COSAF Report | Recommendations & Comments

Referendum: The Entertainment Council Fee
Referendum: The Transportation Equity Fee

February 14, 2025

Timeline:

11/22/24	The Entertainment Council Fee and the Transportation Equity Fee referendum ballot language was presented to COSAF
11/22/24	Via Qualtrics survey, all council members provided feedback on neutrality of ballot language (**ACTION ITEM NO. 2025-048 & 2025-049)**
2/14/25	The Entertainment Council Fee sponsor and the Transportation Equity Fee sponsor presented updated ballot language to COSAF
2/14/25	Qualtrics survey distributed to all COSAF members to provide recommendations on the referenda moving to student body elections in Spring 2025. See results below.

2/14/25
The proposed referendum has reached the stage where COSAF considers all written materials and presentations it has received from all parties and advises the administration on whether or not to endorse the proposal moving forward.

A 'Yes' vote indicates that you believe it is in the best interest of the campus as a whole to move forward and place the item on the ballot in Spring of 2025.

A 'No' vote indicates that you believe it is not in the best interest of the campus as a whole to move forward and place the item on the ballot in Spring of 2025.

Survey Question: Do you endorse the following initiatives moving forward?	**Yes,** I believe it is in the best interests of the campus as a whole to move this initiative forward.	**No,** I do not believe it is in the best interests of the campus as a whole to move this initiative forward.
Entertainment Council Fee	6	8
Transportation Equity Fee	13	1

RESULTS: By majority consensus;

- COSAF does not recommend the **Entertainment Council Fee** moving forward to the Spring 2025 election ballot. **ACTION ITEM NO: 2025-072**
- COSAF does recommend the **Transportation Equity Fee** moving forward to the Spring 2025 election ballot. **ACTION ITEM NO: 2025-073**

The following pages include comments provided by council members in support of their recommendation.

Entertainment Council Fee

YES comments

This fee will benefit students!

I think the students should have the ability to decide on this fee increase. I would have preferred that the fee only extended for five years, instead of ten years. I am concerned about future university budgets at both the federal and state levels.

I support what the entertainment council fee will support. I think they should have the ability to raise more funds for better shows and concerts.

While I can understand the need and want for security in the yearly budget, I think that this is not in the best interest of students. $10 is a very steep increase in tuition and again I understand that pricing and planning in the Entertainment world is tough, but this is just a fee that wouldn't be as beneficial to students as others could be at this point in time. I voted yes because I believe it is for the students to decide how they want to vote.

I voted yes on the Entertainment Council Fee referendum because it provides stable funding for campus events like Sunset Fest, Local Limelights, and Lawntopia, ensuring free or low-cost entertainment for students. Without this fee, these events could be reduced due to budget constraints. Additionally, 25% of the fee supports financial aid, making entertainment more accessible to all students. The gradual $0.50 per year increase ensures long-term sustainability without sudden financial strain. This fee enhances student life, supports student artists, and strengthens the campus community.

NO comments

In the ASUCD fee guidelines, it states that the ASUCD fee will cover the cost of all the units listed under it so it doesn’t feel right to charge additional fees. While i do agree that the wider student body should have the final say, they do not have all the facts and information that COSAF members have.

With so much access to carryforward resources, I believe there are better alternatives to receive funding for this referendum. A big reason for the referendum was to stabilize the budget for negotiation purposes and a solution for that although not instantaneous would be to allocate funds for the next 1-3 following year(s) to allow a stabilization of the budget. I understand right now is a time of uncertainty with funding, but considering that ASUCD has a consistent flow of income through their student fee. I believe that there could be an alternative solution found that would be in the best interest of the campus as a whole to accomplish the goal of the Entertainment Council without a fee referendum.

Although I believe this fee needs more democratic oversight overall, I do not think it is ready to be placed on the ballot in its current form. The issues raised over the arbitrary $10 starting amount and its 10 year sunset clause motion me towards rejecting it from the ballot as it currently stands, given the current economy and uncertainty regarding funding to higher education programs in general. I believe a $10 quarterly fee that increases every academic year by $0.50 is a steep price to pay over the course of 10 years, especially given that the events hosted by ASUCD are not guaranteed to be free for all students even after this fee is passed (if I am remembering our discussion in November correctly). That being said, with further adjustments regarding the structuring and life of the fee, I believe its return on investment may be worth the cost for our students. I understand Entertainment Council's argument regarding the volatile prices of the entertainment industry and am aware of our place amongst other UC's entertainment council funds. I simply think the fee is not ready to be placed on the Spring Ballot as it is currently written.

Entertainment Council Fee

NO comments *continued*

The 10-year fee life seems to be more than what's necessary to gauge whether the fee is properly serving the student body. I would prefer to see a 5-year fee life with a reassessment after this period.

Given the immense economic uncertainty over the next ten years, including the real possibility of a recession, it is not responsible to burden current and future students on a long-term financial commitment to Concerts/Events. The wording of the Entertainment Council Fee referendum is slightly misleading, especially in its claim that "other campuses have passed similar referenda". Each university's Associated Students operate under different structures, meaning the goals and context of those referenda are not directly comparable to UC Davis.

Moreover, most students are unaware that ASUCD holds an $8 million carry-forward in the Base Fee, a Fee that was presented as a way to eliminate the need for future referenda. Given this context, I cannot, in good conscience, endorse placing this referendum on the ballot.

The Entertainment Council Fee referendum would essentially force students into a long 10-year fee that increases yearly, and it is unknown how the fee was determined. I do not believe this fee is beneficial for this sole purpose. There should be a pilot program (max of 5 years) to actually assess the need for a new fee. Additionally, ASUCD’s base fee had assured there would be no need for new referenda â€” an aim that is no longer true and is rather deceptive now.

Transportation Equity Fee

YES comments

Transportation is essential for all students.

This fee uses clear, concise language that the student body can make an informed decision about. The life of the fee and the adjustment of the fee is also reasonable and would benefit UC Davis if moved forward.

I think this fee is mostly about helping commuter students afford increased parking fees. The student body should have the ability to decide on this fee. The fee increase is only for the next five years. This would allow students to then decide if the fee should continue or not.

I fully endorse this initiative. The ballot language is very clear and I think that commuter students should be given grants to help offset the cost of parking.

I believe that everyone deserves access to resources and should be able to commute to and from school in an affordable manner. I think this fee referendum has the possibility to potentially impact these commuting students and better their education opportunities, should students decide to pass the referendum

The TEF clearly outlines how it plans to serve the UC Davis student body with its funding, which I believe is needed to support the commuter student population and students with dependents. The ballot language is clear and unbiased, and the life of the fee is fair considering its yearly CPI increases.

I can see no reason to exclude this from the ballot for students. I think it is a great idea, and is planned out well enough to be a great success. I look to the future for great things accomplished by this referendum.

The timeframe for the Transportation Equity Fee is reasonable, and the language is clear. Students deserve the opportunity to review the referendum and decide for themselves whether it should pass.

Parking has been a huge topic of debate among UCD students, so I believe that they should be given the chance to vote on what they would like to do to address the issue. Although the fee does not ensure parking will be lowered or remain at current rates, and rather makes people pay TAPS another fee on top of parking rates/tickets, I do see the benefits in the long run.

I voted yes on the Transportation Equity Fee referendum because it helps fund essential programs like bike registration, safety initiatives (Lit Not Hit, Helmet Hair Don't Care), and transportation education that benefit all students. This fee also supports commuter students and students with dependents through a transportation grant, making campus more accessible. With rising transportation costs, this fee provides a sustainable funding source to maintain and improve mobility options while ensuring 25% of the fee goes toward financial aid, helping students with the greatest need. Investing in transportation equity enhances accessibility, sustainability, and overall student well-being.

NO comments

I do not see value in tacking on extra fees on the student body at this point of time. This sounds like a good initiative but I'm not sure if all students should have to pay additional fees since most students either bike or use Unitrans to commute to campus.