

Transportation & Parking Services

Transportation Alternatives Board

Thursday, April 24, 2008

9:00-11:00AM

Student Resource Building (SRB) Room 1103

AGENDA

- I. Roll Call 9:00AM
- II. Introduction of Guests
- III. Approval of the Minutes
- IV. Report from the Chair
- V. Update on Items from the Chair:
- Right-of-way for bicycle roundabouts informational letter to Marc Fisher
 - Promoting “Curb Your Commute” program at UCSB –letter to Vice Chancellor, Administrative Services
- Information Items:
- VI. TAP Parking Hours Used by TAP Members –Jamey Wagner
- VII. 2008-09 Vanpool Fares – Jamey Wagner
- Discussion Items:
- VIII. Board Discussion of Capital Development Tax for the UCSB Transportation Alternatives Program
- IX. Transportation Plans in the Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP) and LRDP Environmental Impact Report
(Please refer to <http://www.ucsbvision2025.com/downloads.html>)
- Miscellaneous:
- X. Public Comment (Any member of the public may address the Board for up to 2 minutes on an alternative transportation related item not scheduled elsewhere on the agenda).
- XI. Schedule Future Agenda Items
- Update on April 29 Campus Planning Committee meeting response to the AS Bicycle Infrastructure Proposal
 - Long-Range Development Plan Presentation
- XII. Adjournment 11:00AM

1 **Transportation Alternatives Board**

2 **April 24, 2008**

3 **Minutes**

4
5 **Members Present:** Barbara Hirsch, Kyle Richards, Bernie Kirtman, Bruce Kendall, Max DuBuisson,
6 Bill Freudenburg, and Laura Crownover

7
8 **Staff Present:** Robert Defendini, Bob Silsbee, Jamey Wagner, and Dolly Smith

9
10 **I. Roll Call**

11 The meeting was called to order at 9:05AM with Stephanie Brower and Corey Huber unable to attend.

12
13 **II. Introduction of Guests**

14 The following guests attended:

- 15 • Ron Cortez, Assistant Vice-Chancellor, Administrative Services
- 16 • Bob Stevenson, ECE, vanpool driver
- 17 • Sydney Roberts, Labor Relations
- 18 • Ralph Fertig, Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition
- 19 • Steve Maas, Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District (MTD)

20
21 **III. Approval of the Minutes**

22 The minutes from the February 21, 2008 and March 13, 2008 were approved unanimously as written.

23
24 **IV. Update on Items from the Chair**

25 Chair Kendall reported:

- 26 • He sent a memo to Associate Vice-Chancellor (AVC) of Campus Design and Facilities,
27 Marc Fisher, about installing yield signs at the campus bicycle roundabouts.
- 28 • He also sent a memo to Donna Carpenter, Vice Chancellor, Administrative Services,
29 encouraging flexible schedules and use of work time to participate in Curb Your
30 Commute.
- 31 • Vice Chancellor Carpenter stated she would discuss this Curb Your Commute memo
32 with AVC Fisher.

33
34 In response to Chair Kendall's inquiry, Ron Cortez stated he would follow up with Vice-Chancellor
35 Carpenter and report back to the Chair.

36
37 **V. TAP Parking Hours Used by TAP Members**

38 Chair Kendall stated the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) currently credits the Parking
39 Ratepayers Board with the amount of complimentary parking allocated to the TAP members.

40
41 Jamey Wagner reported:

- 42 • The Chancellor allocates \$250,000 (Chancellor's Allocation) per year to Transportation
43 & Parking Services, as it had been recommended by the Chancellor's Special Advisory
44 Committee on Parking in their 2002 final report (please refer to pages 16, 19 on the
45 report at http://www.tps.ucsb.edu/PDF/Final_Report.pdf).
 - 46 • From 2002-2007, TAP did not receive any of the \$250,000 to fund alternative
47 transportation.
 - 48 • In spring 2007, Chair Kendall petitioned the Parking Ratepayers Board (PRB) to allow
49 TAP to receive some of the funding from the Chancellor.
- 50
51
52

- 53 Chair Kendall stated:
- 54 • He proposed to the PRB that, in principle, the Chancellor's Contribution should be split equally
 - 55 (50/50) between Parking Operations and TAP.
 - 56 • He recognized that TAP members are sometimes using parking spaces subsidized by
 - 57 ratepayers, and the estimate was calculated at the monthly parking rate at \$0.18 per hour
 - 58 (\$51,000 per year) for 2006-07.
 - 59 • He proposed PRB allocate half the Chancellor's Contribution (\$125,000) minus \$51,000 of
 - 60 complimentary parking be given to TAP members each year. The PRB accepted this proposed
 - 61 allocation of \$74,000 for year 2007-08.

62

63 Chair Kendall reported the \$51,000 was a rough estimate of parking hours value based on what was

64 allocated to TAP members, not what they actually used; TAP has now measured how many hours

65 were actually used.

66

67 Actual Parking Hours Used

68 Jamey Wagner reported that TAP members used approximately \$43,000 of parking hours in 2007-08

69 (please refer to Attachment "A").

70

71 Night & Weekend Parking Hours

72 Chair Kendall stated it is difficult to calculate a different value for night and weekend parking because

73 it is cheaper than weekday daytime parking rates, but people usually park less time during the

74 nighttime or weekend day.

75

76 After Board discussion, the Board agreed the night and weekend rate should be the same as the day

77 rate because it is simpler, consistent with the monthly regular permit rate, and may better

78 accommodate the PRB.

79

80 **VI. 2008-09 Vanpool Fares**

81 Mr. Wagner then presented a PowerPoint presentation on 2008-09 Vanpool Vehicle Allocation and

82 Fares (please refer to "Vanpool Replacement & Fare Increase.ppt").

83

84 Jamey Wagner distributed "2008-09 Vanpool Fares" (please refer to Attachment "B").

85

86 **Vanpool Replacement**

87 Please refer to slides 4-8.

88

89 Mr. Wagner reported:

- 90 • The vanpool drivers do not pay for the vanpool when they drive, so they are not included in the
- 91 full time equivalent (FTE) "payers".
- 92 • 4 out of 5 of the 14-passenger vanpool vehicles in the UCSB fleet will need to be replaced with
- 93 11-passenger vans (due to roll-over risk, UCSB is not allowed to purchase new 14-passenger
- 94 vans).
- 95 • Santa Maria II vanpool has only 10 total seats because it has a wheelchair lift.
- 96 • The average vanpool fare is \$125 per month, ranging from \$117-131 per month.
- 97 • UCSB Vanpools are currently operating at approximately 96% occupancy, which is higher than
- 98 the average of 80% vanpool occupancy at other UC campuses.
- 99 • In "Option 1", 3 people from Lompoc 1 and 3 people Lompoc 3 (6 total) will need to move from
- 100 their vanpools to a new "Lompoc 4" vanpool, including the 4 people on the waiting list. There
- 101 will also be one FTE driver, making a total number of 9 payers.
- 102 • The difference between Option 1 and Option 2 is that there would be 10 less payers and a
- 103 larger decrease in percentage occupancy.
- 104

105 Marketing UCSB Vanpools

106 In response to Board inquiry, Jamey Wagner reported:

- 107 • In the past, TAP has done outreach to potential vanpool riders to encourage more riders.
- 108 • Currently, it would require an increase in the total amount of the vanpool fare support if we
- 109 increased the number of vanpools at UCSB, and TAP currently does not have the funding
- 110 available in its budget.

111

112 Advantages of Option 1

- 113 • The Vanpool Program would be able to serve 10 more people on the vanpools.
- 114 • The occupancy levels would remain about the same, allowing the costs to stay at the lowest
- 115 possible levels and the resulting revenue would be maximized, thereby keeping fares as low
- 116 as possible given the funding available.

117

118 Advantages of Option 2

- 119 • Currently there is only one driver from Ventura, and sometimes the van does not run if the
- 120 driver is unavailable to drive.
- 121 • Option 2 would help relieve the pressure of the Class B driver's license requirement for the 14-
- 122 passenger van from Ventura and allow others to become drivers without this requirement.

123

124 **Vanpool Costs**

125 Please refer to slides 10-17.

126

127 Fuel-Efficiency and Fuel Types of 11-passenger Vanpool Vehicles

128 Board member Richards inquired:

- 129 • Are the 11-passenger vanpool vehicles were more fuel-efficient than the 14-passenger vans?
- 130 • Are the vans hybrid vehicles?

131

132 Jamey Wagner reported:

- 133 • The 11-passenger vans are only nominally more fuel-efficient than the 14-passenger vans.
- 134 • The vanpool vehicles are not hybrid vehicles.

135

136 Lease Costs

137 In response to Board member Kirtman's inquiry, Jamey Wagner reported:

- 138 • Vanpool vehicles are bought by Transportation Services, that then recharges or "leases" the
- 139 vehicles to TAP for the monthly costs (which include items like insurance, financing, and
- 140 depreciation).

141

142 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Vanpool Vehicle/Shuttle

143 Chair Kendall stated:

- 144 • The ADA vanpool vehicle was more expensive than the other vans, why does TAP need to
- 145 have this vehicle?
- 146 • Can it be sold to another department on campus?

147

148 In response, Jamey Wagner stated:

- 149 • The Vanpool Program does not currently need the ADA van, but it still needs to be paid for as
- 150 long as it is operable.
- 151 • It is possible that the van could be leased to another department at full cost, which could save
- 152 the program approximately \$500 per year in lease costs.
- 153 • Switching from the 10-passenger ADA van to an 11-passenger van would increase revenue by
- 154 one full time equivalent payer.

155

156

157 In response to Board inquiries, Jamey Wagner reported:
158 • TPS has announced the operation of the ADA to the following campus groups: Disabled
159 Students Program, the ADA Coordinator, Farfalla Borah, and Housing & Residential Services.
160

161 Board member Freudenburg suggested:
162 • The ADA van could be used during the workday as an ADA campus shuttle for students.
163 • Other campus departments could help fund the operation of the ADA van.
164

165 In response, Jamey Wagner reported:
166 • Staffing a shuttle is expensive.
167 • There has not yet been any funding identified for staffing an ADA shuttle on campus.
168

169 Fuel Costs and Projections

170 In response to Chair Kendall's inquiry, Jamey Wagner stated:
171 • He has used the current actual costs of fuel from Transportation Services (approximately 1
172 month lag) and the fuel cost projections are from McCormick and other fuel forecasts.
173

174 **Vanpool Fares**

175 Please refer to slides 10, 18-20 and "2008-09 Vanpool Fares" (please refer to Attachment "B").
176

177 Mr. Wagner reported:

- 178 • The current annual shortfall (TAP funding) for 2007-08 is expected to be approximately
179 \$20,000.
- 180 • The proposed shortfall (TAP funding) for 2008-09 is approximately \$30,000, a 50% increase in
181 TAP funding support to benefit UCSB vanpools (see Attachment "B").
- 182 • TAP proposes providing \$21 funding support per month per participant (the same funding
183 amount as TAP provides other transit participants such as Clean Air Express, Coastal, and
184 MTD).
- 185 • Option B is to phase in the increase in two steps, one increase effective from 7/1/08 to
186 12/30/08 and another increase effective from 1/1/09 to 6/30/08.
- 187 • Option B's second increase could be offset by funding provided by vanpool sponsorships.
- 188 • The average vanpool fare will go from \$125 per month per person to \$150 per person per
189 month (average 20% increase).
- 190 • The new distance-based fares will range between \$136-171 per person per month.
- 191 • The vanpool participants will be given an online survey where they can vote on one of these
192 two options.
193

194 Board member Hirsch stated:

- 195 • The vanpool participants are often lower-income employees who cannot afford to live in the
196 Santa Barbara area, so they must live further from the campus.
- 197 • Therefore, vanpool participants should be subsidized the most for their commuting costs.
198

199 The Board recommended TPS change the Two Step option have two equal increases.
200

201 **Board Member Inquiries and Discussion**

202 Funding for Parking vs. Alternative Transportation Modes

203 Board member Freudenburg stated:

- 204 • People who drive single occupant vehicles (SOVs) to campus everyday and park are being
205 subsidized more to park on campus than those that ride the vanpool or carpool, take transit,
206 etc.
207
208

209 Vanpool Sponsorships

210 Board member Freudenburg suggested:

- 211 • The Vanpool Program should target businesses that are local to each city where the vanpools
- 212 originate, such as banks and realtors in Santa Maria.
- 213 • The vanpool sponsorships should include some information on how the vanpool is reducing
- 214 carbon emissions: "This vanpool is saving ____ tons of CO₂ emissions."

215

216 Jamey Wagner reported his understanding of the guidelines for vanpool sponsorships:

- 217 • Names and logos are permitted
- 218 • Radio call signs are NOT permitted
- 219 • Phone numbers, e-mail addresses, street addresses, city names, and web addresses are NOT
- 220 permitted

221

222 Carbon Emissions

223 Jamey Wagner reported the campus does not currently capture the amount of carbon emissions from

224 vehicles commuting to UCSB.

225

226 Board member Freudenburg stated:

- 227 • The campus should allocate some parking permit revenue to alternative transportation in order
- 228 to reduce carbon emissions.

229

230 Board member Freudenburg requested TPS to make an estimate of the amount of carbon emissions

231 made from vehicles coming to UCSB based on available information on commute distances and

232 average vehicles carbon emissions.

233

234 Chair Kendall inquired:

- 235 • What is the campus currently spending on reducing our carbon emissions?

236

237 Ron Cortez, Vice-Chancellor, Administrative Services, reported:

- 238 • He will forward this question to Perrin Pellegrin, Sustainability Coordinator, and get back to the
- 239 Board with her response.

240

241 Sustainability and Environmental Groups

242 Board member Kirtman stated there should be a committee dedicated to reducing carbon emissions

243 on the campus that would help fund alternative transportation.

244

245 Jamey Wagner reported there will be a Campus Sustainability Committee advisory to the Chancellor

246 formed in the near future and other sustainability groups are already in place at UCSB.

247

248 Board member Kirtman requested TPS provide the Board with a list of campus organizations related

249 to sustainability and environmental advocacy groups.

250

251 Vice-Chancellor Cortez stated he could present information about sustainability at UCSB to the Board

252 at their next meeting.

253

254 **VII. Board Discussion of Capital Development Tax for the UCSB Transportation Alternatives**

255 **Program**

256

257 Chair Kendall proposed his ideas for funding TAP:

- 258 • Sustainability goals for reducing carbon emissions on the campus would require additional
- 259 funding from parking ratepayers for alternative transportation.

- 260 • Ground rent and/or a capital development tax could be established for alternative
261 transportation.
262

263 In response to Board member Kirtman’s inquiry, Bob Silsbee reported:

- 264 • UCLA charges a ground rent for non-state funded buildings.
265 • The ground rent is charged to the owners of the buildings.
266

267 Parking Revenues and Alternative Transportation

268 Jamey Wagner reported:

- 269 • UCOP reports that UCSB is the only campus in the UC system that prohibits the use of
270 parking permit revenues to support alternative transportation.
271 • UC Berkeley charges a \$15 fee per parking permit to go toward campus shuttles and
272 alternative transportation; permit holders are allowed to use the shuttles as part of their permit
273 fee.
274

275 Board member Freudenburg suggested the Board make a resolution to the Chancellor recommending
276 that the campus have parking revenue go to alternative transportation. The Board did not agree to
277 form this kind of resolution without further consultation from AVC Fisher, Vice-Chancellor Carpenter,
278 and the Parking Ratepayers Board.
279

280 Ralph Fertig reported:

- 281 • Stanford University did a study entitled “Solving Stanford’s Parking Shortage: New Solutions to
282 an Old Problem” (authored by Patrick Siegman) comparing building a parking structure and
283 funding/promoting alternative transportation. The study found that promoting alternative
284 transportation was much less expensive than building a parking structure.
285

286 Chair Kendall stated he would contact Marc Fisher inquiring about the possible revenue generated by
287 capital development tax and ground rent options.
288

289 **VIII. Transportation Plans in the Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP) and LRDP**
290 **Environmental Impact Report**
291

292 Chair Kendall led a discussion of the new draft Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP) and the LRDP
293 Environmental Impact Report (Please refer to documents online at
294 <http://www.ucsbvision2025.com/downloads.html>).
295

296 Chair Kendall reported:

- 297 • The LRDP states there will be little net growth in campus parking, but there will be surface
298 parking lots removed, requiring that replacement structured parking be built on the campus.
299 • Parking Ratepayers Board could pay some of the costs of increasing alternative transportation
300 in an effort to reduce the amount of replacement parking built on the campus, leading to a net
301 decrease of parking on the campus.
302 • Funding alternative transportation may cost less than the cost of structured parking.
303

304 Ron Cortez, Assistant Vice-Chancellor of Administrative Services, reported:

- 305 • There are some vanpools that are funded by a golf course in Santa Ynez because the golf
306 course is required to mitigate its traffic impacts.
307 • When there is a traffic study conducted for the LRDP Environmental Impact Report (EIR),
308 there will need to be traffic mitigation funds provided by UCSB to local government agencies.
309
310
311

312 Board member Freudenburg stated:

- 313 • The 101 widening project between Santa Barbara and Ventura will increase traffic congestion,
314 which can be offset by increasing funding to TAP to provide better alternative transportation.
- 315 • Parking costs approximately \$30,000 per (underground) parking space; one 11-passenger
316 vanpool reduces the number of parking spaces needed by 9 spaces.
- 317 • If the parking ratepayers gave TAP \$30,000 per year, the vanpool program could be partially
318 supported for one year and would eliminate the need for nine out of ten parking spaces (each
319 space costing approximately \$30,000).

320
321 In response to Board inquiries, Bob Silsbee reported:

- 322 • The newest parking structure, 22 Parking, cost approximately \$22 million plus interest (5.75%)
323 and has approximately 1,000 spaces.
- 324 • He would provide the Board any information needed about parking costs at UCSB.
- 325 • The Parking Ratepayer Board does not pay for the parking structure at one time, it is spread
326 out over several years, with no interest due until a few years after it has been built.
- 327 • Next year, the two new parking structures will have interest due.
- 328 • In the past, there were more frequent parking rate increases to afford the new structures; there
329 may only be nominal parking rate increases the next year.

330
331 Chair Kendall stated he would inquire of Marc Fisher:

- 332 • The traffic mitigation funding needed for the LRDP and if some of this funding could be
333 allocated to TAP as a mitigation measure.
- 334 • The projected cost of building parking structures to replace surface parking lots and cost-
335 savings for not building new parking structures.

336
337 **IX. Public Comment**

338 Steve Maas, MTD, stated:

- 339 • Just like a vanpool, transit is not self-supporting and does not receive all funding from fares.
- 340 • In order for MTD to increase their service to the campus, it requires an additional subsidy.
- 341 • If anyone is interested, he can send the amount of carbon emissions from MTD buses by e-
342 mail request.

343
344 Ralph Fertig reported:

- 345 • City of Goleta has recently installed bicycle lockers at the Amtrak Goleta train station and will
346 soon build restrooms.
- 347 • Bike to Work week is coming up in May. Bike to Work Day will be on May 21, 2008.
- 348 • At the Earth Day event in Santa Barbara, the SB Bicycle Coalition surveyed bicyclists about
349 their needs and desires for bicycling in the area. By far, people wanted more bicycle lanes and
350 more bicycle racks on MTD buses.
- 351 • At Bike to Work Day at UCSB, Ralph Fertig will repeat the survey for UCSB bicyclists.

352
353 **X. Schedule Future Agenda Items**

- 354 • Update on April 29 Campus Planning Committee meeting response to the AS
355 Bicycle Infrastructure Proposal –Chair Kendall
- 356 • Long-Range Development Plan Presentation –Marc Fisher
- 357 • Capital Development Infrastructure Tax that could benefit the UCSB Transportation
358 Alternatives Program –Marc Fisher
- 359 • Sustainability at UCSB –Ron Cortez

360
361 **XI. Adjournment**

362 The meeting adjourned at 11:00AM.

Attachment "A"

In Vehicle Parking Meter Hours & Coupons Used

2/1/07 - 1/31/08

In-Vehicle Parking Meter (IVPM) Usage			
Time of Day		7:30 am - 5:00 pm	5:00 pm - Midnight
Total IVPM		202,211	19,162

TAP Student Coupon Usage			
Time of Day		7:30 am - 5:00 pm	5:00 pm - Midnight
Total TAP Student Coupon¹		2370	N/A

Total IVPM and Coupon Usage		
TAP Parking Status	Usage	Total Value²
Total IVPM Hours Used	218,619 Hours	\$39,351.51
TAP Student Coupon Days Used ¹	2370 Days	\$4,052.70
Total		\$43,404.21

¹Each use of a TAP student coupon is valid for 1 day student-parking permit.

TAP students may use up to 6 coupons per quarter.

²\$0.18 per IVPM hour or \$1.71 per coupon use

2008-09 Vanpool Fare Calculation (Option A: One Step)

City of Origin	Average Mi/Mo	Fixed Costs per FTE	Mileage cost per FTE @ \$0.038/mi	Monthly FTE Fare w/\$21 in TAP support per FTE	Current Fare	2008-09 increase \$	% increase from 2007-08 fare
Lompoc	2065	\$86	\$78	\$143	\$123	\$20	16.4%
Santa Maria	2814	\$86	\$107	\$172	\$131	\$41	31.0%
Santa Ynez	1866	\$86	\$71	\$136	\$117	\$19	15.9%
Camarillo/Oxnard	2310	\$86	\$88	\$152	\$131	\$21	16.4%
Thousand Oaks	2835	\$86	\$108	\$172	\$131	\$41	31.6%
Ventura1	1874	\$86	\$71	\$136	\$124	\$12	9.6%

Average increase 20% or \$25 per FTE

2008-09 Vanpool Fare Calculation (Option B: Two Equal Steps)

City of Origin	Average Mi/Mo	Fixed Costs per FTE	Mileage cost per FTE @ \$0.038/mi	7/1/08 to 12/30/08 Average Monthly FTE Fare	1/1/09 to 6/30/09 Average Monthly FTE Fare*	7/1/08 to 6/30/09 Average Annualized Monthly FTE Fare w/\$21 in TAP support per FTE	Current Fare	2008-09 Annualized \$ increase	% increase from 2007-08 fare
Lompoc	2065	\$86	\$78	\$136	\$150	\$143	\$123	\$20	16.4%
Santa Maria	2814	\$86	\$107	\$158	\$185	\$172	\$131	\$41	31.0%
Santa Ynez	1866	\$86	\$71	\$129	\$142	\$136	\$117	\$19	15.9%
Camarillo/Oxnard	2310	\$86	\$88	\$145	\$160	\$152	\$131	\$21	16.4%
Thousand Oaks	2835	\$86	\$108	\$159	\$186	\$172	\$131	\$41	31.6%
Ventura1	1874	\$86	\$71	\$132	\$140	\$136	\$124	\$12	9.6%

Annualized Average increase 20% or \$25 per FTE

* This January increase might be reduced if fuel prices drop and TAP's efforts to obtain sponsorship for the vans is successful.