

Transportation & Parking Services

Transportation Alternatives Board

February 21, 2008

12:30PM-2:30PM

AS Conference Room, MCC 2525

- | | | |
|-------|--|---------|
| I. | Roll Call | 12:30PM |
| II. | Introduction of Guests | |
| III. | Approval of the Minutes | |
| IV. | Report from the Chair | |
| V. | Information on Stanford's Capital Development Tax Funding Alternative
Transportation – TPS | |
| VI. | Update on Skateboarding Resolution – Barbara Hirsch | |
| VII. | 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). | |
| VIII. | Schedule Future Agenda Items <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Information on Projected 2008-09 Vanpool Costs• Update on Support for AS Bicycle Infrastructure Proposal• TAP Parking Hours Used by TAP Members• Joint Long-Range Development Plan Meeting between TAB and the Parking
Ratepayer Board Members | |
| IX. | Adjournment | 2:30PM |

1 **Transportation Alternatives Board**
2 **February 21, 2008**
3 **Minutes**

4
5 **Members Present:** Barbara Hirsch, Kyle Richards, Corey Huber, Bruce Kendall, Bill
6 Freudenburg, and Max DuBuisson

7
8 **Staff Present:** Robert Defendini, Dolly Smith, Jamey Wagner and Marc Fisher

9
10 **I. Roll Call**

11 The meeting was called to order at 12:34pm with Stephanie Brower, Bernie Kirman, and
12 Laura Crownover unable to attend.

13
14 **II. Introduction of Guests**

15 The following guests attended:

- 16 • Cyril Johnson, former TAB member
- 17 • Sarah Henkel, Chair, Associated Students Bicycle Infrastructure Keeps Everyone
18 Safe (AS BIKES)
- 19 • Ralph Fertig, Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition

20
21 **III. Approval of Minutes**

22 The minutes from the 12-3-07 meeting were approved 4-0 (1 abstaining) with the
23 following correction:

- 24 • Line 69 was changed to: "The fuel economy of hybrid-electric buses is better
25 than diesel buses; the entire MTD diesel bus fleet now uses bio-diesel."

26
27 The minutes from 1-15-08 were approved 4-0 (1 abstaining) as written.

28
29 **IV. Report from the Chair**

30 Chair Kendall reported:

- 31 • Last year, the Board made a recommendation to the Chancellor to tie future
32 vanpool fares to campus salary increases. The Chancellor decided not to accept
33 this recommendation.
- 34 • There will be an ad hoc committee for vanpool fare increases.
- 35 • At the next meeting TPS will present vanpool fare proposals to the Board.
- 36 • TAB's oversight over vanpool is necessary since it affects the TAP budget.

37
38 The Green Initiative Fund (TGIF) Carshare Grant Proposal

39 Jamey Wagner reported:

- 40 • Students have a lock-in fee amounting to approximately \$160,000 per year to
41 fund green projects called The Green Initiative Fund (TGIF) and they put out a
42 call for grant proposals.
- 43 • TAP's grant proposal is for funding up to six more carshare vehicles on campus
44 at the rate of \$800 per vehicle per month.
- 45 • The TGIF grant coordinator has announced that TAP has been chosen as a
46 TGIF grant proposal finalist for 2008. TAP has been invited to present to the
47 grant committee on March 7, 2008.
- 48 • He reported to TGIF that the grant is scalable and the grant committee may
49 choose to grant TAP anywhere between one and six carshare vehicles.
- 50 • The carshare company Flexcar has merged with Zipcar, as of January 2008.

- 51
- Additional carshare vehicles would help reduce the vehicles on campus
- 52
- If accepted as a proposal, TGIF wants the carshare vehicles to be just for the
- 53
- students. Mr. Wagner stated he is not sure if this is possible to restrict the
- 54
- vehicles to only students with Zipcar membership.
- 55

56 Previous and Current Carshare Use at UCSB

57 In response, Jamey Wagner reported:

- 58
- When the carshare program was in-house, 500 people used it. 250 people used
- 59
- Flexcar. 80-90 people have signed up with Zipcar in the first month, Zipcar
- 60
- reports utilization has been impressively high.
- 61
- The current rate for using the Zipcar vehicle is \$5.50 per hour and \$60 per day
- 62
- including gas and insurance.
- 63
- Zipcar will start marketing in the Spring quarter, and will do most of the marketing
- 64
- in the Fall.
- 65

66 **V. Update on Stanford's Capital Development Tax Funding Alternative**

67 **Transportation**

68 Chair Kendall reported:

- 69
- Funding for TAP is currently coming mostly from Fines & Forfeitures.
- 70
- TAB is looking at other revenue sources for TAP
- 71
- Stanford University has a tax on building projects that goes towards funding
- 72
- alternative transportation.
- 73
- Jamey Wagner has done research on Stanford's model and he will present this
- 74
- information to the Board. The goal is for the Board to discuss how to recommend
- 75
- TPS to pursue this funding source.
- 76

77 Jamey Wagner distributed "Fundraising for TAP" (Please refer to Attachment "A")

78

79 Jamey Wagner reported:

- 80
- The Stanford Infrastructure Program (SIP) is a 4.6% tax on the total cost of most
- 81
- capital projects
- 82
- The SIP funds parking and alternative transportation projects such as bicycle
- 83
- infrastructure, alternative transportation operations and programs
- 84
- General Use Permit (GUP) is a ground tax on the square footage of all building
- 85
- growth in the amount of \$80 per square foot.
- 86
- Since the GUP was established in 2001 Stanford has reduced the Single
- 87
- Occupant Vehicle (SOV) coming to campus from 72% to 52%
- 88
- The General Use Permit (GUP) has generated \$160 million, which a portion went
- 89
- to alternative transportation.
- 90
- The GUP states one of the university's goals is to realize no net new peak hour
- 91
- trips during the life of the GUP (next 15-20 years).
- 92

93 **Board Response**

94 Chair Kendall inquired what departments could be charged the infrastructure tax?

95

96 In response, Jamey Wagner reported:

- 97
- Marc Fisher stated that this would be for non-state funded buildings
- 98
- There could be a "ground rent" as well as an whole building infrastructure tax

99 LEED Certification
100 Chair Kendall stated the infrastructure tax could be tied to the LEED certification for new
101 buildings constructed on campus; the funds generated would be allocated to TAP and
102 would provide points for the alternative transportation requirements of LEED.

103
104 In response, Jamey Wagner stated TPS could discuss with the Sustainability
105 Coordinator, Perrin Pellegrin, ways of providing funding to TAP as a step toward
106 expanded certification of campus buildings.

107
108 Bicycle Infrastructure
109 Board member DuBuisson stated the bike infrastructure should be included in the
110 construction plans or the contractor should have to pay a fee.

111
112 State-Funded Buildings Built on Surface Parking Lots

113 Chair Kendall stated:
114 • Surface parking lots will be lost due to new buildings constructed on the campus
115 and replacement parking will be in parking structures, which is very expensive.
116 • Since most of the population increase will result from the growth of state funded
117 buildings, there will be a conflict for new non-state funded buildings, such as
118 parking structures. This will provide rationale for taxing the state funded buildings
119 to fund new non-state funded buildings and infrastructure.
120 • What is the cost of parking spaces in parking structures?
121 • Should UCSB reduce mitigation fees for traffic to the county and instead give it to
122 TAP to reduce traffic?
123 • What would be the total amount generated from buildings?

124
125 Board member Freudenburg stated:
126 • State funded buildings could also be targeted for the construction tax.
127 • Constructing more parking structures is very expensive at UCSB and there is
128 limited space, so the campus will need to reduce SOVs coming to campus.
129 • The campus needs to consider the full cost of constructing parking on the
130 campus and how it relates to the parking fees.
131 • The campus needs to create policies that will help our relationship with the
132 community by reducing the traffic impacts resulting from people driving to the
133 campus.

134
135 In response, Director Defendini stated:
136 • Parking above ground is \$17,000-23,000 per space
137 • Parking below ground is \$ 30,000-35,000 per space
138 • TPS is working with MTD to explore expanding bus service to and around the
139 campus including more routes and stops around the campus, and increased
140 frequency.
141 • The expansion of bus service to the campus has associated costs and UCSB is
142 currently unable to provide adequate funding to implement these bus service
143 improvements.
144 • If the campus had an infrastructure tax to generate revenue, this would cover our
145 needs for expanding the MTD bus service to the campus.
146 • Improved bus service targeted at students living off-campus would allow more
147 students to commute using the bus.

- 148 Board member Richards stated:
- 149 • He is concerned with the infrastructure tax. Who would be paying for that? Would
 - 150 Housing and Residential Services pay for it?
 - 151 • What is the rationale behind the tax; what buildings would have the most impact
 - 152 on transportation?
 - 153 • He needs more information about who would pay for the ground rent before he
 - 154 can support this proposed tax.

155

156 Charging Non-state Buildings for Transportation

157 Chair Kendall stated:

- 158 • What are the current non-state funded buildings and new proposed non-state
- 159 funded buildings to be constructed?
- 160 • AVC Fisher will be able to give us an inventory of the non-state funded buildings
- 161 to be built in the next several years.
- 162 • What is the current ground rent at UCSB?
- 163 • Of the non-state funded buildings, who funds the departments that operate these
- 164 buildings? For example, Housing is self-supported by resident fees.
- 165 • What are the expected costs of building future non-state funded buildings as
- 166 projected over the next several years?

167

168 Board member Freudenburg stated:

- 169 • Students who live in the residence halls usually do not drive to campus so they
- 170 are not contributing to the problems of traffic and parking.
- 171 • Resident Hall students should not have to support traffic and parking mitigations
- 172 since they are not part of the problem.

173

174 Surcharges on Parking for Alternative Transportation

175 Board member Freudenburg stated:

- 176 • People that drive everyday to campus should be the ones to be charged for the
- 177 parking and traffic impacts on the campus. There should be surcharges on
- 178 parking fees to help support alternative transportation at UCSB.
- 179 • There is a non-quantitative value to reducing traffic such as the “good will” value
- 180 of working with local governments to mitigate traffic impacts on the community.
- 181 • The campus can be expanded without increasing automobile traffic and parking
- 182 needs by increasing the use of alternative transportation, which will go a long
- 183 way to improving our relationships with the community.
- 184 • UCSB needs to get faculty and staff to pay more for parking.

185

186 Board member Richards inquired why aren't the ratepayers paying for TAP?

187

188 In response, Chair Kendall reported the Parking Ratepayers Board has created a

189 guiding principle that fees from parking permits should only go to parking lots and

190 maintenance.

191

192 Board member Freudenburg stated:

- 193 • Last year the Board was trying to calculate the avoided costs of building new
- 194 parking structures on campus.
- 195 • He encouraged the Chair and the rest of the Board to recommend the Parking
- 196 Ratepayers Board provide more funding to alternative transportation on campus.

197 Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV) Use at UCSB
198 Board member Freudenburg inquired what is the amount of people driving to campus via
199 SOV?

200
201 Jamey Wagner reported:
202 64% of 4,605 Faculty/Staff (or 2,947) primarily commute by SOV
203 18% of 20,634 Students (or 3,714) primarily commute by SOV
204

205 So as a total percentage out of a total campus population of 25,239, 26% (or 6,661)
206 primarily commute by SOV, based on these survey results.
207

208 This is based on two UCSB commuter mode split surveys: a 2002 survey of Students
209 and a 2006 survey of Faculty/Staff.
210

211 Event Parking for the Community/Visitors

212 Director Defendini stated:

- 213 • Ratepayers Board manages the budget differently than other UC campuses
- 214 • TPS is in the process of replacing coin meters with pay machines.
- 215 • Arts and Lectures audiences are more willing to drive and pay for parking (\$3
216 each night/weekend day) for events.
217

218 Board member Hirsch stated:

- 219 • The community does not want to come to the campus because of the parking
220 costs.
- 221 • There should be a pro-rated parking amount for occasional parking such as
222 through the In-Vehicle Parking Meters.
223

224 Chair Kendall stated Arts & Lectures has a lot of events that are not supported by the
225 bus and the bus does not run during the late evening (after 9pm).
226

227 Parking Fees at Stanford

228 In response, Jamey Wagner reported Stanford charges \$603 for an Annual 12-Month “A”
229 (prime parking) permit and \$234 for an Annual 12-Month permit that is further from
230 buildings.
231

232 Parking and Transportation Goals in the Campus LRDP

233 Chair Kendall stated:

- 234 • The new LRDP assumes a net growth in student, staff, and faculty populations
235 on the campus so it would be good to include goals to reduce the traffic impacts
236 in the LRDP.
237

238 Director Defendini reported:

- 239 • The latest draft LRDP is not completely finished but is in the process of being
240 finalized, it can be revised to fit the needs of the campus including transportation
241 infrastructure.
- 242 • He has not seen the new LRDP yet.
- 243 • UCSB had plans to build two parking structures on the campus, and the campus
244 had to revisit it.
- 245 • He needs to ask Marc about the status of the new LRDP.

- 246 Board member Richards reported:
- 247 • The latest draft LRDP has been around for about a year and a half.
 - 248 • The new draft LRDP will have a public review period through June 2008, when it
 - 249 will be sent to the UC Regents for final approval.
 - 250 • To make any changes in the draft LRDP, the Board will need to give feedback
 - 251 soon.

252

253 In response to a Board inquiry, Dolly Smith stated the new draft LRDP is expected to be

254 released to the public by the end of March 2008 on the website

255 www.ucsbvision2025.com.

256

257 Chair Kendall stated the Board needs a presentation by Marc Fisher about the new draft

258 LRDP.

259

260 Board member Huber inquired what would be realistic to add to the new LRDP by June

261 2008?

262

- 263 Board member Freudenburg stated:
- 264 • Marc Fisher needs to have pressure from the community in order to make
 - 265 changes on the transportation policies and plans in the LRDP.
 - 266 • The Board can provide options to reduce traffic impacts on the campus to be
 - 267 included in the LRDP.
- 268

- 269 Board member Hirsch reported:
- 270 • Marc Fisher has a good perspective on reducing traffic and the environmental
 - 271 impacts because he works with a few departments dealing with sustainability,
 - 272 parking, and the campus planning and design.
- 273

274 Housing Plans

- 275 Board member Richards stated:
- 276 • The way the campus says they are mitigating traffic due to the campus growth is
 - 277 by increasing housing near the campus.
- 278

- 279 Jamey Wagner reported:
- 280 • If housing is built on the North Campus, then Housing and Residential Services
 - 281 may need a shuttle and this needs to be funded by some entity.
- 282

283 **VI. Skateboarding Resolution**

284 Board member Hirsch distributed "TAB Skateboarding Resolution(s)" (please refer to

285 Attachment "B").

286

- 287 Board member Hirsch stated:
- 288 • The different paragraphs indicate different audiences.
 - 289 • The first paragraph is for the university community and the UCSB administration
 - 290 and related committees. The first paragraph is a resolution that skateboarding is
 - 291 a legitimate form of transportation at UCSB.
 - 292 • The second paragraph is to be sent to the campus community when there has
 - 293 been a program established for skateboarding on the campus.

294 Chair Kendall stated:
295 • This resolution would be a recommendation to the Chancellor through the office
296 of Donna Carpenter, Vice-Chancellor of Administrative Services.
297 • He recommends sending the first and last paragraphs to Donna Carpenter.

298
299 Board member Freundburg stated the Board is trying to communicate the current
300 policies on skateboarding to the campus and requests more enforcement on the
301 skateboarding rules to ensure skateboarding and pedestrian safety.

302
303 Board member Hirsch moved to send the first paragraph to the Chancellor. Board
304 member Freudenburg seconded the motion.

305
306 The motion was passed with unanimous vote.

307
308 **VII. Public Comment**

309 Ralph Fertig stated:
310 • At the last Associated Students Bicycle Infrastructure Keeps Everyone Safe (AS
311 BIKES) meeting, there was a question on the bicycle roundabouts right of way.
312 The question was about who has the right of way, and it was suggested that
313 those entering the roundabout have the right of way.
314 • This is the opposite of traffic roundabouts: those in the roundabouts have the
315 right away.
316 • There are no signs about this rule on the campus bicycle roundabouts.
317 • Traffic circle right of ways have changed
318 • UC Davis bicycle coordinator stated the campus is putting yield signs in the
319 bicycle roundabouts.
320 • There should be a UC policy on bicycle roundabout right of way and signage.

321
322 Sarah Henkel, Chair of AS BIKES:
323 • She is not sure who said that entering traffic has right of way.
324 • The bicycle roundabouts should be able to accommodate more than one bicycle
325 riding side by side, which would require the bicyclists already in the roundabout
326 to move closer to the inside of the roundabout to allow entering bicycles.

327
328 Cyril Johnson:
329 • The yield is on the left of the roundabout in Europe.

330
331 Jamey Wagner stated:
332 • He has sent an email to Marc Fisher inquiring about the right of way rules for
333 bicycle roundabouts at UCSB.
334 • He is not sure if there is a campus regulation on this.
335 • The bicycle regulations on safety are decided UC-wide.

336
337 Bicycle and Pedestrian crossing at Stadium Road

338 Stadium and the bike path stop:
339 • Chair Kendall stated the bicycle path that crosses Stadium Road near El Colegio
340 Road should not be a stop for bicyclists but a stop for vehicles.

- 341 Sarah Henkel stated:
- 342 • The stop sign at that bicycle crossing is to prevent vehicles from backing up into
 - 343 El Colegio Road.
 - 344 • There has been discussion of installing a bike signal coordinated with the traffic
 - 345 signal. However, she does not know how expensive this bike signal would be or
 - 346 who would pay for it.

347

348 In response, Jamey Wagner reported something to consider is there may be a new

349 traffic roundabout at the intersection of El Colegio Road and Stadium Road as part of the

350 San Clemente Housing project.

- 351 Board member DuBuisson stated:
- 352 • He was told by an officer that if a car stops for you, then you can go through the
 - 353 intersection.
 - 354 • Santa Ynez Apartments has a stop for cars on the bike path.

355

356

357 UCSB Bicycle Infrastructure Policy

- 358 Sarah Henkel reported:
- 359 • The bike infrastructure policy was supposed go in front of the Campus Planning
 - 360 Committee (CPC) at their meeting in February, and the meeting was cancelled.
 - 361 As a result the bike policy is postponed until the March 18th CPC meeting.
 - 362 • She will be present at the CPC meeting in case there is any questions from the
 - 363 CPC.

364

365 Jamey Wagner stated he will send the list of CPC members to the Board via e-mail.

366

367 **VIII. Schedule Future Meetings for Winter Quarter**

368 The next meeting will be either March 6 or March 13 from 12:30-2:30pm.

369

370 **IX. Public Comment**

- 371 Susan Moon stated:
- 372 • She uses the vanpool and wants a vanpool that come at a later schedule
 - 373 (8:30am-5:30pm).
 - 374 • Coastal Express buses are being used, cheaper.
 - 375 • Vanpool drivers are burning out from driving.
 - 376 • Part-time Vanpool schedules and fares should be more flexible; riders should not
 - 377 have to pay to ride different days than they are scheduled.

378

379 In response, Dolly Smith reported vanpool schedules are made to maximize the riders

380 on the vanpools.

381

382 **X. Schedule Future Agenda Items**

- 383 Future agenda items include:
- 384 • Capital development tax funding alternative transportation
 - 385 • TAP parking hours used by members
 - 386 • UCSB bicycle infrastructure policy
 - 387 • Vanpool fares, 2008-09
 - 388 • LRDP presentation

389 TAP Parking Hours

390 Jamey Wagner reported:

- 391 • TAP's complimentary parking usage figures will be given to the Board by the
392 April meeting.
393 • The numbers of hours used will include the previous 12 months.
394 • At the request of the Board, TPS is now looking at the total hours by day and
395 night.

396

397 Joint LRDP meeting between both Boards

398 Chair Kendall stated:

- 399 • TPS will coordinate a joint meeting on the LRDP between the Parking Ratepayers
400 Board and TAB to discuss transportation and parking issues in future campus
401 development.

402

403 **XI. Adjournment**

404 The meeting was adjourned at 2:00pm.

Fundraising for the Transportation Alternatives Program to Encourage the use of Alternatives to Single Occupant Motor Vehicles

At the January 2008 TAB meeting AVC Marc Fisher mentioned Stanford's fees charged to capital projects. Perhaps the Transportation Alternatives Board will encourage the Chancellor to explore alternative funding sources for TAP such as those employed by Stanford.

Stanford currently has two such "infrastructure" taxes in place.

The Stanford Infrastructure Program (SIP) is a 4.6% tax on most capital projects (tax is on total project cost), and has been in place for many years. As its name implies, it is used to fund a variety of infrastructure projects (including parking) and programs in general support of the University's environs.

The other tax is relatively new (2001). It is the General Use Permit (GUP) Entitlement Fee, and is an \$80ft² assessment on increases in gross square footage. The purpose of this fee is to pay for the many county imposed conditions required for the approval of the GUP (the equivalent of a Long Range Development Plan in the UC system), and to help pay for infrastructure needs to accommodate campus growth. New parking facilities to meet the needs of campus growth are covered by this fee. One of the university goals under the GUP is to realize no net new peak hour trips during the life of the GUP (next 15-20 years).

This fee also pays for some of Stanford's transportation demand management program elements (like free rail and transit passes, program marketing, and a variety of incentives; over \$1 million per year).

Stanford's alternative transportation portion of the GUP fees has helped Stanford reduce the Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV) rate of their faculty and staff from 72% down to 52% in recent years. However, a majority of their alternative transportation program expenses are still covered by parking ratepayer fees.

Perks currently offered by Stanford to their alternative commuters

- Shuttles from Transit Stops and across campus - \$5 million per year
- Free bus-pass and commuter rail – Cost \$2.1 million/year
- Free Clean Air Cash \$234, per person, per year – Cost \$600K/year
- Vanpools outsourced to users and subsidized \$200, per van, per month

Options the TAB may want to consider recommending to the Chancellor based on the funding mechanisms employed by Stanford:

- Charge a one-time fee to non-state funded buildings at UCSB for new construction to encourage alternatives to SOV use
- Charge increased ongoing annual "ground rent" to non-state funded buildings at UCSB to encourage alternatives to SOV use

Attachment "B"

TAB Skateboarding Resolution(s)

The Transportation Alternatives Board acknowledges that skateboarding is a legitimate and efficient form of transportation within the campus community. A University policy (number 5450) addresses regulations and etiquette in order to promote safety, but these are currently not publicized or enforced. As interactions between skateboarders and pedestrians resulting in anger or injury do occur, the board suggests a strong ongoing education campaign, coupled with enforcement, analogous to the current practices to promote bicycle safety on campus.

NB – this would not be the resolution for the entire campus community, as it suggests that a program be established. For general consumption, sent by VC Carpenter, a different wording such as:

The Transportation Alternatives Board acknowledges that skateboarding is a legitimate and efficient form of transportation within the campus community. A University policy already in place (number 5450) addresses regulations and etiquette in order to promote safety. Trick skateboarding is not permitted on campus, and there are posted areas wherein skateboarding of any kind is not permitted. As for general regulations and etiquette, a continuing program is currently being established to educate the campus community, specifically skateboard riders, toward a safer and more satisfying pedestrian experience for all.

Depending on the target audience (e.g. campus administrators and appropriate organizations) for this resolution, more specific suggestions regarding a new program could be included, such as the following:

The education and enforcement campaign could be presented by Associated Students, Residential Life, the Police Department, etc. and might employ information in orientation packets, Nexus ads or articles, flyers, and electronic communications, including emails, text messaging, perhaps even a short and entertaining "training" video posted on a campus website or shown in the dorms. This annual program would convey campus policies concerning transportation vs. recreational or "Trick" skateboarding, use of earbuds, cellphones, pedestrian right of way, and general etiquette. For enforcement, Campus CSO's could be placed strategically and at random times to issue warnings. TAB encourages any efforts towards clean, civilized modes of transportation!