

Memo

Budget Committee, Academic Senate

To: Budget Committee

From: Michael J. McIntyre, chair

Subject: Parking Fee Increase

Date: December 6, 2007

I've attached the notice of an increase in parking fees, plus the pages dealing with parking in the FY 2008 budget book. This matter was not discussed at all in our committee, and I do not believe there was any faculty consultation. The lack of consultation with faculty is annoying (I'm pretty confident there was consultation within the administration). The Senate gave the administration cover a while back (2002) when parking fees were increased substantially. I served on a parking committee which, I must say, took a huge amount of time.

I really have trouble with this "sneak attack" parking increase, coming at a time when students have already had to pay a huge increase in tuition. From the information given us in the auxiliary budgets, the reserves for parking are adequate (estimated fund balance for FY2008 of \$832,900). The budget is shown as balanced without any increase. There was no suggestion, when the budget was presented, that the parking fees would be raised — the contrary, actually. I'd think that the increase in the student population would have added to parking revenues. Here is an excerpt from page 221 of the FY2008 Auxiliaries Budgets Book:

Parking fees for students, faculty, and staff remained at prior year levels [for FY 2008].

Parking fees increases ranging from \$0.25 to \$0.50 per day were implemented beginning in the fall of 2004. The increase has been used for numerous parking lot improvements as well as to defray the costs of the new campus-parking shuttle implemented during FY 2005.

The list of parking accomplishments includes several items that we were told were self-financing, such as the Forest Street structure. Are there now cost overruns that the students are being asked to cover? I've heard nothing, so I don't mean to be starting rumors. Or is the goal to replenish the "auxiliary plant fund" <g>.I just think an explanation is in order, and that puff memo from the parking office does not do the job.

The fact that parking is structured as an auxiliary function does not mean it is

unrelated to the university mission. I don't think the parking office should be allowed to raise rates at will without accountability. In any event, I think the topic is worth a few minutes of discussion, and I've been asked by President Seymour to put the matter on our agenda.