

Transportation & Parking Services

Ratepayer Board

July 16, 2007
3:30-5:00PM
UCen Goleta Valley Room

1. Roll Call 3:30PM
2. Introduction of Guests
3. Introduction of the Transportation & Parking Services (TPS) Director
4. Approval of the Minutes
5. Review of Past Board Recommendations
6. Overview of Plans and Ideas of the TPS Director
7. Other Comments
8. Public Comment
(Any member of the public may address the Board for up to 2 minutes on a Ratepayer related item not scheduled elsewhere on the agenda.)
9. Future Agenda Items
11. Adjournment 5:00PM

1 **Parking Ratepayer Board**

2 **July 16, 2007**

3 **Minutes**

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

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

9
10 **I. Roll Call**

11 The meeting commenced at 3:32pm with Board members Marti Lopez, Stephanie Brower,
12 Corey Huber, and Rick Church unable to attend.

13
14 **II. Introduction of Guests**

15 Kay Chambers, Arts and Lectures; and Vic Cox, 93106; attended.

16
17 **III. Approval of Minutes**

18 The minutes from the May 2, 2007 and June 6, 2007 meetings were approved.

19
20 **IV. Introduction of the TPS Director**

21 Robert Defendini was introduced as the new Transportation & Parking Services (TPS) Director.

22
23 Director Defendini stated:

- 24 • He has been asked to give plans and ideas about TPS, however he has only been at
25 TPS for one week and it is premature for him to report on this issue
- 26 • He has initiated an assessment of the department to improve inefficiencies so to better
27 serve customers
- 28 • His overall goals are to improve customer service by meeting the campus community
29 over the next few months to get an understanding of their needs and providing them with
30 what TPS can do to serve them
- 31 • TPS is considering internal things that are needed to make the department better, such
32 as: projects that will improve software, staffing, and organizational changes. He also is
33 developing procedures and standards of conduct and documenting these
- 34 • TPS will work to improve their marketing, communications, and outreach to the campus
- 35 • TPS hopes to develop a structure or process that will allow them to notify the customers
36 in advance and clarify changes before they are implemented
- 37 • TPS will work to ensure transparency in customer service and setting up processes to
38 show customers they are doing things cost-effectively and according to UC policies
- 39 • He would like to implement a mechanism or process in which the Board may
40 communicate any parking issues to him through the Chair and he may respond through
41 to the Board through the Chair

42
43 **Board Response**

44 Board member Harkins welcomed the Director and stated:

- 45 • He has worked at TPS in the past as the night enforcement officer
- 46 • He now offers his support as the fire martial and Board member
- 47 • Working at TPS is challenging, often it is difficult to keep the morale from being negative.
48 It is great to have employees that are able to see it as a challenge and keep on smiling
- 49 • He wished him well

50

51 Director Defendini stated he appreciated the expressed support and his advice and input; he
52 would like to meet with each Board member individually.

53
54 Chair Goulias stated:

- 55 • He is interested in the Director's assessment of the department and its different
- 56 functions
- 57 • The Board previously assessed the number of different groups served by TPS and used
- 58 this to divide the budget between them
- 59 • The Board is in need of principles in how to split the budget between TAP and parking
- 60 operations. For example, how can this be done: by the number of customers served,
- 61 budget revenue, something else? It is often difficult to get the right numbers and
- 62 calculations because our system is not designed to do that
- 63

64 In response, Director Defendini stated the difficulty is not just the calculations, but the formula
65 that gives you the appropriate end results. TPS needs to develop the criteria and know the
66 value that the Board needs. The transportation and parking budget at UCSD is one budget and
67 is not split between the different functions; the revenue all goes into one budget.

68
69 Chair Goulias stated the parking principles are different at UCSB.

70
71 Board member Bouraad-Nash stated:

- 72 • She has been working with parking for a long time, since 1986
- 73 • The history of Parking Services at UCSB has been very difficult
- 74 • She encouraged Director Defendini to learn about the "Lucas committee" (Chancellor's
- 75 Special Advisory Committee on Parking), which was formed after a revolt on campus
- 76 parking
- 77 • Parking Services does not have a high esteem from the campus community
- 78

79 In response to Board inquiries, Director Defendini stated the single point of contact between the
80 Board and TPS is Director Defendini.

81
82 **V. Update from the Chair**

83 Chair Goulias reported he is a new member of the Faculty Issues Council and was elected the
84 Vice Chair. One item under consideration of the Faculty Issues Council is university-wide
85 policies for parking.

86
87 Status of Past Board Recommendations

88 Chair Goulias reported he received a response from the Chancellor, Henry Yang, stating he
89 approved the Board recommendations for 2007-08. Chair Goulias distributed the letter from
90 himself and the Chancellor's response letter (please refer to Attachment "A").

91
92 Transportation Alternatives Program/Board

93 Chair Goulias reported:

- 94 • Parking Ratepayer Board made a recommendation to give \$74,000 from the
- 95 Chancellor's Contribution (campus funds allocated from the Chancellor) to the
- 96 Transportation Alternatives Board with an expectation that there will be an increase of
- 97 the number of people joining the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)
- 98 • TAP currently is operating on a budget deficit

- 99
- TAP is increasing the costs to customers for their programs such as for the bus pass (which was previously free) and carshare which may result in a decrease of number of TAP members
- 100
- Due to the decrease in members and funding, the Transportation Alternatives Board (TAB) may request additional funding from the Parking Ratepayer Board
- 101
- 102
- 103
- 104

105 Board member Bouraad-Nash stated:

- It is unrealistic for TAP members to have the entitlement to a free bus pass
 - It would be nice if TAP could give bus users a free bus pass, but not currently possible
- 106
- 107
- 108

109 Board member Deutsch stated:

- Graduate students do not have UCSB bus pass privileges during the summer because they are not enrolled in classes, so they have to pay the full bus fare
 - Graduate students may be working on campus this summer, but they are not considered Staff, so they don't qualify for the Faculty/Staff discounted bus pass program
- 110
- 111
- 112
- 113
- 114

115 Chair Goulias stated:

- There is a similar problem in the summer with Faculty members who are not employed during the summer: they go to buy a parking permit at TPS and when their employment cannot be found through the usual mechanisms, they are not able to buy Faculty parking permits
 - These employment verification procedures are not good customer service and need to be fixed
 - TPS needs to be operating under the principle that there is more supply of parking than demand. Therefore, TPS should be increasing permit sales and extending TAP privileges to more people
- 116
- 117
- 118
- 119
- 120
- 121
- 122
- 123
- 124
- 125

126 Director Defendini stated:

- TPS needs to assess the value of each option to reduce parking
 - It may not be good to offer a bus pass for free from the on-set because then when customers have to start paying for it, there is more resistance. This is now happening with TAP due to the bus pass no longer being free
 - The half-priced bus pass is a really good deal because it costs a lot more to drive to campus (not including the parking permit) due to the costs of vehicle ownership and maintenance
 - It is a balance between how valuable the service is to you, how much it costs, and how much you are willing to spend for the extra service. For example, your primary service could be a bus pass and if you wanted campus parking, that would be an extra cost
- 127
- 128
- 129
- 130
- 131
- 132
- 133
- 134
- 135
- 136
- 137

138 Board Inquiries and Comments

139 Board member Bouraad-Nash inquired of Director Defendini if he will be working with the Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) on creating additional bus lines?

140

141

142 Director Defendini stated:

- He has yet to meet with MTD
 - TPS staff have met with MTD to discuss expanding the bus service to UCSB
 - TPS now has a good relationship with MTD
 - Part of his responsibilities is to meet with MTD about expanding bus service to UCSB, within reason and budget constraints
- 143
- 144
- 145
- 146
- 147

148 Board member Bouraad-Nash stated:

- 149 • One of the greatest failings of UCSB for the past 25 years has been that the university
- 150 has not been able to meaningfully influence MTD to service this campus
- 151 • Board member Church (who was not able to attend) has a lot of information on UCSB's
- 152 history with MTD and needed bus routes
- 153 • There is no express bus service from the San Roque area in Santa Barbara. There used
- 154 to be an express bus service from this area that was fast and efficient, and very popular
- 155 during the commute hours
- 156 • Express services are only needed during the commute hours, during the morning and
- 157 evening
- 158

159 Associate Vice Chancellor (AVC) Marc Fisher reported:

- 160 • TAB has been working with MTD to expand the lines 6 & 11
- 161 • TAB is also interested in re-instating the uptown express that ran from the San Roque
- 162 area to UCSB
- 163 • TAB recently extended the \$21 per person per month subsidy to UCSB riders of the
- 164 MTD Valley Express bus (from Santa Ynez Valley) and is in process of extending this to
- 165 the Coastal Express and Clean Air Express buses (from Ventura, Santa Maria, and
- 166 Lompoc)
- 167 • UCSB has been working with VISTA to improve the schedule of the Coastal Express so
- 168 that it works better for UCSB-Ventura commuters
- 169

170 Chair Goulias stated:

- 171 • The \$21 funding to MTD Valley Express does not make it better for commuters because
- 172 the schedule is not flexible; it leaves Solvang at 6:40am, with a 7:23am arrival at UCSB
- 173 (which is too early for many faculty/staff). There is not a later option to leave Solvang in
- 174 the morning
- 175 • If UCSB uses its bargaining power to negotiate with MTD, there would be better results
- 176

177 Relationship between TAB and Parking Ratepayer Board

178 The Board inquired why do people have to give up their parking permit to join TAP?

179

180 Associate Vice Chancellor (AVC) Marc Fisher stated:

- 181 • There are limited funds for TAP benefits and so by making people give up a parking
- 182 permit to be in TAP, it creates an incentive and commitment for them to use alternative
- 183 transportation and not park on campus
- 184 • If everyone was able to have a parking permit and have the discounted bus pass, then it
- 185 would create a higher cost to TAP for subsidizing bus passes
- 186 • UCSB is not like other UC campuses that use parking permit revenue to support
- 187 alternative transportation
- 188 • He suggested taking some funding from the parking reserves budget to go toward
- 189 alternative transportation incentives for those that also own parking permits
- 190

191 Board member Pellegrin stated UCSB has a higher amount of people who use alternative

192 transportation than are part of TAP because there are people who own permits and bike,

193 carpool, or take the bus occasionally to campus.

194

195 Chair Goulias suggested the Board should meet with the Transportation Alternatives Board and

196 one item to discuss would be how to extend TAP privileges to those that own parking permits

197 Storm Drainage Infrastructure Renewal Project

198 The Board's motion and vote regarding the infrastructure project recommendation can be found
199 on page 5, line 241 of the June 6, 2007 meeting minutes.

200

201 Chair Goulias stated:

- 202 • In his letter to the Chair (please see Attachment "A"), the Chancellor stated that TPS
203 needs to pay something for the storm drainage infrastructure project (Multiple Systems
204 Renewal Project)
- 205 • He met with the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, Donna Carpenter, who
206 stated one way to handle the difference between the needs of the campus and the
207 needs of TPS is to stagger the costs of the infrastructure project
- 208 • The Board needs to discuss, in subsequent meetings, a formula of how much of the
209 funding is required for the infrastructure project

210

211 AVC Fisher reported administration is currently drafting a schedule for the infrastructure project
212 payments and the largest financial impact would be for construction the following year.

213

214 Night & Weekend Parking and Enforcement

215 Chair Goulias reported the Chancellor approved the Board's recommendation that the monthly
216 Night & Weekend rate would be increased from \$10 to \$12

217

218 AVC Fisher reported:

- 219 • In response to the Chancellor-appointed parking ad hoc committee (2006-07)
220 recommendation, the increased revenue from the \$1 increase of the Night & Weekend
221 parking permit (totaling approximately \$120,000 per year) was allocated into the
222 Enforcement units for expenses incurred from servicing events

223

224 22 Parking Storage

225 Chair Goulias reported the Chancellor approved the Board's recommendation that there be a
226 parking permit fee implemented for monthly storage parking spaces in 22 Parking at \$72 each
227 per month.

228

229 TPS reported there was a campus-wide e-mail sent out to all the student e-mail addresses
230 about the new Night & Weekend parking permit system and storage parking in 22 Parking.

231

232 AVC Fisher reported:

- 233 • There are currently 100 spaces allocated in 22 Parking for storage spaces. If there is
234 more demand, TPS could allocate more spaces to storage parking
- 235 • TPS would be presenting the storage parking information to the student orientations

236

237 The Board discussed the lack of publicity and outreach for storage parking in 22 Parking.

238

239 Director Defendini suggested using the student outreach example of UCSD, who has a full page
240 ad on the student handbook, at UCSB to publicize the storage parking in 22 Parking.

241

242 The Board stated there should also be an ad on the Daily Nexus about the available storage
243 parking in 22 Parking.

244 Parking Rates
245 Chair Goulias stated the Board needs to further discuss increasing the student, staff, and faculty
246 parking permit monthly fares.
247

248 Reserves

249 Board member Bouraad-Nash inquired why does the 25% extra debt coverage from parking
250 revenue go into reserves? Why not use this for operational expenses?
251

252 Board member Bouraad-Nash stated the reserves funding needs to only be used for parking-
253 related expenses.
254

255 AVC Fisher reported:

- 256 • 25% extra debt coverage (1.25) is required for parking structure maintenance
- 257 • Protecting the reserves depends on how TPS labels a parking project. The current
258 system needs to be changed
- 259 • Reserves can't be used for debt service, but it could be used to pay off the debt principal
260 if it was a very large amount
- 261 • TPS can also use it for TAP if they show it will reduce future capital expense
- 262 • Vice Chancellor Donna Carpenter needs to make a presentation to the Board about the
263 reserves budget
264

265 **VI. Future Agenda Items**

266 Future Parking Ratepayer Board items will be:

- 267 • Multiple Systems Renewal Project (storm drainage infrastructure)
- 268 • Parking rate increases
- 269 • 2007-08 operations budget
- 270 • Reserves budget (how they function)
271

272 **VII. Public Comment**

273 None.
274

275 **VIII. Adjournment**

276 The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

Attachment "A"

From: Henry Yang
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2007 12:11 PM
To: Kostas Goulias
Cc: Donna Carpenter; Robert Defendini; Marc Fisher; Gene Lucas; Joel Michaelsen; Richard Watts; Cheryl Dent
Subject: Re: PRB recommendations for the end of AY 2006-2007

Dear Kostas,

Thank you for forwarding the Parking Ratepayers Board End of Year Recommendations. You and the Board continue to exhibit dedication to this important endeavor.

Recommendation: The TPS budget receives a campus contribution that we recommend to be split between the transportation alternatives and parking. \$70,000 should go to the alternatives budget with the condition that funds will be used with success in increasing customers. The remaining funds should stay in the parking operations budget to cover expenses for parking services that are provided at no fee today. Bruce Kendall informed me that the alternatives board has a somewhat different request but in principle agrees with the funds allocation.

I support this recommendation. My understanding is that this essentially distributes the campus contribution evenly between parking and transportation alternatives. This distribution demonstrates the collegiality that we enjoy on our campus and the positive working relationship of the two boards.

Recommendation: As mentioned in my previous email message the "Multiple Systems Renewal Project" cost allocation to parking is causing many concerns. There are two reasons: a) communication about charging our reserves has not been open, transparent, and timely and we received the information we needed only after in essence major decisions and budgets were finalized by the administration; and b) the process and formulas used to compute cost allocation require refinements (e.g. include all impervious surface such as roads, driveway and so forth). In spite of these concerns, the board voted with 5 in favor and 2 against the principle that "parking should contribute its fair share to infrastructure renewal."

I appreciate the complexity of the allocation strategy and the challenge it presented to the board. This is an extremely important set of projects for the future of our campus. I understand that the allocation model was modified during the past year and that the contribution by parking more fairly focused on permanent structures. I am certain that the board's efforts and influence led to this new and favorable allocation model. I accept the majority vote supporting this principle.

Recommendation: At the June 6th meeting we also reviewed all budget components and proposals. Based on the June 6th Staff Report to our Board and with reference to page 2 of 2 we considered the four proposals of increasing fees for different constituents. We recommend with a unanimous vote (9-0) to proceed with items 2 and 4. Item 2 increased night and weekend monthly permits from \$10 to \$12 per month and includes a few

Attachment "A"

clarification notes. Item 4 is the implementation of storage parking in 22 Parking Structure and elsewhere. The other two items (numbered 1 and 3) will be considered by our boards after items 2 and 4 are implemented and their impacts are assessed.

I concur with your recommendation to increase the monthly permit from \$10 to \$12 and to implement storage parking in 22 Parking. Transportation & Parking Services (TPS) has acted on each of these proposals as of July 1, 2007. The storage parking can serve as a benefit to our neighboring community. I will encourage TPS to properly market this program.

As you know, we are required to meet the increasing debt service of our new parking structures. I am encouraged that the board will meet through the summer and continue to evaluate the new rate structures, determining whether additional rate increases are necessary. Again, I commend your efforts for the past year. Your leadership and hard work are greatly appreciated.

Best regards,
Henry

Kostas Goulias wrote:
Dear Henry,

The Parking Ratepayers Board completed its AY 2006-2007 work with a few new recommendations:

1. The TPS budget receives a campus contribution that we recommend to be split between the transportation alternatives and parking. \$70,000 should go to the alternatives budget with the condition that funds will be used with success in increasing customers. The remaining funds should stay in the parking operations budget to cover expenses for parking services that are provided at no fee today. Bruce Kendall informed me that the alternatives board has a somewhat different request but in principle agrees with the funds allocation.
2. As mentioned in my previous email message the "Multiple Systems Renewal Project" cost allocation to parking is causing many concerns. There are two reasons: a) communication about charging our reserves has not been open, transparent, and timely and we received the information we needed only after in essence major decisions and budgets were finalized by the administration; and b) the process and formulas used to compute cost allocation require refinements (e.g., include all impervious surface such as roads, driveways and so forth). In spite of these concerns, the board voted with 5 in favor and 2 against the principle that "parking should contribute its fair share to infrastructure renewal."
3. At the June 6th meeting we also reviewed all budget components and proposals. Based on the June 6th Staff Report to our Board and with reference to page 2 of 2 we considered the four proposals of increasing fees for different constituents. We recommend with a unanimous vote (9-0) to proceed with items 2 and 4. Item 2 increases night and weekend monthly permits from \$10 to \$12 per month and includes a few clarification notes. Item 4 is the implementation of storage parking in 22 Parking

Attachment “A”

Structure and elsewhere. The other two items (numbered 1 and 3) will be considered by our board after items 2 and 4 are implemented and their impacts assessed.

We are also planning to continue meeting during the summer and we are looking forward establishing a good rapport with the new director of TPS.

Please let me know if you have any questions and comments,

Best Regards,

Kostas Goulias
Chair, RPB