

Resolution on Transportation and Parking Services Planned Changes to Parking Rates and Programs

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

Background

On Friday, January 30, 2026, Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) sent an email to the UC Santa Cruz campus community announcing the planned implementation of targeted adjustments to TAPS parking permit and program rates and offerings, effective July 1, 2026.¹ The campus community was invited to share feedback via a Google form by March 16, which includes one open ended question (limited to 100 words). These proposed changes are of broad and significant concern to the Academic Senate because of their potential long-term impact on 1) the campus budget and infrastructure, 2) issues of equity, as these changes will be borne disproportionately by different campus constituencies, and 3) access and the ability to carry out the university's core mission of teaching, research, and service. Despite this sweeping significance, no prior notification or consultation regarding the proposed changes was provided to the Academic Senate, including the committees that regularly consult with Vice Chancellor for Finance, Operations, and Administration (VCFOA) Reiskin, such as the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) and the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB). TAPS also failed to notify or consult with the Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (ACCTP), which includes representatives from both CFW and CPB, before announcing these proposed changes. The ACCTP is charged with advising the administration on “annual updates to the 10-Year Plans for both parking and transit, along with any associated fee and fare proposals necessary to support those Plans.”² A Senate representative on the ACCTP has informed us that these plans were discussed at ACCTP on February 3, 2026, the week following the announcement to campus.

The Senate’s concerns regarding the TAPS proposal are twofold: the drastic substance of these changes and their potential impacts on our campus community, and a breakdown in the Senate consultation process. Even more troubling is Chancellor Larive’s subsequent assertion that the Senate has no role in reviewing and advising on issues related to TAPS or any “auxiliary services.”³ This position *directly* undermines the principles of shared governance, as these services have broad and significant implications for the university’s core mission, and the well-being of faculty, staff and students. It also directly contradicts CPB’s charge, which states: “The Committee confers with the Chancellor of the University of California, Santa Cruz, concerning the budget and budget policy for the Santa Cruz campus.”⁴

¹ Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) to UC Santa Cruz Campus Community, 1/30/26, Re: Proposed Increases to Parking Permits and Program Rates

² Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (2025-26 Charge/Membership): <https://transportation.ucsc.edu/about-taps/#acctp>

³ Chancellor Larive and iCP/EVC Koch to Senate Chair McCarthy, Senate Director Mednick, et al., 3/04/26, Re: Parking Rate Increases

⁴ Committee on Planning and Budget Charge, Senate Division Manual 13.25.2: <https://senate.ucsc.edu/senate-division-manual/#cpb-charge>

The Chancellor's troubling assertion via email on March 4, 2026, was sent in response to the Senate's formal memo to Chancellor Larive, Interim Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (iCPEVC) Koch, and VCFOA Reiskin on March 3, 2026, following up on Senate Executive Committee (SEC) consultation with the Chancellor and iCPEVC on February 24, 2026.⁵ This memo noted the lack of prior review by the full Academic Senate, as well as the failure of TAPS to bring this issue before ACCTP for discussion, and thus requested that implementation of the proposed changes to the parking program and fee rate increases be suspended until a full and proper consultation process could be implemented.

Formal Senate consultation *before* decisions are made is essential. Based on only preliminary review during CFW, CPB, and SEC meetings, the Senate has already identified several critical issues that should be addressed before any changes are implemented:

- The proposed plan does not merely suggest a one-time adjustment but establishes a compounding rate increase (10% annually through 2031, followed by 6% annually through 2036, and 5% annually thereafter) that will double the cost of some permits by 2036 and increase them by over 300% by 2043, creating a long-term financial burden on faculty, staff and students that outpaces projected salary growth and inflation. This level of sustained rate increase cannot be justified without additional data, context, and argument. Changes of this magnitude affect the university's core mission and require Senate review.
- The proposed rates are likely to alter campus culture by discouraging attendance, with potential impacts on instruction and community-building (e.g., fewer students in class, fewer student-faculty interactions, more remote meetings, decreased attendance at campus events).
- In addition, the proposed rates have significant implications for campus commitments to equity and access as they will be borne unevenly across faculty, staff, students, and the public taxpayers of California. For example, faculty and staff who must come to campus frequently will bear an outsized burden of these cost increases. We also urge thorough review of the proposal to ensure full ADA compliance and access.
- The Senate believes these changes will have a negative impact on "hybrid" commuting, principally bike or public transport with occasional personal automobile trips to campus. This type of commuting helps the campus reduce traffic and parking congestion as well as environmental impacts associated with single-occupancy vehicle trips. Hybrid commuting should be encouraged; however, the proposed pricing structure with significant increases to daily parking (110% increase next year and to nearly \$22 in FY36) and bus pass rates effectively incentivizes the purchase of annual or at least quarterly permits. Or could have the opposite effect and dis-incentivize faculty, staff, or students from coming to campus. Once people have an annual parking permit, they will, in all likelihood, make more personal automobile trips to campus. This may be good for TAPS' bottom line, but it

⁵ Senate Chair McCarthy to Chancellor Larive, iCP/EVC Paul Koch, and VCFOA Reiskin, 3/03/26, Re: Recently Circulated Parking Rate Increases

contradicts campus long term planning for bike and pedestrian infrastructure and may undermine campus sustainability commitments.

- The rate proposal indicates that at least in part, these rate increases are due to the campus deficit costs, which have been passed down to Finance, Operations, and Administration (FOA) and TAPS to accommodate in their ongoing budgets, as well as to multiple years in a row of no rate increases, with growing operational costs in the interim borne by the central campus. It is not acceptable to directly pass on campus deficit reduction targets to the constituent students, staff, and faculty through service fee increases.
- In the TAPS FAQ, it is stated that “...inflation has averaged approximately 4% annually, peaking at levels not seen in the United States in nearly five decades.”⁶ The current California inflation rate is roughly 3%.⁷ Campus General Range Adjustments are generally 3-4% per annum. The proposed rate increases greatly exceed (for multiple years) both the rate of inflation and general increase. There is also no justification given for how the multi-year rate increases have been determined, and no quantitative basis (such as indexing to the annual California Consumer Price Index); this is consistent with the primary goal of this policy being to pass on structural deficit costs to faculty, staff, and students.
- In response to the Academic Senate’s 2023-24 review of the proposed UCSC Automated License Plate Recognition (ALPR) policy, the administration argued that the technology and program was implemented in order to cut costs and increase “cost-effectiveness,”⁸ yet now we see a budget justification for these rate increases necessitated in support of ALPR. This proposed justification begs further questions about the value and sustainability of the ALPR program, such as 1) how much has the switch to plate readers actually saved the campus, and 2) if ALPR has cut costs, why are more funds needed to support the program going forward?

These are just a few examples of multiple issues that have been raised by CFW, CPB, and SEC after only a cursory review of the proposal, which highlights the need for formal Senate and broader campus review before implementation.

In the March 4, 2026 email, the Chancellor and iCPEVC Paul Koch acknowledged that neither they nor the VCFOA had considered consulting with the Senate about the change to parking rates, and agreed that they would consult now to hear and better understand the Senate’s concerns.⁹ They also acknowledged that TAPS’s failure to bring this proposal before the ACCTP until after the

⁶ Transportation and Parking Services, 2026 Parking Permit Price Increase Proposal, Frequently Asked Questions: https://transportation.ucsc.edu/parking/parking-permit-price-increase-2026/?utm_source=MarketingCloud&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=taps-rates&utm_content=https%3a%2f%2ftransportation.wordpress.ucsc.edu%2fparking%2fparking-permit-price-increase-2026%2f%23faq#faq

⁷ Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO), The California Legislature’s Nonpartisan Fiscal and Policy Advisor, Inflation Tracker, February 20, 2026: <https://lao.ca.gov/LAOEconTax/Article/Detail/766>

⁸ VCFOA Reiskin to Senate Chair Gallagher, 1/27/24, Re: Senate Feedback on Proposed Campus Policy on Automated License Plate Readers

⁹ Chancellor Larive and iCP/EVC Koch to Senate Chair McCarthy, Senate Director Mednick, et al., 3/04/26, Re: Parking Rate Increases

proposal was finalized was a “missed opportunity” and that, in the spirit of no surprises, the proposal should have been shared with SEC at the same time. However, they communicated that they are not willing to suspend implementation of the program and rate changes while retroactive consultation goes forward, effectively preventing the Senate from exercising its advisory role. In addition, they asserted that, as an “auxiliary service, Senate consultation is not required for changes to parking rates,” but that “TAPS can be available throughout the year to any standing committee who would like to understand how our Transportation and Parking program operations work.” To support these assertions, the Chancellor and iCPEVC cited a memo to Chancellor Blumenthal from Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Valentino and Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget (VCPB) Delaney re: Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) Fee Review & Approval Process Event Parking Fee Package, dated May 21, 2012.¹⁰ The Senate notes that the cited memo was an internal administrative communication that was not addressed to nor copied to the Academic Senate. From our perspective, this memo does not directly speak to nor absolve the administration from the necessity of Senate consultation regarding issues related to auxiliary services, especially as these broadly impact faculty and campus welfare and sit squarely in CPB’s charge. Furthermore, such a position contradicts practices of shared governance and consultation in regards to auxiliary services, such as Transportation and Parking, Housing, Childcare, etc., that have been ongoing since the 2012 memo. Thus, the administration’s assertion that Senate consultation is not required in this instance is troubling and has significant and far-reaching implications for shared governance on related issues going forward.

***Whereas:** On January 30, 2026, Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) sent out a message to the UCSC campus community announcing a multi-year strategy with proposed increases to parking rates with an effective date of July 1, 2026.*

***And whereas:** The proposed plan does not merely suggest a one-time adjustment but establishes a compounding rate increase (10% annually through 2031, followed by 6% annually through 2036, and 5% annually thereafter) that will double the cost of some permits by 2036 and increase them by over 300% by 2043, creating a long-term financial burden on faculty and staff that outpaces projected salary growth and inflation.*

***And whereas:** Shared Governance calls for the administration to seek Senate consultation on issues affecting anything within the purview of the Academic Senate, including those related to budgets and faculty welfare, such as parking and transportation.*

***And whereas:** The Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (ACCTP), on which there are two Senate committee representatives (CFW and CPB), is charged with advising the administration on “annual updates to the 10-Year Plans for both parking and transit, along with any associated fee and fare proposals necessary to support those Plans.”²*

***And whereas:** Prior to circulation to the greater campus community, this proposal was not brought before the Senate for review nor was it discussed (or even mentioned) at the ACCTP.*

¹⁰ VCBAS Valentino and VCPB Delaney to Chancellor Blumenthal, 5/21/12, Re: Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) Fee Review and Approval Process Event Parking Fee Package

***And whereas:** The Academic Senate sent a formal memo on March 3, 2026, after discussion in Senate Executive Committee consultation with the Chancellor and iCPEVC on February 24, 2026, and requested that the implementation be halted until proper consultation process was followed.*

***And whereas:** On March 4, 2026, the Chancellor and iCPEVC acknowledged by email that neither they nor the VCFOA thought about consulting with the Senate about the proposed changes to parking rates and programs, and agreed that they would consult now to hear and better understand the Senate's concerns.*

***And whereas:** The Chancellor and iCPEVC, noted in the March 4 email message to the Senate that they are not willing to suspend implementation at this time.*

***And whereas:** The UCSC Academic Senate contests the Chancellor's claim that Senate review and consultation is not required prior to any changes to policies, fees, or services associated with campus auxiliary service units, as this contradicts Senate committee charges and current and past practices of shared governance.*

Therefore be it resolved: The Academic Senate calls on the administration to immediately suspend the planned implementation of the proposed TAPS parking rate increases and program changes; to send the proposal to the Senate, ACCTP, and campus community for formal review, with the appropriate data and justifications; and to consider and utilize review feedback to revise the proposal where appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

David Bernick

Hunter Bivens

Josen Diaz

Selmin Kara

Sara Niedzwiecki

Katherine Seto

Zhu Wang

Judith Habicht Mauche, *ex officio*

Yat Li, *Chair*, Committee on Faculty Welfare

Raphael Kudela, *Chair*, Committee on Planning and Budget

Gabriela Arredondo, *Chair*, Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

March 6, 2026