DISSENTING STATEMENT

Megan Healy, CTC Member, September 2012-Current
Herschel Kissinger, CTC Member, September 2012-February 2013
Jo Matzner, CTC Member, September 2008-Current
Brittany Moes, CTC Member, March 2013-Current

APPENDIX 1

Minority Dissent

Historically, consistent with its charge, the CTC has utilized subcommittees to ensure proper attention is devoted to key issues.

The Budget/Policy Subcommittee and the Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Safety Subcommittee did not meet from September 2010-May 2012 and the Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee met sporadically. Reinstating the subcommittees would help to ensure that the CTC fulfills its full charge.

Since the Budget/Policy Subcommittee and the Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Safety Subcommittee did not meet and the Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee met only sporadically, there is no longer a mechanism for the campus to address issues like properly vetting the Transportation Services budget, proposed rate hikes, concerns with snow removal, and there is no formal mechanism to address safety with bus routes, campus construction, etc.

APPENDIX 2

Minority Dissent

In the sentence immediately preceding this box, a Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee vote is referenced. Since no meeting Minutes are posted for the Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee, there does not appear to be a way to access a copy of the vote or the discussion that preceded it.
**DISSENTING STATEMENT**

**APPENDIX 3**

**Minority Dissent**

As listed under January 2011:
- Continue to convert state disabled stalls to UW disabled stalls (note: a motion in February was made and passed that did not include this item).

At February 2011 Meeting:
“[a] Motion was made to reconsider recommendation from January 7, 2011 meeting. Amendment was made to remove the UW Disabled parking portion from all the other parking increases that were voted on.


As listed in the points directly above:
- Converted the State disabled parking spaces on campus over to spaces requiring a UW disabled permit or visitor parking payment.

There was no vote stated in the Minutes from September 2010-May 2012 to approve the conversion of State disabled parking spaces to campus disabled parking spaces.

Prior to the May 6, 2011 CTC meeting, the CTC received a number of carbon copies of emails sent to the Chancellor regarding accessible parking. Monica Kamal sent a letter an also spoke at the May 6, 2013 CTC meeting. Ms. Kamal’s letter is enclosed as Appendix A at the end of this document (reprinted with Ms. Kamal’s permission).

In the May 6, 2011 meeting, the Minutes show that “T. Gloeckler talked about how at the one forum held on disabled parking that those using the disabled parking spots on campus talked about the failure of the system to meet their needs, especially the need to move around the campus to attend classes or to attend meetings. It is a ‘onesize fits all’ system based on the ‘drive to campus and park’ model in place for able bodied parkers. Whereas those requiring accessible parking spots have varying levels of needs that are not currently being addressed. Guest speaker Monica Kamal-- concerns about changes with disabled accessible stalls. Three hours stalls close to building are very important. Transportation Services website is not clear or easily navigated. Looking at policy inclusive for all students. Asked about Federal funding or grants for parking. What are the distances for the relocation of these stalls. Discussed the 3 hour accessible stalls currently in lot 62. All disabled student & faculty are not equal in their in their disabilities.”

The update of the Disabled Stall Conversion at the September 9, 2011 CTC was as follows:
“– Goal for September 1, 2011 was not met. Still on going, could not get the physical work completed. Upgrading all UW Disabled stalls to be compliant with ADA regulations. Adjust space to meet supply and demand of campus needs. Met with Bascom personnel and they are satisfied with the direction of the ADA project. Email the full list of location of disabled stalls to the committee.
- Rob will check out Grainger height restrictions at the entrance.
- At the May 6, 2011 meeting, guest speaker Monica Kamal volunteered to get a working group of people who purchase UW disabled parking permits/and or pay for daily parking to UW disabled parking spots so they could meet with P. Kass and Transportation Services to help develop a system that better fit the needs of those who use those spots. J. Matzner asked if P. Kass ever met with that group. P. Kass said there was not a need to meet with them.”
DISSENTING STATEMENT

The CTC should review how transportation affects people with disabilities and they should involve the disability community so people with different types of mobility concerns are involved in the discussions before policy is set and ensure the user group has input in the campus policy that is developed.

APPENDIX 4

Minority Dissent

- Renegotiated the revenue sharing model with Athletics from 50/50 to 60/40. The model was also changed from splitting net revenues to one where Athletics leases all spaces for donor parking at a reduced rate and Transportation Services retains all day of games sales.

According to Wisconsin Statute 36.11.8b all revenue should be going to Transportation Services.

APPENDIX 5

Minority Dissent

The Majority lists the important votes in the above section; however, this appears to be the first CTC Annual Report where the CTC was asked to vote on rate increases without knowledge of the budget and after the budget had already been approved by Administrations.

The 2007-2009 Annual Report states, “On February 22, 2008 approved the budget that includes an estimated $16,282,400 in revenue and $17,457,400 in expenses” and the 2008-2009 Annual Report states, “March 6, 2009 approved the budget that includes an estimated $16,706,100 in revenue and $18,124,000 in expenses.”

Under the Chair’s Discussion, DRAFT 2010-2011 Annual CTC Work Plan, the Minutes of September 3, 2010 list, “P. Kass reminded the committee member of the CTC Charge states approval of the rates and not the actual budget.” The Number 1 of the CTC charge is to, “Provide advice and recommendations to the administration and all governance bodies on policies and budgetary matters, including rates...”

In past years the Budget-Policy Subcommittee met and discussed the budget prior to votes on the budget or rate increases. The Budget-Policy Subcommittee did not meet from September 2010-May 2012. The CTC should see a detailed budget prior to voting on any rate increases and before it is submitted to Administration and the Budget-Policy Subcommittee should be allowed to meet.

APPENDIX 6

Minority Dissent

- Implement a night permit; garage specific for $40 and various surface lots for $125.
- Extend hours of control of four parking structures until midnight, Monday – Friday.

Since the Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Safety Subcommittee did not meet from September 2010-May 2012, the CTC did not have the opportunity to fully vet this issue. Enclosed as Appendix B is an email from Professor William Tracy about these issues (reprinted with Professor Tracy’s permission).
APPENDIX 7

Minority Dissent

As the official report indicates above, “Transportation Services conducted two open moped forums to discuss changes. First one had low turnout. Second presentation had higher attendance.”

The forums were held:

Wednesday, February 15, 2012
10:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m
Memorial Union

Wednesday, February 29, 2012
5:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
Union South

Transportation Services reported a low turnout for moped forums. The forums were scheduled at inconvenient times for students and both were on a Wednesday. There was no data shared as to how many people attended each forum. The only student in attendance at the Wednesday morning forum at 9:55am was a student member of the CTC.

The December 2, 2011 Minutes state, “Moped Forum – Request to please take into consideration student schedules. Use the ASM CTC members as venue for getting the word out.”

From the CTC meeting Minutes of April 11, 2012, “J. Matzner stated she heard students were disappointed about forums. She stated the forums were held when students were in class. The campus moped committee was not informed. Several people were furious about this.”

APPENDIX 8

Minority Dissent

- Transportation Services met with ASM to revise the campus bus funding model. Cut 10% from the campus bus service hours after negotiations with ASM over the cost share of the program. The routes were reconfigured to eliminate underperforming services and to maintain headway on high demand routes.

  The CTC was not consulted on this meeting that has a considerable impact on student’s financial burden through Student Segregated Fees. As the Annual Report pertains to the CTC’s work, it is meant to reflect work done jointly with the CTC.

- Transportation Services completed the 2012 on-board campus survey administered by Transportation Services.

  The CTC was not consulted, did not approve of, or vote on the methodology, or questions within the survey. The CTC did not formally accept the results of the survey with a vote.
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APPENDIX 9

Minority Dissent

- Continue to negotiate with ASM to increase their funding of the campus bus service to a level equal to student ridership.

CTC did not authorize Transportation Services to meet with ASM in this manner. As the Annual Report pertains to the CTC’s work, and neither the issue of ASM negotiations or route reconfigurations was brought for discussion or vote to the CTC, it is inappropriate to include this information in the report.

- Complete the expansion of the hospital parking structure (Lot 75) to offset parking losses (Lot 60 & 85) and meet increased visitor and employee parking demands.

CTC has not authorized Transportation Services to meet with the hospital or spend millions of dollars to expand parking there. Since the hospital is a “public authority”, it is unclear if this construction project is legal according to state statute. The CTC has not discussed this issue.

APPENDIX 10

Minority Dissent

- Fall 2010 survey indicated in good weather 94% of students, 52% of faculty/staff, and 27% of hospital employees commute to campus by modes other than driving alone. The next survey will take place in spring 2013.

The same Fall 2010 survey indicated that 60% of students use the bus less than once a week or not at all.

- The Routes 80, 81, 82, 84, and 85 routes remain among the most heavily used of all Metro routes. The Route 85 was absorbed into the Route 80 in fall 2012 due to budget constraints.

This action was not reviewed or approved by the CTC.

- Transportation Services provided valet bicycle parking for home football games for a second year through a partnership with the Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin.

The first year valet parking was provided by blocking the only accessible entrance to the Computer-Aided Engineering Building. This building is an academic computing facility accessible 24 hours to all Engineering students and students that take engineering classes. While the CTC staff reported on faculty and staff that were unable to park by their office when they came in to work on the weekend because of football games, the only accessible entrance was blocked for bicycle parking.

- Continue to replace older bus shelters with attractive and uniquely designed UW shelters with warm wooden benches and W crests at a rate of four shelters per year.

This topic was not discussed with the CTC. Nor was it mentioned that it may be illegal to require students to pay for capital expenditures with student segregated fees. In negotiation with the Student Transportation Board, Transportation Services has said that students must pay for these shelters out of Student Segregated...
Fees because Transportation Services does not have the money to pay for them. Even though students have rejected this expenditure for the last couple of years, there is no way to control the money once Transportation Services receives it.

SAFEwalk continues to serve the campus community with escorted nighttime walks. Transportation Services discontinued administration of the SAFEride cab program June 30, 2012.

The CTC did not discuss Transportation Services decision to end SAFEride Cab. With the end of this long time program, the Minority saw even more need for the Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Safety Subcommittee to meet and discuss safe transportation options, particularly at night. **While the Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee met only sporadically, and with it working primarily on issues of encouraging multimodal forms of transportation, the Minority has been concerned that there has been no mechanism to discuss campus safety.**

**APPENDIX 11**

Minority Dissent

The Committee was not permitted to vote on the issues listed above under “FUTURE ISSUES FOR CTC DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION,” or submit additional topics for consideration.
DISSENTING STATEMENT

APPENDIX 12

Minority Dissent

The summary above references the peer review of Transportation Services. It is not clear from the Annual Report how the peer review came to be.

At the May 16, 2008 CTC meeting, M. Rodriguez made a motion and D. Harmatuck seconded, for an independent review of Transportation Services. Tim Gloeckler called the question and J. Matzner seconded. The vote passed unanimously, 10-0.

Below is the motion that passed:
“Motion to commission a review of Transportation Services operations”

“Assessment of client satisfaction, review of operations from fresh and independent viewpoints, and establishment of performance benchmarks have become standard tools in quality focused entities.”

“The Campus Transportation Committee (CTC) approves the creation of an ad hoc committee that will institute an independent review of Transportation Services operations, with particular emphases on customer service, effective use of available resources, and resources needed for future excellence.”

“The ad hoc committee will include representatives of faculty, staff, and students who are not members of CTC. The membership, procedures, and criteria for the independent review will be developed by the CTC Chair in consultation with the Director of Transportation Services, and will be submitted to the CTC for approval no later than October, 2008. The review will then be conducted by the ad hoc committee with a final report due to the CTC before the end of the spring, 2009 semester.”

The Independent Review of Transportation Services id not take place and a Peer Review was held in place of an Independent Review. The Peer Review took on a different focus than the Independent Review and did not address many of the questions/concerns the CTC had regarding issues of transparency, customer service, communication with the campus, accessible parking needs, the role Transportation Services plays in campus planning, and whether or not there is a suitable process for planning and obtaining appropriate resources for achieving Transportation Services’ goals. This issue of obtaining appropriate resources for achieving its goals was raised again in 2011-2012 and not acted upon.
DISSENTING STATEMENT

APPENDIX 13

MINORITY DISSENT SUMMARY/RECOMMENDATIONS

From the Annual Report it appears that there was no time to discuss topics important to campus such as safety, bus routes, customer service, or improving other aspects of transportation on campus. There are no discussions of innovative attempts to develop new funding streams or cooperative efforts with the private sector to develop new models such as what the University did with 333 East Campus Mall, that would not rely on parkers or Student Segregated Fees.

A recommendation in both the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 Annual Reports indicates that the committee should “explore ways for construction projects to include the cost of building replacement parking facilities when parking lots are lost as a result of construction.” The CTC has not yet followed up on this recommendation, and while some members requested that this recommendation be explored, the Policy/Budget Subcommittee did not meet from September 2010-May 2012 so it could not follow-up.

A recommendation in the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 reports indicates that the committee should “work with the Office of the Chancellor to investigate the possibilities of setting rates in accordance with an employee’s ability to pay” and work with the Office of the Chancellor to establish permit priority system(s) that allow permit allocation on the basis of need versus longevity and highest salaries. During the past year, some CTC members voiced support for a special parking rate for those with the lowest salaries. This support was not more fully explored and the recommendation does not appear in the 2011-2012 official report.

The Majority Summary ends with, “CTC will work with Transportation Services as another challenging budget cycle approaches.” It is difficult for the CTC to complete its charge if Transportation Services does share a detailed budget or allow members to add to the meeting agenda.

The topic of Transportation Services developing a sustainable funding model was not discussed by the Campus Transportation Committee. It was often requested that the subcommittees meet so there could be a process in which the CTC could have a discussion about Transportation Services developing a sustainable funding model and other important topics. So that this topic and other important topics are addressed, it is the Minority view that the Budget/Policy Subcommittee and the Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Safety Subcommittee be allowed to meet. It is also the Minority view that the Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee has enough agenda items that are critical to the campus that it be restored to its previous stature as a full Shared Governance Committee that is run by the committee members and not by Transportation Services staff.

Given the facts outlined in this report, the Minority also recommends that members of the CTC should be involved in the writing of the Annual Report every year and vote on it. The Minority further recommends that all CTC meetings should be moved to a central accessible meeting location on campus that includes a lot with parking available (including accessible parking) for meetings, and that meetings be restored to two hours in length.

There should be an Independent Review of Transportation Services.
Dear Chancellor Martin:

The purpose of this letter is to urge the University to stop its plan to eliminate all free Department of Transportation (DOT) accessible parking spaces for persons with disabilities on campus and replace them with accessible parking spaces obtainable only through the purchase of a permit, which now costs $495 per academic year and is expected to double with the next rate increase. If implemented, the University is furthering its message to persons with disabilities that they are not welcome on campus.

The plan is morally flawed and short-sighted. I know of approximately 90 persons with disabilities from the community who volunteer their time, as “guest students,” to assist a number of academic programs on campus. These volunteers allow the University’s students, like those pursuing degrees in physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech therapy, kinesiology, nursing, medicine, vocational rehabilitation, etc., to have some actual experience interacting with persons with disabilities. Instead of compensating them for their contributions, which has continued for the past 15 years plus, the University instead will make them pay to provide their volunteer services. A large percentage of those volunteers are unemployed or on fixed incomes. For them, they will no longer be able to afford to volunteer on campus. In these dire economic times, the University should be cultivating and encouraging more volunteerism to augment faculty and staff. Moreover, others with disabilities who utilize the facilities and services on campus may no longer be able to afford to do so. This is unconscionable.

While the University invited persons with disabilities to the open forum to discuss their concerns over the parking plan on April 20, 2011 at TITU, Union South, its invitation was disingenuous. A large number of persons with disabilities were not able to attend, largely due to the fact of the lack of accessible parking slots around Union South and in lot #13, which serves Union South. If it truly was interested in hearing from persons with disabilities.
with disabilities, it would have held the forum in a more accessible location with ideally ample, or at least more, accessible parking.

In addition, the University has removed a significant number of accessible parking slots immediately around or adjacent to certain buildings, like the Natatorium and others. In certain instances, its decision to do so – deliberately or ignorantly - places persons with disabilities’ safety and health at risk. Persons with disabilities must now cross heavily trafficked roads or pass behind parked vehicles to access accessible routes to buildings. Moreover, by having to travel further from the accessible parking slots to buildings, the University is jeopardizing the health of those persons who were issued DOT disabled parking identification cards or disabled license plates. They were issued such identification cards or licensed plates because an authorized healthcare professional has certified they cannot walk 200 feet or more without stopping to rest, cannot walk without use of a cane, brace, crutch, prosthetic device, wheelchair, or assistance from another; are restricted by lung disease, use portable oxygen, have a cardiac condition, or are severely limited in their ability to walk. For those persons, it is incumbent that the University provides accessible parking with the shortest route to buildings as possible.

This latest parking plan, when coupled with the other programmatic barriers and the pervasive architectural barriers throughout the campus, clearly communicates to persons with disabilities the they are unwelcomed on campus, and I believe does not meet the University’s overarching antidiscrimination mandate under title II of the Americans with Disability Act or its mandates under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

For me, implementation of the University’s parking would significantly limit me from volunteering activities and time at the UW. I volunteer at the adaptive fitness program; for physical and occupational therapy, rehab psychology, and other classes. I also volunteer to work with engineering graduate students on their projects aimed at persons with disabilities by providing input and ideas. In the past, issues mainly attributed to my disability have limited my employment opportunities and it has already limited me from continuing my graduate studies at the university. I have been an employee at UW Madison and I paid for disabled parking. Even with that, I did not have spots to park in as I need a van accessible spot in order for me to independently get in and out of my van. In one instance, I actually had to have a meeting in a campus parking lot with my supervisor as no disabled spot was available for me to use. To further exacerbate the situation, it was winter and I cannot park farther away and push my manual wheelchair to work.

A vast number of UW employees, students, spouses of employees and students, guest students and visitors with disabilities deal with access limitations and significant barriers to parking, buildings, and bathrooms. An environment of discrimination at the campus exists because of the University’s inattention to this. Those barriers do not allow or encourage access to all aspects of university life for people with disabilities. Individuals with disabilities must have the opportunity to participate in all programs, services and activities on an equal basis with colleagues and peers. This is not the case by the transportation policies put in place and other program, services, and activities limited at the university.
DISSENTING STATEMENT

I urge you to stop implementation of this parking plan and encourage you to meet with this affected population to explore this and other issues affecting persons with disabilities on campus.

Sincerely,

Monica Kamal

Cc: steve.arnold@uwebc.wisc.edu, bittner@engr.wisc.edu, abogan@fpm.wisc.edu, gbrown@fpm.wisc.edu, tjgloeck@wisc.edu, afhabel@wisc.edu, pkass@fpm.wisc.edu, matzner@wisc.edu, noyce@engr.wisc.edu, patz@wisc.edu, gpilcher@uwhealth.org, punuganti@wisc.edu, cwilliam@ssc.wisc.edu, jyackee@wisc.edu
Professor Noyce,

I am sure you have read Mr. Kass's response to some of Professor Sprott's concerns. Among other roles, I am currently the president of PROFS. Apparently for this reason someone listed me on some literature as some one to contact about this issue. In addition to Professor Sprott, I have heard from a number of graduate students including my own.

This change impacts our academic mission and public safety and I urge your committee to reconsider. Many graduate students work late nights, often after bus service stops. The work they do is vital to our research and teaching missions and this policy will reduce that work (increasing time to degree and decreasing research productivity). More importantly, this policy will jeopardize our students' safety. More will be biking late at night and worse still, given the recent rash of muggings and assaults, many will be walking home alone after midnight.

The parking garages with which I am familiar are nearly empty at night, so I don't find Mr Kass's access argument compelling. As he said this is a revenue issue and this policy falls hardest on those least able to afford it. I understand that transportation is looking for new revenue sources and folks there may think $40.00 is trivial. But have you looked at how much our grad students are paid or when they last got an increase? A TA on 33% time will find $40.00 a burden. The main reason I got involved in shared governance was to work on issues affecting student life and this policy will really hurt them. This is just another step in my making UW-Madison less attractive to the very best graduate students.

I look forward to your committees reconsideration of this policy. I also urge the University Committee to consider the impact of this change on student safety and reseach and teaching effectiveness.

Bill

On Wed, May 16, 2012 at 11:09 AM, Clint Sprott <csprott@wisc.edu> wrote:
Patrick -- Thanks for taking the time to respond. I understand the arguments in favor of this change, but I still think it was a bad decision that will do more harm than good for the University.
-- Clint

KASS, Patrick wrote:
Professor Sprott:

It has been brought to my attention that you have some concerns over the changes we are making to the parking program this fall. There has been some misinformation about our changes circulating around the campus so I wanted to take the opportunity to explain what is occurring and why.

Starting on September 1st we will be extending the hours of control of four of our campus parking structures. The facilities are currently controlled Monday-Friday from 7am until 4:30pm. The new hours of control will be Monday-Friday from 7am until midnight. These facilities will not be controlled on the weekends. The specific parking structures are Lot 17 (Engineering Drive), Lot 20 (University Drive), Lot 36 (Observatory Drive) and Lot 76 (University Bay Drive). These four parking structures will not be the only facilities that are controlled at night. Currently 60% of our parking spaces are controlled at night. This percentage has been relatively constant for the last five years. The controls are in place to help facilitate employee access to their offices and labs after hours.

Understanding that individuals have limited options to access the campus during the evening, they created a garage specific evening permit at a cost of only $40 per year. This permit will allow an individual to park after 4:30pm in the selected facility. This parking permit will also be offered for the other parking structures that are currently controlled in the evening for which no evening permit is available. For those who do not wish to purchase a parking permit or are visitors to the campus, these facilities will have an evening parking rate that is substantially less than the daytime rate. The visitor rate will be $1 per hour with a $5 nightly maximum.

Transportation Services is a program revenue department and as such does not receive any State or University funding. We must pay for all their program costs, including the annual debt service payments on campus parking facilities, through revenue generated from permit and visitor parking sales. The loss of surface parking to new building construction
DISSENTING STATEMENT

and the need to replace this parking with more expensive structured facilities has created a structural deficit within the Transportation Services budget. In past years the burden to resolve this deficit was placed mainly on permit holders. Transportation Services has been working to develop new funding strategies to spread the cost of the overall campus parking and transportation programs to all users. By controlling these four facilities into the evening, Transportation Services will be able to generate additional revenue to lessen the burden on employees.

This change in policy should have no impact on the Wonders of Physics event held in February. I will offer the assistance of my staff to work with the program committee for this event to help facilitate the access needs for your visitors.

I hope I have been able to address your concerns about our policy change. This was not an easy decision to make, but given the current budgetary circumstance it was needed. We have no plans of mimicking the policies at the University of Minnesota in regards to parking, but we do need to ensure that our system is both accessible and sustainable so we can meet the needs of our customers today and in the future.

Sincerely,

Patrick Kass
*///**/**/Patrick J. Kass, CAPP/*
Director
Transportation Services
Facilities Planning and Management
University of Wisconsin
(608) 265-3200