

Transportation & Parking Services

Transportation Alternatives Board

May 31, 2007
9:00AM-11:00AM
SRB Room #2293

- I. Roll Call 9:00AM
- II. Introduction of Guests
- III. Approval of the Minutes
- IV. Chancellor's Contribution to TAP – Chair Kendall
- V. Sponsorships for Vanpools
- VI. Guiding Principles for Future Vanpool Rates – Chair Kendall
- VII. Fines & Forfeitures Budget Update – Bob Sundberg
- VIII. Wireless Internet on Buses and Vanpools – Cyril Johnson and Bob Stevenson
- IX. Future Meetings – Schedule & Agenda Items
- 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. Adjournment 11:00AM

1 **Transportation Alternatives Board**

2 **May 31, 2007**

3 **Minutes**

4
5 **Members Present:** Barbara Hirsch, Bill Freudenburg, Bruce Kendall, Cyril Johnson, Laura
6 Crownover, and Stephanie Brower

7
8 **Staff Present:** Bob Silsbee, Bob Sundberg, Dolly Smith, James Wagner, and Marc Fisher

9
10 **I. Roll Call**

11 The meeting commenced at 9:05am with Jared Goldschen, Bernie Kirtman, and Brent Miller unable to
12 attend.

13
14 **II. Introduction of Guests**

15 The following guests attended:

- 16 • Linda Williams, Summer Sessions, vanpool rider
- 17 • Michael Holford, vanpool rider
- 18 • Ralph Fertig – President of the Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition
- 19 • Beverly Leaning, vanpool rider
- 20 • Patricia Marin – IC, Lompoc vanpool rider
- 21 • Alex Sanchez –IC, Santa Maria vanpool rider
- 22 • Jennifer Earl –Sociology, vanpool rider
- 23 • Lisa Murawski – SBCAG, Traffic Solutions
- 24 • Scott Spaulding – SBCAG, Traffic Solutions
- 25 • Toni Griffith-Reed –Black Studies, vanpool rider
- 26 • Corey Huber: AS President 2007-08

27
28 **III. Approval of the Minutes**

29 The minutes were approved with the following corrections by the quorum present:

- 30 • Lines 254-55 were changed to: “After participation in the discussion with the other Board
31 members, Board member Johnson conceded the Chancellor approved the proposed fare
32 increases...”
- 33 • Line 283 was changed to: “The Ventura commute would provide good bandwidth coverage
34 using EVDO”

35
36 **IV. Update from the Chair**

37 Chancellor’s Allocation of Core Funding

38 Chair Kendall stated he attended the May 2, 2007 meeting of the Parking Ratepayer Board (PRB) to
39 present information to Board regarding the Chancellor’s Allocation of core funding to TPS. Historically,
40 all of this funding has gone to parking operations. At this meeting, the following occurred:

- 41 • Chair Kendall stated the Chancellor’s Special Advisory Committee on Parking’s (CSACOP)
42 “Final Report” stated some of the core funding should go to TAP (please refer to
43 recommendation 4 on page 8 the “Final Report” of the CSCAOP)
- 44 • He reported to the Ratepayer Board that they have been giving a parking subsidy of
45 approximately \$51,000 of long-term parking equivalent to TAP members through the In-
46 Vehicle Parking Meters and coupon numbers for use at the permit dispensers
- 47 • He proposed the PRB split the funding 50/50 with TAP
- 48 • The PRB agreed to the principle that the core funding should be split 50/50 between parking
49 operations and TAP
- 50 • Chair Kendall had reported TAB has been trying to cut the costs of TAP but administration
51 costs have gone up because staff salaries have been reallocated between the parking
52 operations side and Fines & Forfeitures (enforcement, adjudication, TAP) side

- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- The PRB stated if the TAB Chair could come up with documentation of reduced parking demand and concrete TAP plans, they will consider redistributing the remaining \$51,000
 - The PRB passed this motion: “The Board moves to allocate half the Chancellor’s Allocation minus \$51,000 (a total of \$74,000) for the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), and if given a suitable report in subsequent meetings from the Chair of the Transportation Alternatives Board, the Board would consider reallocating the remaining \$51,000 to TAP”

60 Chair Kendall stated he recommends the Transportation Alternatives Board endorse the same motion
61 so the two Boards can send a joint recommendation to the Chancellor.
62

63 **Board questions and discussion**

64 The Board’s questions and discussion focused on the timeline for allocation, complimentary parking
65 allocation to TAP members, and the PRB’s decision.
66

67 Timeline for Allocation

68 The PRB approved the \$74,000 to be given to TAP for fiscal year 2007-08.
69

70 Complimentary Parking Allocation to TAP Members

71 TPS reported the number given to Chair Kendall was approximately the amount of complimentary
72 parking allocated, but this does not reflect what was used. TPS will get more accurate information
73 about hours used the next week and send it to the TAB Chair.
74

75 Board member Hirsch:

- 76
- 77
- 78
- 79
- The complimentary parking allocation of \$51,000 is not completely accurate, as there are TAP members who accumulate parking hours but do not use them
 - She would like to have a more accurate number of parking hours used by TAP members in 2006-07

80

81 Board member Freudenburg stated:

- 82
- 83
- 84
- 85
- The \$51,000 seems to be a good estimate by the Chair and would like to delegate the Chair to find a more accurate number
 - If TPS discovers that the parking used is within 10% of \$51,000, the Board should let the PRB keep the \$51,000 as a thank you for providing the rest of the Chancellor’s Allocation

86

87 Board member Johnson stated:

- 88
- 89
- The Board needs criteria of how to value the parking used: the rate of a long-term parking permit or the daily rate?

90

91 Ratepayer Board’s Decision

92 Board member Hirsch inquired how the PRB would give away \$74,000 in funding; how will this affect
93 their budget?
94

95 Board member Brower reported, as a member on the Ratepayer Board:

- 96
- 97
- 98
- 99
- 100
- 101
- 102
- The Chancellor’s Allocation was originally intended to be split 50/50 with the Transportation Alternatives Program
 - The PRB already has to pay off debt and the parking operations budget is being analyzed to reduce costs and increase revenue
 - Board member Brower stated that by Chair Kendall disclosing the \$51,000, it made the PRB more likely to compromise and negotiate with Chair Kendall about funding TAP

105 Chair Kendall stated:

- 106 • The PRB currently believes the Chancellor's Allocation was intended to offset the unfunded
- 107 mandates of parking, such as the campus' events like commencement
- 108 • The PRB was willing to give TAP the \$74,000 due in part to the acknowledgement that TAP
- 109 receives approximately \$51,000 per year in complimentary parking

110

111 Discussion Summary

- 112 • The Board accepts the \$74,000 from the Chancellor's Allocation for the fiscal year 2007-08
- 113 with further review for subsequent years
- 114 • The Board authorizes and delegates the Chair with the responsibility to review the amount of
- 115 parking used by TAP members as a deficit against the Chancellor's Allocation

116

117 **Board Action**

118 Motion

119 TAB moves, in cooperation with the PRB, to move forward to re-allocate the Chancellor's funding so
120 that it is split between the two Boards, with consideration of parking used by TAP members as a
121 deficit against that amount.

122

123 Vote

124 The motion passed unanimously.

125

126 **V. Sponsorships for Vanpools**

127 Chair Kendall reported he met with Victoria Wing, Director of Major Gift Planning - Development,
128 about the possibility of sponsorships for vanpools. Victoria Wing oversees the Sustainable
129 Transportation Fund. In their meeting, Victoria Wing stated:

- 130 • It is not a problem for vanpools to be sponsored as long as there was no logo or advertising
- 131 other than the sponsor's name on the vanpool vehicles
- 132 • It is acceptable to put some educational messages on the vanpool vehicles, such as "This
- 133 vanpool vehicle keeps 10 cars off of the road," or "If 10% of people rode vanpools, there would
- 134 be no congestion on the 101."
- 135 • There can be a number of different sponsorship levels, ranging from an imprint of "This
- 136 vanpool is sponsored by..." for a few thousand dollars to the purchase price of a van for the
- 137 Vanpool Program

138

139 The Chair reported:

- 140 • He did not ask Victoria Wing about having artwork done by sponsors on the vanpool vehicles
- 141 such as nature scenes; it is up to TAB and the Vanpool Program how they want to decorate
- 142 the vanpools
- 143 • He would like to see the Board and vanpool riders outreach to potential sponsors
- 144 • The Board needs to determine how much it would cost to paint sponsorships on the vanpools
- 145 and calculate this in the charge to sponsors

146

147 Vanpool Funding Principles

148 The Chair stated:

- 149 • The Board needs to discuss principles for how to use funding from sponsorships for the UCSB
- 150 Vanpool Program to keep fares as low as possible; sponsorships should be a direct benefit to
- 151 the vanpool riders
- 152 • Sponsorship of one vanpool route should be spread evenly between all of the vanpool riders to
- 153 reduce all of the fares on an average

154

155

156

- 157 Board member Freudenburg stated:
- 158 • The benefit of having a local business sponsor a vanpool from their area would be that their
 - 159 name would be seen on that vanpool in their area
 - 160 • The more specific the Board can be, the more likely donors would provide funding to vanpools
 - 161 • The intention of the Board is for the sponsorships to go directly as possible to benefit the
 - 162 Vanpool Program participants and making the Vanpool Program as appealing as possible to
 - 163 potential participants
 - 164

165 The Board discussed:

- 166 • Board member Crownover stated if only one vanpool route was sponsored, the funding should
- 167 go to the Vanpool Program as a whole and not only to the vanpool route that was sponsored
- 168 • Board member Johnson stated sponsorships should be used generally for all related vanpool
- 169 issues such as expanding the Vanpool Program
- 170 • Board member Hirsch stated the Board would like the Vanpool Program be expanded to
- 171 increase the number of people using the program
- 172

173 TAP Funding for the Vanpool Program

- 174 • Chair Kendall stated the Board needs to discuss how much TAP would fund the Vanpool
- 175 Program
- 176 • Board member Johnson stated it is up to the future Boards to decide how much to fund the
- 177 Vanpool Program
- 178 • Board member Freudenburg stated funding the Vanpool Program is a good thing; Vanpool
- 179 provides benefits to the community by reducing traffic congestion and air pollution
- 180

181 Motion #1

182 The Board moved for TPS to pursue sponsorships for the UCSB Vanpool Program.

184 Motion #2

185 The Board moved any sponsorship funding goes specifically and directly to benefit the vanpool riders

186 and the Vanpool Program.

188 Vote

189 Both the motion #1 and motion #2 regarding vanpool sponsorships were passed unanimously.

191 **VI. Guiding Principles for Future Vanpool Rates**

192 Chair Kendall stated:

- 193 • There needs to be a more efficient way for vanpool rate increases than there has been over
- 194 the past two years
- 195 • The Board should come up with principles for how often to raise vanpool rates absent any
- 196 extraordinary circumstances. This would make rate increases more predictable for vanpool
- 197 participants and eliminate the current extensive consultation process
- 198 • The Chair reported vanpool rates in the past have increased on average about 3-6% per year
- 199 • Future rate increases are mostly driven by the replacement of the 14-passenger vans and
- 200 gasoline prices
- 201 • TAB should recommend regular modest vanpool rate increases
- 202 • TAB can set limits on what the annual vanpool increases should be
- 203

204 Jamey Wagner, TAP Manager, distributed “2007-08 through 2008-09 Projected Vanpool Costs” and

205 “2009-10 through 20010-11 Projected Vanpool Costs” (please refer to Attachments “A” and “B”).

206

207

208

- 209 Jamey Wagner reported:
- 210 • UCSB Vanpool is currently planning to replace four 14-passenger vans with five 11-passenger
 - 211 vans in fiscal year 2007-08
 - 212 • Vans are leased at one rate for six years and a lower rate for the seventh year

213
214

215 Projected Revenue for Fiscal Year 2007-08

- 216 • In 2007-08 there are expected to be 116 full time equivalent payers out of 129 total possible
- 217 payers, which is approximately 90% occupancy
- 218 • The projected average cost of the Vanpool program will be approximately \$141 per full time
- 219 equivalent payer per month

220
221

221 Funding from TAP to Vanpool

- 222 • Projected annual shortfall for 2006-07 will be approximately \$43,000 (Fines & Forfeitures
- 223 funded)
- 224 • Projected annual shortfall for 2007-08 will be approximately \$23,000 (Fines & Forfeitures
- 225 funded)

226
227

227 Vanpool Rates for 2007-08

- 228 • The Chancellor approved the TAB recommendation from 2005-06 regarding vanpool rates to
- 229 be raised to a full time average rate of \$125 per person per month and be distance-based
- 230 • This vanpool rate increase will be effective July 1, 2007
- 231 • The 30-day notification to vanpool participants will be sent out June 1, 2007

232
233

233 Price of Fuel from Transportation Services

234 Beverly Leaney stated TPS told vanpool participants the price of fuel from Transportation Services

235 was lower than current market rates, so why is this fuel price projection based on market rates?

236 TPS responded that prices charged by Transportation Services are lower than the market for short

237 periods of time. The price that the vanpool program pays for fuel is adjusted quarterly. The price we

238 are charged is based on the average fuel price paid for the previous quarter. Given the fuel price

239 fluctuations, the price for fuel from Transportation Services lags behind market price fluctuations.

240
241

241 As prices rise the fuel prices from Transportation will be lower than the market, for a time. As fuel

242 prices fall the fuel prices from Transportation Services will be higher than market rates, for a time, until

243 the next quarterly price adjustment is made by Transportation Services.

244
245

245 **Board inquiries and Discussion**

- 246 • Board member Crownover inquired if the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) van was still in
- 247 service. Yes, that is correct; the ADA van carries 10 people and is currently called Santa Maria
- 248 2 and it no longer serves a rider in a wheelchair.

249
250

250 Increasing the Usage of Vans

- 251 • Board member Freudenburg inquired if Transportation Services could continue to use the
- 252 same vans for eight years to decrease costs? TPS reported that the older vans have over
- 253 200,000 miles on them. The garage manager reports it would not be wise or safe to continue
- 254 using these vans much longer. Also, if there were breakdowns it would be challenging for the
- 255 vanpool riders to be transported to home or UCSB.
- 256 • Board member Freudenburg stated he strongly advises the Vanpool Program to consider
- 257 using the vans longer to reduce costs. TPS stated they will consider this option and discuss it
- 258 with Transportation Services
- 259 • Board member Johnson stated the risk of using the vans longer would not be worth the
- 260 discounted price

- 261
- 262
- 263
- 264
- 265
- 266
- 267
- 268
- 269
- 270
- 271
- 272
- 273
- 274
- 275
- Board member Brower stated the Vanpool Program must consider the vanpool riders comfort in riding vans that breakdown; it's not worth losing members in order to save money
 - Board member Hirsch stated the cost of the new vans could go up if purchased later, so it may be more cost-effective to purchase vans sooner as the prices are less expensive
 - Chair Kendall inquired of the vanpool riders present if they were in older vans and felt comfortable riding in them? Patricia Marin, Lompoc driver, stated she felt comfortable in the van because they are maintained well and regularly. Michael Holford stated his van has 220,000 miles on it and does not have any major issues. Jennifer Earl stated the interior conditions of the vans are much nicer than the loaner vans
 - TPS stated that the Vanpool Program has received calls from vanpool riders from the oldest vans eagerly inquiring when their vans will be replaced
 - Board member Crownover stated that the Lompoc vanpool routes are more rural and further from repair shops; breaking down on their route would be much more concerning and risky than for Vanpool routes that travel in more populated areas

276 Local Van Shuttle Service

- 277
- 278
- 279
- Marc Fisher stated it would be a good idea to consider using the older vans for shuttling from closer areas like upper State Street in Santa Barbara, the Mesa, and Carpinteria
 - Board member Hirsch stated TPS should consider the short-distance shuttle service

281 Carpinteria Vanpool Riders

- 282
- 283
- 284
- 285
- There is a Carpinteria stop on the Ventura 2 vanpool
 - In the past, there were as many as three Carpinteria vanpool riders. Currently, there is one Carpinteria rider

286 Vanpool Projections

- 287
- 288
- 289
- 290
- 291
- In 2008-09, the number of vanpools will increase by replacing one 14-passenger van with two 11-passenger vans
 - Assuming there will be the same occupancy level (90%), the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) paying riders will increase from 120 in 2008-10, to 135 FTE paying riders in 2010-11

292 Future Fare Increases

293 Chair Kendall:

- 294
- 295
- 296
- 297
- 298
- 299
- 300
- He inquired of the Board if there should be a cap on fare increases and a regular annual increase increment?
 - The Board needs principles of funding such as matching the same funding per person as the funding for the MTD bus riders
 - In the past, the Board may have felt the Vanpool Program could be self-supporting, but that does not seem like the case with the sentiment of the current TAB
 - The Board can make some sort level of funding commitment

302 Marc Fisher stated:

- 303
- 304
- 305
- 306
- 307
- 308
- 309
- The Board may choose a cap based on the average salary increases, which has historically been between 1-6%
 - The Board may use the projected annual salary increase at UCSB, which is approximately 3.5%
 - Salary increases are compounded, so the compounded annual increase in vanpool fare increases would match salary increases

310 Jennifer Earl stated:

- 311
- 312
- It is not fair for the vanpool riders to solely pay for the UCOP mandate to move to smaller vehicles

- 313 • The annual increase of some percentage between 1-6% is compounded, which increases a lot
314 over several years. There should be a percentage cap on the net fares from one year
315 • There should not be a huge fare increase one year due to a variable cost such as fuel
316 • At some point, the vanpool riders will reach a maximum price point for the vanpools and they
317 will not ride it
318 • Not having a vanpool program is disadvantageous to the university for a large variety of
319 reasons, such as having UCSB employees quit their jobs and not being able to recruit new
320 employees
321 • One benefit of the Vanpool Program is that it allowed her, as a new faculty member, to buy a
322 house in Ventura and get to UCSB inexpensively
323 • The Vanpool Program is better for the environment than driving single occupant vehicles
324 • The Board seems to support the continuation of the vanpool program, but there has not been
325 much information outside of the Board to show support for the vanpool program
326 • The Board needs to ask themselves: "Is there another source of revenue?"
327

328 Board member Freudenburg:

- 329 • The Vanpool costs are roughly 50/50 between gasoline and fixed costs
330 • To determine Vanpool fares, the Board should use the annual cost-of-living and the annual
331 cost of gasoline to determine a percentage cap for fare increases
332

333 Board member Johnson stated:

- 334 • He supports the idea of tying fare increases to average annual salary increases at UCSB; it is
335 the most reasonable
336 • Previous Boards have made mandates that have affected the future Boards, so they can make
337 mandates for future Boards
338

339 Board member Crownover stated:

- 340 • Most rates at UCSB are not tied to the cost-of-living, so basing the fare increases on average
341 annual salary increases is realistic
342 • The Vanpool participants do not want to bear the burden of the UCOP mandate by themselves
343

344 Jamey Wagner stated if the Board decides to limit future vanpool fare increases to the average rate
345 of pay increases across campus, and no new sources of revenue are found for the Vanpool Program,
346 the gulf between Vanpool income from fares and the costs of the vanpool program will continue to
347 grow rapidly. This will require dramatically larger expenditures from the Fines budget in coming years,
348 which already runs at a planned deficit for this year.
349

350 Board's Commitment to the Vanpool Program

351 Board member Brower stated:

- 352 • The Board has consistently committed to the Vanpool program and its existence
353 • She thinks it was a misinterpretation that the Board planned at any time, or ever considered, to
354 put all of the cost of the Vanpool Program on the vanpool riders; she regrets that feeling of the
355 Vanpool riders
356 • Funding the Vanpool Program has always been a big concern and focus of the Board; the
357 program has been so effective in the positive changes they have made
358 • She suggests the Board look at their budget first and then decide if they can afford this funding
359 commitment
360 • Even if the Board seeks intently for donors, there is the possibility that there will not be the
361 interest in funding TAP
362 • What happens when the Board is unable to support the Vanpool Program in a certain way?
363 Does the Board stop funding the Vanpool Program the same amount? That would be the worst

364 of all situations. Will these changes of funding the Vanpool Program cause serious problems in
365 the long-run?
366

367 Jennifer Earl stated:

- 368 • The reason vanpool riders feel like there was no support from the Board for the Vanpool
369 Program was due to an article in 93106 stating the Board was thinking of no longer funding the
370 Vanpool Program
- 371 • Any commitment requires a risk; that's the nature of commitments
- 372 • Is the Board willing to say to the Vanpool participants they, as a Board, are supporting the
373 Vanpool program by working hard to fund the program?
374

375 Board member Freudenburg stated:

- 376 • Removing the funding for the Vanpool program would not be equitable because they provide
377 funding for all the other programs
- 378 • He is less comfortable using salaries increases than with using a combination of future costs-
379 of-living and changes in fuel prices; these are more realistic. Those that do not ride a vanpool
380 to UCSB have to pay much higher commuter costs than the vanpool participants
- 381 • The Board's principle should be that the Board try their best to keep the Vanpool fares
382 increases from increasing higher than the percent combination of the cost-of-living and the
383 cost of fuel
- 384 • The Vanpool participants are so articulate and passionate that they should also seek
385 sponsors; they may be more effective than Development in recruiting sponsorships for UCSB
386 Vanpool
387

388 Board member Hirsch stated:

- 389 • The Board definitely has a commitment to all of the TAP incentives, including Vanpool
- 390 • It does not seem possible to make the Vanpool program self-supporting, at this time
- 391 • The Board does not have the right to mandate future Vanpool fare increases forever for future
392 Boards; the current Board may only strongly advise TAB for the near future
- 393 • The Board is committed for the foreseeable future and it is up to the future Boards to choose
394 their level of commitment
- 395 • The Board is strongly in favor of funding the Vanpool Program and wants the smallest annual
396 fare increases possible
397

398 Consultation to Vanpool Riders on Higher Fare Increases

399 Board member Brower stated she accepts the suggestion to have consultation meetings with Vanpool
400 riders in the event there needs to be a higher fare increase than the average annual salary increases
401

402 Other TAP Incentives

- 403 • Board member Freudenburg stated the cap on fare increases for future years may negatively
404 affect other alternative transportation programs in the future and this would not be good for the
405 Board in the future
- 406 • Board member Brower stated how will a funding commitment to Vanpool affect the budget?
407 Will this decrease or remove their ability to fund other programs? Does this mean that all the
408 other programs will be unfunded because of their commitment to these very important, but 120
409 riders?
410
- 411 • Chair Kendall stated the concerns of the Board members are good; the Board needs to get on
412 the ball with getting alternative sources of funding in for TAP
413
414
415

416 Other Sources of Funding

417 Chair Kendall stated:

- 418 • The Board may consider presenting to the PRB a plan to use the Chancellor's Allocation to go
- 419 toward funding the UCOP mandate to move to smaller vans
- 420 • Currently, commuting is not considered by the Sustainability Committee as a source of
- 421 campus carbon emissions and it should be. If it was, this would allow TAP to target campus
- 422 funds at UCSB for sustainability reasons

423

424 Summary of Board's Vanpool Principles

425 Chair Kendall stated:

- 426 • The Board seems to agree on basing Vanpool fare increases on the average UCSB annual
- 427 salary increases on the condition that any higher increases needed requires extensive
- 428 consultation with Vanpool riders
- 429 • The Board needs to find sponsors to provide additional funding to the Vanpool Program

430

431 Motion

432 Board member Johnson moved that future Vanpool fare increases are the same as the average
433 annual salary increases campus-wide, and if this amount is not sufficient, the Vanpool riders are to be
434 extensively consulted. The motion passed with unanimous vote.

435

436 **VII. Fines & Forfeitures Budget Update**

437 This agenda item will be postponed until the next meeting.

438

439 **VIII. Wireless Internet on Buses and Vanpools**

440 This agenda item will be postponed until the next meeting.

441

442 **Future Meetings – Schedule & Agenda Items**

- 443 • Fines & Forfeitures Budget Update
- 444 • Wireless Internet on Buses and Vanpools
- 445 • MTD "Uptown Express"
- 446 • Skateboarding Principles at UCSB

447

448 The Board will meet again in late June and in August.

449

450 **IX. Public Comment**

451 Scott Spaulding stated:

- 452 • The Board should consider a general transit benefit to all transit users of about \$20-25 per
- 453 person per month that could go toward the Vanpool Program
- 454 • There are approximately 20 un-funded transit riders to UCSB that use the Clean Air Express
- 455 and Coastal Express

456

457 Board member Johnson responded he thinks it is possible for the Board to come up with a general
458 transit benefit.

459

460 Jennifer Earl thanked the Board for their hard work; it is appreciated.

461

462 Ralph Fertig stated:

- 463 • The Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition's June newsletter can be found online at www.sbbike.org
- 464 • Bike Week just finished and there were a lot of activities
- 465 • At Bike Week, Mr. Fertig gave a presentation at the Museum of Natural History about bicycling
- 466 touring in Cambodia, Thailand, and Spain. These countries use different bicycle and
- 467 pedestrian facilities that could be used at UCSB. For example, in Mammoth Lakes and in

- 468 Spain has pedestrian crossings at road intersections with flashing blue lights; they are highly
469 visible and automobiles stop immediately for pedestrians.
- 470 • The Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition does a census of bicyclists every other year, and will be
471 doing a census this year and will see if there is a correlation between increases in bicyclists as
472 there has been a high increase in the price of gasoline.
 - 473 • He will lead a bicycle tour of the conditions of bicycle facilities at UCSB during the UCSB
474 Sustainability Conference from June 22-26
 - 475 • The new Bike Station in Santa Barbara opened May 1 on Anacapa Street, across from the
476 Santa Barbara Library. It provides showers, secure bike parking, etc for bicyclists
477

478 Marc Fisher responded there are new bike racks by the Psychology building and Web Hall; they are
479 Peak Racks. UCSB will soon replace other bike racks on campus with the new Peak Racks.
480

481 **X. Adjournment**

482 The meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM.

Enforcement, Citations and TAP Financial Report

2006-07 (10 Month) and 2007-08 Proposed

	2006-07 Budget	2006-07 10 Month Actuals	2006-07 Projected	Proposed 2007-08 12 Month Budget
Revenue				
Fines and Forfeitures	\$1,396,000	\$1,052,861	\$1,296,000	\$1,411,000
Recharges- Housing Enforcement	\$81,000	\$61,200	\$73,440	\$73,440
Recharges- Field Services	\$0	\$152,128	\$182,128	\$165,000
Chancellor Allocation to TAP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$74,000
Van Pool Fares	\$143,000	\$121,440	\$145,728	\$175,500
Bike Grant Reimbursement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$55,000
MTD Bus Riders (Rider-paid Pass-Through)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,000
Clean Air Express (Rider-paid Pass-Through)	\$32,500	\$26,612	\$35,483	\$32,500
Bike Locker Rental Fees	\$1,000	\$980	\$980	\$2,000
Total Revenue:*	\$1,653,500	\$1,415,221	\$1,733,759	\$2,028,440
Expenses				
Salaries/Wages/Benefits	\$902,000	\$783,366	\$994,400	\$1,156,200
				-\$120,000
				\$1,036,200
Campus Services				
Transportation Services-Enforcement/Field Services	\$50,000	\$60,253	\$72,304	\$70,000
Transportation Services (Vanpool)	\$165,000	\$143,010	\$171,612	\$182,500
Student Health / DMV Physicals for Vanpool	\$1,700	\$1,370	\$1,644	\$1,900
Police Recharge	\$35,000	\$3,766	\$35,000	\$35,000
Comm. Services / Phones & Radios	\$9,500	\$9,362	\$11,248	\$11,200
IS&C	\$5,400	\$13,534	\$16,241	\$17,100
Common Fund/Cost Recover/Ins/Mail	\$15,000	\$17,677	\$21,212	\$22,275
Utilities	\$4,500	\$4,369	\$5,246	\$5,700
FM Custodial & Bldg Maint.	\$4,500	\$9,276	\$11,123	\$6,500
FM Admin Support	\$3,000	\$0	\$3,000	\$3,000
HR / Fingerprinting	\$0	\$429	\$350	\$300
Central Stores	\$8,000	\$5,307	\$6,407	\$8,000
Other Campus Recharges	\$0	\$3,512	\$7,000	\$7,340
Total Campus Recharges	\$301,600	\$271,865	\$362,388	\$370,815
Contractual Services				
CarShare	\$40,000	\$39,386	\$48,991	\$21,270
Citations Processing - Vendor	\$85,000	\$80,281	\$96,337	\$110,000
Wireless Phone Hardware & Contract	\$7,000	\$4,014	\$4,847	\$5,000
Data Ticket	\$0	\$3,414	\$4,133	\$4,300
Temporary Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$640	\$768	\$800
Total Contractual Services	\$132,000	\$127,735	\$155,076	\$141,370
Other				
Clean Air Express (Rider-paid Pass-Through)	\$32,500	\$26,612	\$31,938	\$32,500
Bike Grant	\$0	\$3,010	\$17,000	\$43,500
Subscription - Carpool Matching	\$0	\$80	\$120	\$0
MTD Bus Passes	\$120,000	\$93,512	\$112,214	\$82,000
MTD Line 6/11 Enhancement	\$0	\$0	\$4,457	\$8,940
In Vehicle Parking Meters, Cards & Batteries	\$0	-\$7,980	-\$6,000	\$7,000
Amtrak Train Shuttle	\$0	\$310	\$372	\$2,000
Advertising, Promo & Special Printing	\$5,000	\$1,300	\$2,000	\$5,000
Valet & Shuttles - Field Services	\$0	\$1,273	\$1,528	\$1,575
Court Costs	\$200,000	\$133,980	\$182,000	\$250,000
Uniforms	\$3,850	\$3,850	\$3,850	\$4,200
General Supplies	\$5,500	\$3,301	\$3,959	\$5,500
Training	\$1,000	\$595	\$714	\$1,500
Computer & Related Supplies	\$6,000	\$2,879	\$3,461	\$6,000
Travel	\$1,000	\$574	\$1,000	\$1,000
Signs & Graphics	\$0	\$20,556	\$20,600	\$5,000
In-House Assistance	\$0	\$20,538	\$24,647	\$23,600
Other	\$1,400	\$0	\$0	\$1,400
Total Other	\$376,250	\$304,390	\$403,860	\$480,715
Total Materials	\$809,850	\$703,990	\$921,324	\$992,900
Capital Expenses	\$25,000	\$23,442	\$79,442	\$28,000
Total Operating Expenses	\$1,736,850	\$1,510,798	\$1,995,166	\$2,057,100
Profit/Loss	-\$83,350	-\$95,577	-\$261,407	-\$28,660
Carry Forward (Reserves fr Prior Yr)	\$390,379		\$390,379	\$128,972
Balance	\$307,029		\$128,972	\$100,312
MTD Advance	\$15,000		\$0	\$0
Total Fund	\$322,029		\$128,972	\$100,312

¹ Salary reduction from additional night and weekend revenue

Attachment "B"
Enforcement, Citations and TAP Financial Report

2006-07 (10 Month) and 2007-08 Proposed

	2006-07 Budget	2006-07 10 Month Actuals	2006-07 Projected	Proposed 2007-08 12 Month Budget
Revenue				
Fines and Forfeitures	\$1,396,000	\$1,052,861	\$1,296,000	\$1,411,000
Recharges- Housing Enforcement	\$81,000	\$61,200	\$73,440	\$73,440
Recharges- Field Services	\$0	\$152,128	\$182,128	\$165,000
Chancellor Allocation to TAP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$74,000
Van Pool Fares	\$143,000	\$121,440	\$145,728	\$175,500
Bike Grant Reimbursement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$55,000
MTD Bus Riders (Rider-paid Pass-Through)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,000
Clean Air Express (Rider-paid Pass-Through)	\$32,500	\$26,612	\$35,483	\$32,500
Bike Locker Rental Fees	\$1,000	\$980	\$980	\$2,000
Total Revenue:*	\$1,653,500	\$1,415,221	\$1,733,759	\$2,028,440
Expenses				
Salaries/Wages/Benefits	\$902,000	\$783,366	\$994,400	\$1,156,200
				-\$120,000
				\$1,036,200
Campus Services				
Transportation Services-Enforcement/Field Services	\$50,000	\$60,253	\$72,304	\$70,000
Transportation Services (Vanpool)	\$165,000	\$143,010	\$171,612	\$182,500
Student Health / DMV Physicals for Vanpool	\$1,700	\$1,370	\$1,644	\$1,900
Police Recharge	\$35,000	\$3,766	\$35,000	\$35,000
Comm. Services / Phones & Radios	\$9,500	\$9,362	\$11,248	\$11,200
IS&C	\$5,400	\$13,534	\$16,241	\$17,100
Common Fund/Cost Recover/Ins/Mail	\$15,000	\$17,677	\$21,212	\$22,275
Utilities	\$4,500	\$4,369	\$5,246	\$5,700
FM Custodial & Bldg Maint.	\$4,500	\$9,276	\$11,123	\$6,500
FM Admin Support	\$3,000	\$0	\$3,000	\$3,000
HR / Fingerprinting	\$0	\$429	\$350	\$300
Central Stores	\$8,000	\$5,307	\$6,407	\$8,000
Other Campus Recharges	\$0	\$3,512	\$7,000	\$7,340
Total Campus Recharges	\$301,600	\$271,865	\$362,388	\$370,815
Contractual Services				
CarShare	\$40,000	\$39,386	\$48,991	\$21,270
Citations Processing - Vendor	\$85,000	\$80,281	\$96,337	\$110,000
Wireless Phone Hardware & Contract	\$7,000	\$4,014	\$4,847	\$5,000
Data Ticket	\$0	\$3,414	\$4,133	\$4,300
Temporary Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$640	\$768	\$800
Total Contractual Services	\$132,000	\$127,735	\$155,076	\$141,370
Other				
Clean Air Express (Rider-paid Pass-Through)	\$32,500	\$26,612	\$31,938	\$32,500
Bike Grant	\$0	\$3,010	\$17,000	\$43,500
Subscription - Carpool Matching	\$0	\$80	\$120	\$0
MTD Bus Passes	\$120,000	\$93,512	\$112,214	\$82,000
MTD Line 6/11 Enhancement	\$0	\$0	\$4,457	\$8,940
In Vehicle Parking Meters, Cards & Batteries	\$0	-\$7,980	-\$6,000	\$7,000
Amtrak Train Shuttle	\$0	\$310	\$372	\$2,000
Advertising, Promo & Special Printing	\$5,000	\$1,300	\$2,000	\$5,000
Valet & Shuttles - Field Services	\$0	\$1,273	\$1,528	\$1,575
Court Costs	\$200,000	\$133,980	\$182,000	\$250,000
Uniforms	\$3,850	\$3,850	\$3,850	\$4,200
General Supplies	\$5,500	\$3,301	\$3,959	\$5,500
Training	\$1,000	\$595	\$714	\$1,500
Computer & Related Supplies	\$6,000	\$2,879	\$3,461	\$6,000
Travel	\$1,000	\$574	\$1,000	\$1,000
Signs & Graphics	\$0	\$20,556	\$20,600	\$5,000
In-House Assistance	\$0	\$20,538	\$24,647	\$23,600
Other	\$1,400	\$0	\$0	\$1,400
Total Other	\$376,250	\$304,390	\$403,860	\$480,715
Total Materials	\$809,850	\$703,990	\$921,324	\$992,900
Capital Expenses	\$25,000	\$23,442	\$79,442	\$28,000
Total Operating Expenses	\$1,736,850	\$1,510,798	\$1,995,166	\$2,057,100
Profit/Loss	-\$83,350	-\$95,577	-\$261,407	-\$28,660
Carry Forward (Reserves fr Prior Yr)	\$390,379		\$390,379	\$128,972
Balance	\$307,029		\$128,972	\$100,312
MTD Advance	\$15,000		\$0	\$0
Total Fund	\$322,029		\$128,972	\$100,312

¹ Salary reduction from additional night and weekend revenue