered increasing the rates for the Reserved parking spaces?

310

311

312 Board member Bouraad-Nash stated:

- 313
- [The Reserved parking permit's price of] \$72 is not sufficient because of their convenience (they are right next to the permit holder's office building).
 - Reserved parking spaces are reserved 24/7 and cannot be used by anybody other than the Reserved permit holders.
- 314
- 315
- 316
- 317

318 **VII. Future Agenda Items**

- 319
1. Multiple Infrastructure Systems Renewal Project
 2. 2007-08 Parking Reserves Budget
- 320
- 321

322 3. Lot Maintenance of Chemistry and Library Service

323 Board member Church stated:

- 324
- The parking areas Chemistry Service and Library Service have so few parking spaces that they will clearly not pay for themselves, so TPS should not pay for re-maintenance of these service parking lots.
- 325
- 326
- 327

328 4. UCSB Transportation Plans in the LRDP

329 Chair Goulias stated, in response to Doug Morgan's public comment on 12/4/07:

- 330
- Transportation travel behavior studies are not done on the campus.
 - The Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP) does not include plans for transportation systems.
 - The UCSB administration needs to do a transportation plan for the LRDP.
 - He has taken this issue to the Faculty Welfare Committee, who took it to Gene Lucas, Executive Vice Chancellor. Gene Lucas reported UCSB does not need a transportation plan for the LRDP.
- 331
- 332
- 333
- 334
- 335
- 336
- 337

338 **VIII. Public Comment**

339 None.

340

341 **XI. Adjournment**

342 The meeting was adjourned at 4:15pm.

Attachment "A"

TPS Operations Budget
1st Quarter Actual
2007-08

	Budget 2007-2008	1st Quarter 2007-08	% of Budget
REVENUES & RECHARGES			
Subscribed Permits	\$2,510,000	\$621,670	25%
Transient Permits ¹	\$1,705,326	\$406,445	24%
Lock-In Assessments ^{1 and 2}	\$222,975	\$95,405	43%
Meters	\$69,800	\$8,294	12%
Departmental Recharges ³	\$330,000	\$98,485	30%
Additional Allocations			
Campus Contribution ⁴	\$176,000	-	-
STIP	\$200,000	-	-
Halloween Reimbursement ⁵	\$46,000	-	-
Carry Forward			
TOTAL REVENUE	\$5,260,101	\$1,230,299	23%
EXPENSES			
Salaries/Wages/Benefits⁶	\$1,020,421	\$215,940	21%
Campus Services/Recharges			
FM Labor for Lot Maintenance	\$287,830	-	-
FM Utility ⁷	\$163,500	\$32,198	20%
FM JA & BM	\$38,573	\$3,680	10%
Police Security recharges	\$10,000	\$45	-
Large Group Sales ⁸	\$120,000	-	-
Common Fund/Insurance/Mail/HR	\$12,400	\$1,163	9%
Indirect Cost Recovery	\$25,000	-	-
IS&C	\$6,300	\$4,755	75%
Communication Services	\$9,000	\$2,818	31%
Transportation Services	\$27,700	\$5,496	20%
Central Stores/Furniture Services	\$7,300	\$1,356	19%
Other (Artworks/Printing)	\$2,800	\$811	29%
Total Campus Recharges	\$710,403	\$52,322	7%
Contractual Services			
Lot Surveys ⁹	\$24,000	-	-
Sparks Parking Meters	\$9,700	\$11,314	117%
Permits and on-line sales	\$100,000	\$38,643	39%
Bank Fees /Permit Dispensers	\$62,000	\$8,103	13%
Temporary Services	\$0	-	-
Dispenser service/warranty	\$75,000	\$52,653	-
Signage	\$3,000	-	-
Total Contractual Services	\$273,700	\$110,713	40%

Attachment "A"

***TPS Operations Budget
1st Quarter Actual
2007-08***

	Budget	1st Quarter	% of
	2007-2008	2007-08	Budget
Other			
Advertising/Promotion	\$2,000	-	-
Training/Meeting Rooms	\$9,650	\$195	2%
Travel	\$4,000	\$286	7%
Uniforms	\$1,500	\$350	23%
Computers & Computer Supplies	\$25,000	\$5,317	21%
General Supplies	\$18,000	\$5,470	30%
Printing & Paper	\$25,000	-	-
Verizon Wireless	\$6,100	\$1,073	18%
In House Recharged Labor	\$0	\$2,813	-
Lot Operating Projects	\$156,000	\$19,269	12%
Halloween	\$46,000	\$442	1%
Total Other	\$293,250	\$35,215	12%
TOTAL EXPENSE	\$2,297,774	\$414,190	18%
Balance (Net in Operations)	\$2,962,327	\$816,109	28%

1. Reflects correcting adjustment to more accurately include the \$2 to \$3 increase for night and weekend parking and the Graduate Student Lock In Fee increase
2. Includes 1st quarter and Summer Session revenue
3. Reflects adjustments made to better align funding flow from recharges to salaries
4. Ratepayer Board voted to provide \$74K in support of TAP Program
5. Reflects expected increase in operating costs for Halloween 07-08
6. Director Salary @50%, Financial Manager 50% @60K plus benefits, Salary inc.4-5% across the board
7. Increase reflects 22 Parking coming on line
8. Reflects \$1 increase in night and weekend permit sales going to Field Services
9. Necessary because lot surveys are essential to space and occupancy planning for the future.

Attachment "B"

UCSB Parking Net Operating Income-to-Debt Service Requirement Reduced from 1.25 to 1.1

- UCSB Parking has maintained at least a 1.25 Net Operating Income-to-Debt Service coverage ratio since financing construction of 18 Mesa Parking Structure because this was a requirement of the bond issued in the mid-to-late 1990s
- The Mesa parking structure bond was re-financed last year and the campus recently learned that the new bond issued requires a 1.1 Net Operating Income-to-Debt Service ratio
- UCSB Parking also recently completed and financed 2 new parking structures—the bonds issued for both of the new structures require 1.0 Net Operating Income-to-Debt Service coverage ratio (the 1.1 Net Operating Income-to-Debt Service ratio will be the controlling factor for UCSB Parking operations until the Mesa structure debt is fully retired or additional debt with stricter requirements is obtained)
- With 2 new parking structures, annual debt service has/will increase from about \$880,000 in FY 2004-05 to about \$2.7 million in FY 2008-09
- If UCSB Parking continued to maintain a 1.25 Net Operating Income-to-Debt Service ratio, UCSB Parking would have needed to increase its annual coverage (the amount in addition to debt service, which is transferred to the Parking reserves each year) from about \$220,000 in FY 2004-05 to \$675,000 in FY 2008-09
- The 1.25 coverage was considered conservative (private sector typically uses 1.1-to-1.2 in residential operations) and is financially prudent for other operations such as residential services where major capital renewal requirements are typically much greater
- Residential facilities have greater requirements than parking facilities—long term renewal needs in parking structures typically include elevator replacement, lighting, and painting, and in parking lots, primarily asphalt replacement, whereas long term renewal needs in housing include periodic replacement of all major building systems)
- UCSB Parking reserves were \$3.2 million at beginning of FY 2007-08 (more than one year's amount of debt service) and are projected to be \$4.6 million at beginning of FY 2008-09 (\$1.4 million will be transferred from the 10 Parking Structure project construction plant account to Parking reserves because the project is projected to come in below budget by that amount; there may still be a cost issue with naturally contaminated soil that was excavated from the 22 Parking Structure site, but we don't yet know how that will turn out)
- As mentioned at the December RPB meeting, to meet the increased coverage by next year, UCSB Parking C/S/A/B rates would have needed to increase by more than 11%, from \$36/month to \$40/month (or an equivalent amount of income or reduction in expenses would need to be obtained from other actions), plus other actions would have been required

Attachment "B"

- Instead, UCSB requested and received tentative approval from UCOP Financial Management* to implement the following guidelines, incorporating both a Reserve-to-Net Operating Income ratio and a Net Operating Income-to-Debt Service Ratio:

<u>Reserve-to-Net Operating Income ratio</u>	<u>Net Operating Income-to- Debt Service ratio</u>
0.00 - 0.25	1.25
0.25 - 0.50	1.20
0.50 - 0.75	1.15
0.75 - 1.00	1.10
> 1.00	1.10

* UCOP Financial Management anticipates formalizing a policy regarding this issue in the near future.

- By implementing these guidelines, there is still a need to implement the following increases effective July 1, 2008:

1. TPS will charge through the permit dispensers the additional \$1/Night-Weekend fee increase to undergraduate students that have a valid Night-Weekend sticker (this charge will cover the recent Night-Weekend rate increase from \$2 to \$3)

[Net Effect: possibly +\$57,000 for Parking operations; also provides ‘usage’ data]

-or-

prior to implementation of the above measure (or next year, after a review of the usage data), A.S. could approve and provide TPS with Night-Weekend lock-in fee of \$5/student/quarter (TPS would receive \$4.58/student/quarter [no A.S. “overhead recharge”; no vendor permit shipping/handling charges to students]; return-to-financial-aid would receive \$0.42/student/quarter)

[Net Effect: +\$57,000 for Parking Operations]

-and-

2. increase B1 permit rates (Lot 2) from \$36/mo to \$72/mo (same as reserved) and increase B2 rates (and move B2 location from Lot 30 to 22 Parking Structure) from \$36/mo to \$54/mo [Net Effect: +\$70,000 for Parking operations]

-or-

increase C/S/A/B rates by \$1 from \$36/month to \$37/month (+2.8%)

[Net Effect: +\$75,000 for Parking operations]