

Transportation & Parking Services

Transportation Alternatives Board

March 6, 2006

Cheadle Hall, Room 5123

10:00AM-12:00PM

- | | | |
|-------|---|---------|
| I. | Roll Call | 10:00AM |
| II. | Introduction of Guests | 10:02AM |
| III. | Approval of the Minutes | 10:04AM |
| IV. | Update from the Chair | 10:05AM |
| V. | TAB Vision 2005-2006 | 10:25AM |
| VI. | 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). | 11:45AM |
| VII. | Other Comments | 11:55AM |
| VIII. | Adjournment | 12:00PM |

1 **Transportation Alternatives Board**
2 **March 6, 2006**
3 **Minutes**

4
5 **Members Present:** Mark Frickel, Jared Goldschen, Barbara Hirsch, Patricia Holden, Cyril Johnson,
6 Bruce Kendall and Patrice Summers

7
8 **Staff Present:** Marc Fisher, Laura Condon, Bob Sundberg, Jamey Wagner, and Dolly Smith
9

10 **I. Roll Call**

11 The meeting was called to order at 10:00am with Steven Gross and Kamyab Sadaghiani unable to
12 attend.
13

14 **II. Introduction of Guests**

15 Scott Spaulding, Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG), Traffic Solutions; Bob
16 Stevenson, Electrical & Computing (ECE) and vanpool driver; Saturnino Doctor, Housing; David Felix,
17 Bren School; Michael Holford; attended.
18

19 **III. Approval of the Minutes**

20 The minutes were approved with the following correction:
21 Lines 241-42 were changed to reflect Board member Johnson's comment on vanpool.
22

23 **IV. Update from the Chair on TAB Vision 2005-06**

24 Chair Frickel reported his presentation would cover several issues discussed at previous meeting this
25 year and his recommendations for each issue. Chair Frickel distributed "Expenses" (please refer to
26 Attachment "A").
27

28 Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Budget
29 Who does TAP/TAB serve?
30

31 UCSB community and visitors
32

33 **Students**

34 There are over 20,000 students. Three quarters live close to, or on campus (these statistics come
35 from the 2005-2005 Campus Profile provided by Office of Institutional Research & Planning, branch of
36 Budget & Planning, based on the local living addresses provided by the students).
37

38 Primary Commuter Modes

39 49% bike
40 21% Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV)
41 21% walk
42 3% carpool
43 6% bus
44 0% vanpool
45

46 These statistics come from the 2002 transportation survey conducted by Institutional Research and
47 Planning.
48

49 **Faculty/Staff**

50 There are 4,659 Faculty/Staff.
51

52 Primary Commuter Modes

53 72% SOV

54 11% carpool
 55 9% bike
 56 4% bus
 57 3% vanpool
 58 0% walk

59

60 **Campus-wide**

61 Primary modes

62 Students –bike (49%)
 63 Faculty/Staff- SOV (72%)

64

65 Total Use of Commuter Modes

66 42% Bike
 67 30% SOV
 68 17% walk
 69 6% bus
 70 4% carpool
 71 3% vanpool

72

73 Parking Permits

74 Faculty/Staff currently own 3,311 permits (for 5500 parking spaces).

75

76 **Budget Subsidy**

77 What funds are at our disposal?

78

79 The following budget subsidy analysis of TAP revenue and expenses is based on the 6-month actuals
 80 (July-December 2005). Please refer to the minutes from the January 18, 2006 meeting, Attachment
 81 “B.”

82

83 Carry forward (04-05):

84 ~\$290,000

85

86 05-06 Projected Revenue (from citations, net after cost):

87 ~\$270,000

88

89 Deficit

90 Built into the 2005-06 TAP budget is a projected deficit of ~\$30,000 due to the proposed initiation of
 91 the new TAP programs.

92

93 2005-06 Budget Subsidy Update

94 Carry forward (04-5):

95 \$260,000 (adjusted for ~\$30,000 deficit)

96

97 Revenue (05-06) ~\$270,000 + ~\$30,000 deficit covered by carry forward:

98 ~\$300,000 (from citations, net after cost)

99

100 **Breakdown of Expenses**

101

102

103

104

105

106

	05-06 Budget	% of Budgeted	% Over/Under Budgeted
MTD Swipe Fac/Staff	\$75,000	56%	12%
Carshare Fac/Staff	\$40,000	41%	-18%
Vanpool subsidy	\$40,000	58%	16%
Rail	\$5,000	77%	55%

107
108 Projected 2005-06 Expenses
109 MTD - 47%
110 CarShare – 25%
111 Vanpool - 25%
112 Rail - 3%
113
114 6-month Expenses Actuals, 2005-06
115 MTD - 49%
116 CarShare - 19%
117 Vanpool - 27%
118 Rail - 5%
119
120 **Beneficiaries**
121 Who are the beneficiaries?
122
123 MTD-Swipe bus pass
124 489 use MTD on average each month
125 200 use MTD on average each day
126
127 Vanpool
128 106 total registered Vanpool users per month
129 29% of TAP users use Vanpool per month
130
131 CarShare
132 371 users have used CarShare (27% of registered CarShare users)
133 114 users use CarShare on average each month
134
135 Rail
136 Average Users per month 0%
137
138 Total registered TAP users:
139 2167
140
141 Cost of program (per total number of average users, per month):
142 CarShare- \$45
143 MTD - \$43
144 Vanpool - \$36
145 Rail - \$50
146
147 CarShare utilization
148 % Total users who used CarShare by frequency of trips, per month:
149
150 63% - 1-5 times
151 30% - 6-11 times
152 7% - 12+ times
153
154 Those users (37%) who used it more than 5 times per month, were using it more than what TAP has
155 intended for CarShare use. These frequent users used CarShare during night and weekends.
156 Chair Frickel reported Flexcar's technology could track the number of uses per user, which would
157 allow TAP to enforce our rules of use.
158
159 **Proposals and Recommendations**

- 160 1. Place rail shuttle program on hold until further notice
161 – It is an inefficient use of resources
162 – Low # of beneficiaries
163 – Amtrak schedules/reliability no longer convenient
164 – TPS has to pull staff from the office to pick up passengers
165

166 Recommendations:

- 167 – Postpone program until rail schedule is more convenient/reliable for campus commuters
168

- 169 2. Eliminate vanpool subsidies
170 – Subsidies no longer needed to sustain program
171 – Current allocation is disproportionate in terms of number of UCSB users
172 – Alternatives: Flexcar, Clean Air Express (CAE), outsourcing
173

174 TPS responded if the vanpool fare subsidy was eliminated and UCSB follows the UC Office of the
175 President mandate to move to 11 passenger vanpool vehicles, the vanpool fares would go from an
176 average of \$108/month to between \$155~175/month.
177

178 Without subsidy and with outsourcing vanpools to VPSI or Enterprise, the fares would increase
179 to ~\$135/month, which is comparable to the Clean Air Express (CAE). If vanpool was
180 outsourced by vanpool drivers, the UCSB employee-riders could still be eligible for pre-tax
181 payroll deduction.
182

183 Recommendations:

- 184 – Allow vanpools to choose in the absence of fare subsidies, which commuter options suit them:
185 carpool, outsourced vanpool, or long-distance bus
186

- 187 3. Promote Flexcar on campus
188 – Demonstrated demand
189 – Excellent opportunity for growth
190 – Cost effective if structured properly
191

192 Recommendations:

- 193 – Allow a small number of free uses, and charge for additional use
194 – Negotiate with Flexcar on price
195 – Have Flexcar clarify their business objectives for Santa Barbara
196

- 197 4. Integrate vanpool with Flexcar
198 – Solves price gap
199 – Excellent opportunity for growth
200 – Cost-effective if structured properly
201

202 Recommendations:

203 Sedans are preferred over minivans
204 Minivan pilot program
205

- 206 5. Charge Faculty/Staff for MTD ridership
207 – Equity: students pay a fee for ridership (~\$8.50 per quarter)
208 – Not very cost-effective
209 – Charging a fee prevents abuses of the system (this has been resolved to some extent)
210 – Programs should in part pay for themselves
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
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265

6. Form special committees
 - Individual TAB members oversee issues which interest them
 - Effective distribution of labor

Chair Frickel recommended for committees to be based on commute modes such as: rail, bus, bike, and vanpool. Other committees could be things such as: CarShare, accounting, and a transportation survey.

7. Conduct a campus-wide transportation survey
 - Information is critical
 - Results will frame future issues
 - Recommend: allocate needed funding to this project

8. Promote TAP across the campus
 - Current outreach is lacking
 - Possible gains are many

Recommendations:

- Gateway to TAP on the TPS website should be highly visible
- Market TAP through smart advertising and incentive programs
- Make TAP a household name

9. Create proposals for alternative parking schemes
 - Parking schemes and alternative transportation schemes are inextricably linked
 - Is the current system the best system?
 - Are other systems practically and politically feasible?
E.g. “Pay as you go”

Recommendations:

- Use survey results to determine true willingness-to-pay
- Approach the project with a positive state of mind

10. What are the Board members’ proposals?

Board Queries and Discussion

Board queries and discussion focused on the campus survey results, commuters from outlying areas, Faculty/Staff permits, TAP benefits, CarShare utilization, rail service, Flexcar, pilot of CarShare/vanpool program, vanpool, MTD bus passes, Board’s jurisdiction and outreach to UCSB, TAB’s goal(s), bike infrastructure program, sub-committees, more information from TAP/vanpool users, and topics at future TAB meetings.

Campus Survey Results

There are very few students (5) who used the vanpool, which rounds to 0%.
There is no information on Faculty/Staff commute distance provided on Chair Frickel’s presentation due to information not being readily available.

Long-distance commuters

The Board inquired how many commuters come from outlying areas. Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) and Transportation & Parking Services (TPS) reported Human Resources has some information of who comes from outlying areas such as northern Santa Barbara County and Ventura County.

266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317

Faculty/Staff Permits

TPS reported being a permit holder does not mean the commuter is SOV, because there are those that use alternative transportation modes who also own permits.

Carry Forward

The carry forward of citations reserves has been accruing for ~10 years and has remained near current levels for the past 7 years. Therefore, if spent, the carry forward will not be recovered in one year.

TAP Benefits

TAP benefits, other than MTD-Swipe bus pass, vanpool, and CarShare: In-Vehicle Parking Meter (IVPM), Emergency Ride Home. Currently, these complimentary parking benefits to TAP users do not incur operating expenses, but the IVPM and G-status smartcard are a cost related to the parking benefit.

The Board inquired if all TAP users qualify for the IVPM. No, only A-status, S-status, and G-status members qualify for the IVPM.

Other TAP perks: C-status (Graduate students less than 45% UCSB-employed and undergraduate students) get six complimentary days of parking per quarter. Non-C status students are required to use alternative transportation or pay for the cost of daily permits (\$8/day).

TPS reminded the Board that TAP is a subset of alternative transportation users. All of these members do not use SOV as their primary mode of transport and do not own a parking permit unless they are part of a carpool.

CarShare utilization

The CarShare utilization statistics is aggregated from 6 months of CarShare data. The pattern is very similar per month.

Rail service

TPS reported only 1-2 people per 1-2 times a month use the rail service. Transportation or Parking enforcement staff currently runs the shuttle, which means this cuts into Transportation's maintenance work or Parking's writing of citations.

How can TAB improve the rail service?

- Meet with Amtrak
- Put the rail program on hold
- Its use is directly related to on-time service that corresponds with UCSB work hours

The Board stated the southbound train from the Goleta station would be a great alternative transportation mode if it was more reliable. The train currently originates in San Luis Obispo and is often delayed because of freight conflicts. The Board requested TPS to meet with Amtrak about scheduling and origin of trains. TPS suggested the Board gather anecdotes of rail users for TPS to present to Amtrak.

The Board recommended TPS suspend the rail program until the train schedules are more reliable. TPS responded one solution could be to provide taxi vouchers, which would cut the cost per shuttle trip from \$40 per trip to \$10 per trip as long as 6 or fewer were transported. The Board agreed this would be a good solution.

318 Scott Spaulding reported Traffic Solutions is intending to start a rail pilot program from Ventura. It is
319 difficult to coordinate effectively with Amtrak, because they do not own the tracks. Traffic Solutions'
320 "101 in Motion" project needs to secure funds in order to move forward.

321 322 Flexcar/carshare

323 The Board inquired what would Flexcar do in Isla Vista. TPS responded they asked Flexcar if they
324 would take the financial risk of increasing the amount of Flexcar vehicles in UCSB or Isla Vista if there
325 was more demand for CarShare. Flexcar stated they would only consider doing that a year after
326 UCSB makes an agreement with them.

327
328 The Board stated Flexcar could possibly provide insurance for students, which was the obstacle that
329 prevented UCSB from instituting a student carshare program. However, Business Services and Risk
330 Management would have to approve the level of insurance agreement and liability, which will likely
331 slow the process.

332
333 The Board discussed the option of not joining Flexcar and developing a home-grown plan for
334 CarShare, since TPS already has vehicles, part of their own infrastructure, and staffing. Chair Frickel
335 agreed there are compromises of joining Flexcar, but the benefit of joining Flexcar is that they take
336 care of the overhead costs. The costs of running a full CarShare system are currently unknown.

337 338 Flexcar/vanpool program

339 For a review of the Flexcar's program and changes in the UCSB CarShare program, please refer to
340 the minutes from the February 16, 2006 meeting.

341
342 Chair Frickel urged the Board to make a decision on Flexcar. The Board responded they realize the
343 urgency to change the CarShare system. They need more information to make a decision on Flexcar.
344 The Board would like information on how carshare programs work on other campuses.

345 346 Vanpools

347 The Board inquired how full the vanpools are; is there a waiting list? TPS responded they are mostly
348 full and there is only a waiting list for one day for one van due to the variable schedules of riders. TPS
349 will provide more information on occupancy at the Board's request.

350
351 Chair Frickel inquired when the Board will make a decision on the vanpool replacement issue. Board
352 stated they have yet to hear from the vanpool riders, which is crucial to the decision the Board would
353 make.

354 355 Outsourcing Vanpool Vehicles on Other Campuses

356 Other UC campuses outsource their vehicles with a company like VPSI or Enterprise. The driver of
357 the vehicle leases a van from the company and establishes his/hers own fares and collects them from
358 the passengers. The downside to this option is, if the driver leaves the program, the vanpool will shut
359 down unless someone else creates a new lease agreement for the vanpool vehicle.

360 361 MTD Bus Pass

362 The Board discussed charging a small fee for the bus pass, such as \$0.50 per use.

363 364 TAB's Budget Jurisdiction

365 The Board inquired what the TAP budget has jurisdiction over; it is for TAP members or all alternative
366 transportation at UCSB? TPS responded the "Annual Report of the Chancellor's Advisory
367 Transportation Alternatives Board" by Bruce Tiffney, TAB Chair 2004-05 (please refer to the
368 November 1, 2005 minutes, Attachment "C") includes non-TAP member projects such as the Pardall
369 Bicycle/Pedestrian Tunnel. TAB could narrow their focus to TAP or broaden their focus to the whole
370 UCSB community's use of alternative transportation.

371 TAB's ultimate goal(s)
372 Board member Goldschen questioned the proposals of cutting costs of programs and how this fits
373 TAB's ultimate goal. Is TAB's goal to cut costs, or to use their resources to benefit the greatest
374 number of people? TAB could tap into the wider UCSB community, beyond those qualified or aware of
375 TAP.

376
377 Board member Kendall stated that resources used on some existing programs could be used to
378 improve the bicycle infrastructure. Board member Kendal also stated the TAP budget is
379 unsustainable; the costs are exceeding annual TAP revenue generated by citations.

380
381 Sub-Committees
382 The Board stated forming sub-committees for crucial topics is a priority. The Board realized they need
383 to organize the information from each meeting on each topic. TPS suggested the Board use the
384 Board's listserv to discuss topics and decide on sub-committees.

385
386 Future TAB Meetings
387 The Board recommended that some future meetings focus solely on one topic.

388
389 **V. Public Comment**

390 None.

391
392 **VI. Other Comments**

393 Chair Frickel reported Gregg Hart, SBCAG, and Eva Inbar, Coalition for a Balance Measure D, will be
394 coming to present at the next TAB meeting. Professor of Geography, Rick Church, has also been
395 invited and his response is pending.

396
397 **VII. Adjournment**

398 The meeting was adjourned at 12:16 pm.