

Transportation & Parking Services

Ratepayer Board

March 7, 2007
11:00AM-12:30PM
UCen Lobero Room

- | | | |
|-------|--|---------|
| I. | Roll Call | 11:00AM |
| II. | Introduction of Guests | |
| III. | Approval of the Minutes | |
| IV. | Overview of Chancellor's Reply to Recommendations | |
| V. | Presentation of Permit Sales | |
| VI. | Operations Budget Overview | |
| VII. | Bids and Expenses of the Front Deck | |
| VIII. | Other Comments | |
| IX. | Public Comment
<i>(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.)</i> | |
| X. | Adjournment | 12:30PM |

1 **Ratepayer Board**
2 **March 7, 2007**
3 **Minutes**
4

5 **Members Present:** Jared Goldschen, Joe Harkins, Kate Deutsch, Kostas Goulias, Marguerite
6 Bouraad-Nash, Marti Lopez, and Perrin Pellegrin
7

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

10 **I. Roll Call**

11 The meeting adjourned at 11:00am with Richard Church and Stephanie Brower unable to attend.
12

13 **II. Introduction of Guests**

14 The following guests attended:

- 15 • Hal Drake, faculty member in History
 - 16 • Vic Cox, 93106
 - 17 • Marilyn Dukes, Associated Students (AS)
 - 18 • Bob Stevenson, Electrical & Computer Engineering, vanpool driver
 - 19 • W.D. Morgan, Faculty Issues Council
 - 20 • Bill Shiebler, AS Vice President
- 21

22 **III. Approval of the Minutes**

23 The minutes from the January 26, 2007 meeting were approved with 5 votes in favor and 2 votes
24 abstaining. The minutes from the February 7, 2007 meeting had the following correction:

25 Lines 171-179 were changed to:

- 26 • “Board member Bouraad-Nash stated she would like the students to be able to go to the
27 library, events, and everything else on campus during nights and weekends. However, the
28 lock-in fee must be cost-effective. If the proposed lock-in fee increase will not be put on the
29 ballot for the next five years [due to the moratorium], that is too long to provide the service at
30 the current price while other permit types are increased; it is not fair.”
- 31 • “Chair Goulias stated it is a question of principle: a lock-in fee imposes a tax on the entire
32 student population when only a small minority of students use the Night and Weekend permits.
33 This violates the Board’s principle: who uses parking pays for parking.”
34

35 The minutes from the February 7, 2007 meeting will be approved at the next meeting.
36

37 **IV. Overview of Chancellor's Reply to Recommendations**

38 The Chair presented from the e-mail from the Chancellor in response to the 2005-06
39 recommendations sent by the Ratepayer Board and TAB (please refer to Attachment “A”).
40

41 No Mandatory Fees for TAP, Voluntary Tax-Deductible Fund for TAP

42 The Chair reported:

- 43 • TAB proposed a mandatory increase in rates to go to Transportation Alternatives Program
44 (TAP). However, the Board did not approve this mandatory fee, and recommended there be
45 no mandatory fees. Instead, the Board recommended a voluntary tax-deductible fund to go
46 toward TAP.
- 47 • The Chancellor approved the first part of this recommendation and directed Jon Wiemann to
48 set up this fund for TAP.
- 49 • The Chancellor did not completely accept the Board’s recommendation about no mandatory
50 fees to go to TAP. The Chancellor stated parking fees, in the future, may be used for things
51 that benefit people who park on campus.

52 TPS reported the tax-deductible fund has been established but the advertising and donation
53 mechanisms were being worked out between TPS and Victoria Wing of Development.
54

55 **Board Discussion**

56 Board discussion focused on alternative transportation and parking demand, role of the Ratepayer
57 Board, relationship between Ratepayer Board and TAB, storm drainage infrastructure project, parking
58 replacement cost, and capital projects.
59

60 Alternative Transportation and Parking Demand

61 Bob Silsbee reported benefits for parking operations through TAP may include reducing the need
62 for new parking structures.
63

64 Chair Goulias stated:

- 65 • There is one alternative transportation mode that could benefit parkers: a shuttle that would
66 transport people from one parking lot to another parking lot. However, shuttles between
67 parking lots at UCSB are not necessary as parking lots are approximately a ¼ mile distance
68 apart
- 69 • He did his own informal lot survey on a rainy Tuesday afternoon two weeks prior and found the
70 following: at 9:50am the top levels of the Mesa and 10 Parking structures were empty, and
71 later that afternoon the parking structures appeared full but there were people leaving as more
72 people came in; they were near exact capacity.
- 73 • Parking lots need to be at exact capacity to make them the most cost-effective.
74

75 Bouraad-Nash stated:

- 76 • She does not agree that subsidizing bus riders will eliminate the need for new parking
77 structures. There is no credible data on this issue. Currently, there is a surplus for parking.
- 78 • She had previously moved for TPS & Institutional Advancement to establish the tax-deductible
79 fund to go toward TAP
- 80 • She encourages those at UCSB to contribute to the tax-deductible fund for alternative
81 transportation because it is responsible to the environment. The tax-deductible fund is a
82 benefit to UCSB ratepayers as it allows for tax deductions, which is subsidized by the
83 government. The fund is therefore good for both ratepayers and the environment
- 84 • The responsibility of the Board is to represent ratepayers. The social good is for the Board to
85 not raise parking rates
- 86 • Most government employees have free parking at their workplace, and UCSB is a part of the
87 California government.
- 88 • From 1995 to the present, parking fees were raised from \$15 to \$36 per month, which is a
89 240% increase. Most employees at UCSB have not had an equivalent salary increase to the
90 parking increase
91

92 Role of the Ratepayer Board

93 Goldschen reported:

- 94 • The Board should be more socially responsible in regards to increasing alternative
95 transportation and being environmentally friendly
- 96 • The Transportation Alternatives Board (TAB) did not believe the tax-deductible fund would be
97 effective in raising substantial funds for TAP
98

99 Former Board member and member of the Chancellor's Special Advisory Committee on Parking
100 (CSACOP), Hal Drake, reported during the CSACOP, they never discussed trying to get more people
101 to park on campus. Hal Drake stated:

- 102 • Previous to this Board, parking permit rates were decided by every group except for those that
103 paid for parking.

- 104 • In 1999, there were plans to make a large parking structure that would increase parking rates
105 by three times the amount at that time
106 • It would be a mistake to merge the two Boards because then people other than ratepayers
107 would be deciding on parking rates
108 • He is concerned with the response from the Chancellor, who negated the Board and consulted
109 with others. The Chancellor stated in his recommendations that he consulted with other
110 stakeholders regarding parking, but *there are no other stakeholders*; that's the problem.
111 Parking is set up as an enterprise fund, so it has to be run in the interest of those that
112 contribute to the fund (ratepayers).
113 • The Parking Ratepayer Board purpose: parking ratepayers only pay for the cost of parking
114 • As a enterprise fund, the Board has as a fiduciary responsibility (requiring them to defend their
115 actions in court) for making decisions on behalf of the ratepayers
116

117 Chair Goulias stated:

- 118 • He does not believe the Board has a fiduciary responsibility; his legal counsel stated the Board
119 has no responsibility; the Board would not have to defend themselves in court. Rather, the
120 Chancellor has the legal responsibility to defend his decisions in court. The Board is an
121 advisory board, not a board of directors.
122 • Chair Goulias requested AVC Fisher ask the Chancellor for the legal definition of the
123 Ratepayer Board.
124

125 Relationship between the Ratepayer Board and TAB

126 Chair Goulias stated the Chairs of the two Boards have to work together to ensure there are no
127 conflicting recommendations sent to the Chancellor. Chair Goulias suggested merging the two Boards
128 and invited the Board members to discuss this option. The Chair suggested he would also like to have
129 the twos Boards meet together.
130

131 Board member Bouraad-Nash stated there are no conflicting recommendations between Boards since
132 they each have different responsibilities and issues to different constituencies.
133

134 Board member Goldschen stated the two Boards have opposite ideas that can conflict since the
135 Ratepayer Board is trying to sell more parking permits and the Transportation Alternatives Board is
136 trying to reduce the amount of people parking on campus.
137

138 Storm Drainage Infrastructure Project (Multiple Systems Renewal Project)

- 139 • The Chair reported it is the university's policy that every auxiliary unit must contribute to
140 infrastructure cost. One infrastructure item is the storm drainage infrastructure project.
141 • Chair Goulias requested AVC Fisher communicate with TPS and the Budget & Planning office
142 about a formula on infrastructure cost.
143 • AVC Fisher stated the current cost formula for the storm drainage infrastructure project
144 (Multiple Systems Renewal Project) is determined by the surface area of the parking lots and
145 structure. However, there are several options for the cost formula depending on how UCSB
146 assesses the parking lots. Should the assessment for the parking lots include lots marked for
147 building sites? Todd Lee, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Budget & Planning, and Alan Williams
148 are in charge of this assessment.
149 • AVC Fisher stated he would bring in a formula for the storm drainage infrastructure project.
150 • Bob Silsbee reported the infrastructure project costs will be minimal for the first two years
151

151 Bouraad-Nash stated:

- 152 • She does not agree that TPS should pay for infrastructure costs since the UCOP owns the
153 parking lots and structures. Parking is paid by parkers, for parkers.
154 • UCOP should pay for infrastructure costs; Staff, faculty, and students should not have to pay
155 for the infrastructure costs.

156 Parking Replacement Cost

157 Chair Goulias reported:

- 158 • Parking replacement costs for parking lost due to construction of buildings have no set cost
- 159 and the Chancellor did not approve the Board's recommendation on parking site replacement
- 160 cost
- 161 • If the new Education and Social Science Building (ESSB), under construction in former
- 162 Parking 20 and 21, had to pay the full parking replacement cost of approximately \$25,000 per
- 163 space, UCSB could not afford to build this state-funded building. The replacement cost for
- 164 parking lost during the construction of state-funded buildings is substantial.

165 Other discussion:

- 166 • Board member Bouraad-Nash stated only non-state funded buildings pay for parking site
- 167 replacement costs. State funded buildings do not pay for replacement parking
- 168 • Board member Harkins inquired if the Campus Planning Committee (CPC) negotiates parking
- 169 site replacement cost for non-state funded buildings. AVC Fisher stated that is true, the CPC
- 170 negotiates the cost for replacement parking.
- 171 • AVC Fisher and Bob Silsbee suggested the Board recommend to the Chancellor that non-
- 172 state buildings pay more for replacement parking, over a period of time to accumulate interest.

173

174 Chair Goulias requested AVC Fisher draft a proposal to the Board regarding the parking replacement

175 cost for non-state funded buildings.

176

177 Capital Projects

178 The Chancellor directed TPS to bring capital projects in front of the Board for review and to create a

179 Lot Operating Maintenance 5-year plan.

180

181 **V. Presentation of Permit Sales**

182 TPS distributed "Active Permits by Permit Model" (please refer to Attachment "B").

183

184 Due to the interest of time, the Board postponed this agenda item until the next meeting.

185

186 **VI. Operations Budget Overview**

187 TPS distributed "Parking Operations Financial Report" and "Parking Operations 2006-07 Budget 7

188 month" (please refer to Attachments "C" and "D").

189

190 Due to the interest of time, the Board postponed this agenda item until the next meeting.

191

192 **VII. Bids and Expenses of the Front Deck**

- 193 • TPS distributed front deck bids (please refer to Attachment "E")
- 194 • The Board reported the front deck construction plan was not detailed, there were no
- 195 specifications
- 196 • TPS distributed photographs of the front deck repair (please refer to Attachments "F-I").
- 197 • There is a \$7000 maximum estimate for dry rot damage repair if all the wood against the trailer
- 198 is rotted, the total front deck construction current estimated cost is \$112,000
- 199 • Metal flashing was installed where the deck would rest flush against the trailer in order to
- 200 prevent dry rot
- 201 • The trailer 388 was constructed sometime between 1985 -1991. The decks were probably built
- 202 by the trailer's vendor, who did not use preventive measures against dry rot
- 203 • AVC Fisher stated TPS staff should be moved into a new building due to its current
- 204 substandard conditions

205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255

VIII. Other Comments

- Board member Bouraad-Nash reported from UCOP's document "Transportation Systems and Parking Program Principles" (can be downloaded at <http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/parking-principles2002.pdf>) dated April 30, 2002 from the former Senior Vice President Mullinix. This document states on principle number seven (7):
"Parking fees shall not support non-transportation system expenses."

Student Night & Weekend Lock-in Fee

Board member Goldschen stated:

- The idea of the lock-in fee has been to provide a service and convenience for students to access the campus library, events, etc.
- Former TPS Director Tom Roberts agreed to the establishment of the lock-in fee
- Students want to know why they would have to pay for a proposed lock-in fee increase; there needs to be detailed information proving what they are paying for
- Students don't have a choice between spending \$2 per night and/or weekend day or the \$10 monthly Night & Weekend permit; there is only the equivalent of the \$10 monthly Night and Weekend parking permit provided via the lock-in fee.
- Associated Students (AS) is concerned that without enough information provided from TPS, the students will not pass the proposed lock-in fee increase
- AS requests tangible information (such as from surveys) about the parking usage during nights and weekends and how many students use the Night & Weekend permit

Board member Lopez stated:

- The difference between the students' lock-in fee and staff/faculty permit rates is that staff/faculty cannot vote for parking rates
- Lopez agreed with AS that more information is needed

Chair Goulias stated:

- AS/Graduate Students Association (GSA) may get a group discount on the Night & Weekend permit via the lock-in fee
- In contrast to AS and GSA, the Parking Ratepayer Board does not have a widely voting option nor is elective; it is advisory.
- There is a difference between imposing a lock-in fee on the students and allowing the students to choose to pay for a parking permit
- All parking permit costs (including the cost of the Night & Weekend parking permit) cover the guaranteed opportunity to park, not the per parking-use of the parking permit. For example, if a faculty member holds an annual parking permit but only comes to campus 2 days per week, the faculty member must still pay \$36 per month to guarantee the daily-use opportunity of the parking permit
- The cost of the daily-use opportunity to park on campus is increasing because the debt service of the parking structures is increasing
- A survey would cost more than the potential revenue generated from the proposed lock-in fee increase

Board member Bouraad-Nash stated:

- The lock-in fee provides students better access to the library and events by allowing them to park on campus during nights and weekends. The lock-in fee also provides a safer environment for students rather than walking to campus at night
- The Night & Weekend permit lock-in fee must be cost-effective or else TPS can terminate their agreement of the Night & Weekend permit lock-in fee with AS and GSA

- 256 • Students can choose to agree to pay the proposed lock-in fee increase or choose a more costly
257 system. If they choose not to have the lock-in fee, they will either not come to the campus at night
258 or they will walk to the campus (which is unsafe at night)
- 259 • Faculty members choose to work at UCSB because they love the students; that is why they are
260 here. They want students to be safe when coming to campus and not be in danger. They also
261 want the students to benefit from what the university provides, but it must be feasible in order to
262 accommodate them.
- 263 • She encouraged the student Board members to do a survey to determine the student usage of
264 Night & Weekend permits, but only if the survey is inexpensive so that money is used wisely.
265

266 Board member Deutsch stated:

- 267 • Staff/faculty members can choose to park or use alternative transportation during the day;
268 however, students often do not have the choice to use alternative transportation if they want to
269 access the campus at night or on the weekend
- 270 • Students also have a lock-in fee for their bus pass
- 271 • In the past, the students have voted in favor of the lock-in fee
- 272 • She questioned if the students use the lock-in fee for the Night and Weekend permit enough to
273 make it cost-effective.
- 274 • She did not believe that students passing the ballot measure for the proposed lock-in fee increase
275 would be an indication of their use: students could not be using the Night & Weekend permits but
276 still vote in favor of the ballot measure for the benefit of other students who do use the Night &
277 Weekend permits
- 278 • She warned the Board that students will strongly object if the lock-in fee is eliminated and
279 encouraged the Board to reconsider eliminating the lock-in fee
280

281 In response to Board discussion, AVC Fisher informed the Board:

- 282 • The best survey is to put the proposed lock-in fee increase on the ballot to determine if the
283 students would be in favor of a fee increase.
- 284 • If students park on campus more than twice in a quarter during the nights and weekends, it would
285 be cost-effective for them to pay the \$4.00 Night & Weekend lock-in fee
- 286 • The GSA requested the \$4.95 processing fee for the annual Night & Weekend permit be built into
287 the lock-in fee to eliminate the full cost and inconvenience of this individual distribution method
- 288 • TPS/Administrative Services would ratio the cost of the \$4.95 annual permit based on the
289 students' recent past history of requesting the Night & Weekend permits
- 290 • If students elect not to increase the Night and Weekend lock-in fee, then the Ratepayer Board
291 could recommend that TPS terminate the Night & Weekend permit service for students
292

293 Storage Parking in Parking 22

294 Chair Goulias reported he sent an e-mail to the Chancellor regarding the Board's recommendation to
295 provide 300 parking spaces in 22 Parking for storage parking at \$72 each space per month. The
296 Chancellor has yet to respond to this e-mail and Chair Goulias stated he will follow-up with the
297 Chancellor.
298

299 **IX. Public Comment**

300 Bill Schneider stated the students have not elected for the Night & Weekend permit and therefore it
301 has been imposed on them. The proposed lock-in fee increase is an imposition since the students do
302 not want this proposed lock-in fee increase.
303

304 Silsbee reported the Night & Weekend parking permit lock-in fee was established by the students, for
305 the students. UCSB Administration did not request the lock-in fee to be put on the ballot.

306 **X. Adjournment**

307 The next Board meeting dates are scheduled for:

308 April 4, 9:00-10:30am

309 May 2

310 June 6

311 July 11

312 August 15

313

314 Future meeting agenda items:

315 • Permit Sales

316 • Operations budget

317 • Letter from UCOP regarding parking fee principles

318 • Multiple Systems Renewal Project (infrastructure) proposal

319

320 The meeting was adjourned at 12:30pm.

Attachment "A"

Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2007 11:18 AM -0800
From: Henry Yang <henry.yang@chancellor.ucsb.edu>
To: Konstadinos Goulias, Bruce E Kendall
Subject: Parking Ratepayers Board and Transportation Alternatives Board
Recommendations

Dear Kostas and Bruce,

I am writing to respond to the recommendations proposed by the Parking Ratepayers Board and the Transportation Alternatives Board that were not addressed in my previous e-mail to Professor Goulias of November 22, 2006.

As I did prior to my previous response regarding the PRB and TAB recommendations, I have consulted with the faculty leadership of the Academic Senate, including the Chair of the Academic Senate, the Chair of the Academic Senate Council on Faculty Issues and Awards, the Chair of the Council on Planning and Budget and the ad hoc group chaired by Academic Senate Chair Michaelsen, and representatives of student and staff organizations, as well as our administrative colleagues. Based on the outcome of this wide consultation, I have developed the following positions on the remaining recommendations of the PRB and TAB, as noted below:

* I accept the PRB position, for the present time, that no mandatory fee be implemented for transportation alternatives. However, permit fees for TAB might become appropriate in the future under several circumstances. These would be circumstances under which TAB fees would result in clear benefits to those who pay for campus parking. Benefits might include, for example, lower parking rates in the long term through reduction of the need for new parking facilities, improvements of campus transportation that would constitute a clear benefit to parkers, and improved availability of parking in convenient locations through reduction of demand for campus parking.

* It is important that the PRB and TAB work together on any issues that involve both groups to avoid forwarding any directly conflicting recommendations, such as the use of permit fees to fund transportation alternatives. As you know, the Chairs of the PRB and TAB hold ex-officio appointments to the other Board and I encourage your attendance and participation in these meetings.

* All auxiliary units are responsible for paying for their share of campus utilities. I urge the PRB to work with Transportation and Parking Services, and possibly the Budget and Planning Office, to agree on formulas for determining parking ratepayers' fair share of infrastructure costs.

* The current campus policy concerning parking space replacement costs recommended by the Chancellor's Special Advisory Committee on Parking will remain in place. The campus will continue to look at each case individually as projects are presented to the Campus Planning Committee.

Attachment "A"

* I recommend that there should be an annual budget for "Lot Operating/Maintenance Projects," base on a five year plan. The PRB should review the five year plan and approve the annual projects.

* I accept the TAB recommendation that the program providing free bus passes for faculty and staff should be modified so that passes are no longer free but can be purchased at a reduced rate.

* I accept the TAB recommendation that the car-share service should be outsourced and that two vehicles should be leased for the program

* The composition of the TAB will remain the same. The Board is a fair representation of our campus community, with 3 faculty, 3 staff, and 3 student representatives.

* Taxi fare subsidies should be available to TAP members only. Free or subsidized taxi services from the Amtrack station should be limited to commuters who do not hold campus parking permits.

* The use of a distance-based rate plan rather than a flat fee for vanpool participants should be continued.

* I propose that the other TAB recommendations that were not reviewed by the full Board be referred back to TAB this year for further consideration by the whole group.

I want to give my sincere thanks to you and all the past and current members of the PRB and TAB for advising me so thoughtfully and thoroughly on campus parking and transportation issues. I look forward to continuing to receive recommendations from both PRB and TAB that address these important campus issues.

Best regards,
Henry

Active Permit by Permit Model
7/1/06-1/31/07

Subscribers	Permit Model Name	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	
Faculty	2 Person A Carpool 2006-2007	48	55	63	67	66	63	63						
Staff	2 Person S Carpool 2006-2007	105	106	111	114	120	124	127						
Faculty	A Annual 2005-2008	953	925	936	959	962	964	989						
Faculty	A Summer Quarter 2006	28	37	33	0	0	0	0						
Undergrad	B1 Annual 2006-2007	70	70	69	93	88	87	87						
Undergrad	B2 Annual 2006-2007	124	124	126	147	167	189	216						
Undergrad	B3 Annual 2006-2007	42	142	360	362	363	362	384						
Undergrad	C Annual 2006-2007	206	269	298	292	287	286	283						
Undergrad	C Annual Academic Year 2006-2007	34	102	747	1008	1038	1054	1296						
Undergrad	C Summer Quarter 2006	313	421	421	0	0	0	0						
Undergrad	C Summer Session 2006	135	135	0	0	0	0	0						
Construction	Construction Fall 2006	0	0	7	7	14	14	0						
Construction	Construction Spring 2006	*Results are for Fiscal Year 2005-2006										*4	*47	*51
Construction	Construction Summer 2006	46	48	57	0	0	0	0						
Construction	Construction Winter 2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	1						
PT Staff/Grad	G Annual 2006-2007	118	140	151	110	29	23	19						
PT Staff/Grad	G Annual Academic Year 2006-2007	1	26	46	8	0	0	0						
PT Staff/Grad	G Summer Quarter 2006	100	114	116	0	0	0	0						
Undergrad/Grad	Halloween Permit 2006	0	0	0	1556	0	0	0						
General	Night/Weekend Annual 2006-2007	18	35	33	34	33	35	36						
Off Campus	Off Campus Annual 2005-2008	43	44	41	41	37	39	39						
General	One Month Permit 2006-2007	91	113	98	130	95	32	107						
Reserved	R Annual 2006-2007	28	29	31	31	29	29	29						

**Active Permit by Permit Model
7/1/06-1/31/07**

	Permit Model Name	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June
Staff	S Annual 2005-2008	1441	1467	1484	1515	1542	1540	1571					
Staff	S Annual 2006-2007	118	172	401	519	538	555	605					
Staff	S Summer Quarter 2006	33	35	36	0	0	0	0					
Special Guest	SG Annual 2006-2007	1	1	2	2	2	2	2					
Student Lock-In	Student Night/Weekend Annual 2006-2007	380	691	1129	2393	2724	2868	3389					
Vendor	V Annual 2006-2007	42	43	50	56	58	60	62					
Emeriti	EA Annual 2006-2008	25	35	43	45	48	51	55					
Retired Staff	ES Annual 2006-2008	30	45	55	65	70	77	86					

**Parking Operations Financial Report
Attachment "C"**

ACTUAL ALL SOURCES OF REVENUE	06-07 6 month	05-06 12 month	04-05 12 month	03-04 12 month
Subscribed Permit Sales	\$1,704,681	\$2,510,649	\$2,582,816	\$2,622,344
Department Recharges	\$182,836	\$322,805	\$356,280	\$287,338
Transient Permit Sales				
Pay Station Credit Cards	\$445,293	\$811,611	\$603,533	\$347,786
Pay Station Cash	\$178,036	\$308,961	\$307,895	\$300,820
Permits via Kiosk / Front Counter / Events	\$106,479	\$186,400	\$233,624	\$351,870
Permits via the UCEN Access Card	\$7,800	\$20,076	\$75,866	\$7,936
Meters	\$35,994	\$143,918	\$186,303	\$202,660
Lock-In Assessments	\$100,061	\$209,511	\$208,652	\$182,212
Interest Earnings (STIP)	\$69,510	\$173,984	\$97,222	\$76,274
Student Resource Building Mitigation*		\$400,000		
Campus Appropriation		\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Chancellor's Loan Repayment (Paid in Full)	\$43,137	\$98,136	\$98,136	\$98,136
Halloween Reimbursement		\$63,952	\$25,855	
Events*	\$299	\$147,952	\$111,447	\$72,010
Total Revenue:	\$2,874,126	\$5,647,955	\$5,137,629	\$4,799,386
Salaries/Wages/Benefits	\$375,668	\$892,414	\$1,058,150	\$1,101,715
Campus Services/Recharges				
FM Labor in Lots	\$121,832	\$220,916	\$219,586	\$200,449
FM Utilities	\$66,227	\$111,522	\$112,466	\$107,661
FM Janitorial / Administrative Support	\$16,961	\$41,423	\$47,026	\$42,796
Police Security recharges		\$10,000	\$43,152	\$16,756
Common Fund/Insurance/Mail/HR	\$6,296	\$10,442	\$15,371	\$8,584
Indirect Cost Recovery		\$31,654	\$28,073	\$22,878
IS&C	\$3,134	\$13,581	\$18,329	\$17,624
Communication Services	\$4,544	\$10,808	\$11,535	\$13,492
Transportation Services	\$14,161	\$49,710	\$43,359	\$39,614
Central Stores / Furniture Services.	\$2,913	\$12,299	\$15,414	\$17,777
Other (Artworks/Printing/Bookstore)	\$1,187	\$4,135	\$5,784	\$13,521
Total Campus Recharges	\$237,255	\$516,490	\$560,095	\$501,152
Contractual Services				
Stack Parking		\$88,901	\$165,898	\$163,084
Valet / Shuttle/Trolley	-\$4,120	\$21,708		
Sparks Parking Meters	\$9,000			
Permits & On-Line Sales	\$67,254	\$139,533	\$159,715	\$200,081
Bank Fees for Pay Stations	\$34,305	\$65,463	\$54,721	\$14,033
Temporary Services	\$3,010	\$39,957		
Dispenser monitoring,reporting; warranty; parts	\$21,475	\$105,122	\$93,032	\$41,100
Lot Surveys		\$12,413	\$4,084	\$14,401
Signage	\$2,697	\$8,553	\$21,941	\$11,293
Total Contractual Services	\$133,621	\$481,650	\$499,391	\$443,992
Other				
Advertising/Promotion		\$286	\$3,812	\$9,022
Training/Travel/Meetings	\$3,071	\$9,895	\$9,451	\$18,787
Uniforms	\$819	\$4,095	\$1,925	\$5,606
Computers & Computer Supplies	\$10,007	\$19,489	\$4,378	\$17,385
General Supplies	\$13,038	\$38,502	\$19,463	\$23,586
Verizon Wireless	\$2,976	\$6,529		
Conference		-\$12,600	\$39,083	\$1,000
In House Recharged Labor	\$8,430			
Lot Operating Projects	\$15,856	\$131,119	\$25,358	\$215,146
Halloween	\$36,447	\$63,952	\$25,855	
Total Other	\$90,644	\$261,267	\$129,325	\$290,532
Total Materials	\$461,520	\$1,259,407	\$1,188,811	\$1,235,676
Total Operating Expenses	\$837,188	\$2,151,821	\$2,246,961	\$2,337,391
Balance (Net in Operations)	\$2,036,938	\$3,496,134	\$2,890,668	\$2,461,995

*Not operating revenue

**Parking Operations
2006-07 Budget
7 Month
Attachment "D"**

	2006-2007	06-07	%
ALL SOURCES OF REVENUE	BUDGET	Year to Date	Budget
Subscribed Permit Sales	\$2,470,000	\$1,813,898	73%
Department Recharges	\$300,000	\$210,891	70%
Transient Permit Sales			
Pay Station Credit Cards	\$911,612	\$520,487	57%
Pay Station Cash	\$368,991	\$205,597	56%
Sales Office & Large Group Sales	\$186,400	\$113,200	61%
Access Cards	\$20,076	\$11,230	56%
Meters	\$100,000	\$39,945	40%
Lock-In Assessments	\$209,000	\$151,137	72%
Interest Earnings (STIP)	\$152,000	\$69,510	46%
Campus Appropriation	\$250,000	-	
Chancellor's Loan Repayment (Paid in Full)	\$42,987	\$43,137	100%
Halloween Reimbursement			
Events		\$299	
Total Revenue '06-07:	\$5,011,066	\$3,179,331	63%
Salaries/Wages/Benefits	\$892,009	\$442,168	50%
Campus Services/Recharges			
FM Labor in Lots	\$230,705	\$121,832	53%
FM Utility	\$163,500	\$75,163	46%
FM Jantitorial / Administrative Support	\$40,470	\$22,308	55%
Police Security recharges	\$10,000	-	
Common Fund/Insurance/Mail/HR	\$12,000	\$6,643	55%
Indirect Cost Recovery	\$34,265	-	
IS&C /Computer Connects	\$12,982	\$3,389	26%
Communication Services	\$11,720	\$5,197	44%
Transportation Services	\$13,592	\$16,139	119%
Central Stores / Furniture Services	\$9,908	\$3,084	31%
Other (Artworks/Printing/Bookstore)	\$2,629	\$1,324	50%
Total Campus Recharges	\$541,771	\$255,079	47%
Contractual Services			
Valet / Shuttle/Trolley		(\$4,120)	
Sparks Parking Meters		\$9,000	
Permits & on-line sales	\$137,324	\$68,352	50%
Bank Fees for Pay Stations	\$62,000	\$34,305	55%
Temporary Services		\$3,010	
Dispenser monitoring,reporting,warranty,parts	\$75,000	\$61,225	82%
Signage	\$5,000	\$2,697	54%
Total Contractual Services	\$279,324	\$174,469	62%
Other			
Advertising/Promotion	\$300	-	
Travel	\$5,500	\$568	10%
Training/Meeting Rooms	\$2,500	\$2,503	100%
Uniforms	\$1,700	\$819	48%
Computers & Computer Supplies	\$8,500	\$12,355	145%
Outside Printing & Paper	\$14,000	\$13,361	95%
General Supplies	\$12,050	\$6,113	51%
Verizon Wireless	\$3,400	\$3,347	98%
In House Recharged Labor		\$8,430	
Lot Operating Projects	\$150,000	\$19,243	13%
Halloween (request for full reimbursement)		\$36,457	
Total Other	\$197,950	\$103,196	52%
Total Supplies & Expenses	\$1,019,045	\$532,744	52%
Total Operating Expenses	\$1,911,054	\$974,912	51%
Balance (Net in Operations)	\$3,100,012	\$2,204,419	71%