

UUP Labor Management Meeting Notes

Monday, March 16, 2015

1:30 - 3:00 p.m.

AD 712

Present: Heather DeHaan, Fran Goldman, John Oldfield, Benita Roth, Susan Seibold-Simpson, Darryl Wood, Sara DeClemente-Hammoud, Peter Partell, Joseph Schultz, Vice President Brian Rose

New Items from UUP:

Parking: We have been told that the Parking Advisory Committee (PAC) was dissolved and a new structure, called the "Parking and transportation stakeholders groups" (PTSG) was put into place with four subcommittees: parking, transportation, alternative transportation, and campus capital improvement. Weeks ago, UUP was asked to send a UUP rep to a "transportation study group", who was subsequently placed on the campus capital improvement subcommittee. UUP was not told there would be a restructuring of the PAC into the PTSG.

We would like our rep to be part of the parking subcommittee of the PTSG, as this is the issue that most animates our members. As of now, it is our understanding that there is no UUP-representative, or even a UUP-represented employee, on the parking subcommittee. Parking is an element of the UUP Agreement with the State of New York. We understand that arguments have been made that the subcommittees will all come together to make recommendations but that is not sufficient from our standpoint, as it is also likely that subcommittees will be tasked with making recommendations and proposals prior to the convening of the entire group

Additionally, we are concerned that two longtime members of the PAC – who happen to be UUP represented employees – were not assigned to any new PTSG subcommittees, and would like to know why this decision was made.

To be clear, we are not disputing the shifting of the PAC into the PTSG -- but given the new structure, it UUP's choice of where its representative should be placed. We ask that a member of management who can speak to these changes and address the rationale for them. We would like to know what the PTSG is tasked with going forward and how often it plans to meet, as the PAC sometimes went months without meeting.

Additionally, we would like to know if the study on parking and transportation issues recently done by the consulting group is available.

UUP (Benita Roth): About two months ago, we were asked for a UUP representative for the Transportation Study Group. We gave the name of Bob Snyder, who was subsequently placed on the "campus infrastructure" subcommittee of the newly constituted Parking and Transportation Stakeholders Group. Had we known about this new entity, we would have asked for that person to be in a different place (i.e. parking).

Two long-term UUP-represented members of the Parking Advisory Committee, not representing UUP per se, were not invited to stay on the subcommittees. We have an issue about having a choice about where our reps go, and we would like to know more about the consultants' report on parking and transportation. Parking comes up a lot for our membership: questions about safety, accidents, cyclists, and driver aggression has made being on campus less safe.

Management (Brian Rose): A lot of the conversation about parking and transportation began four years ago. The Facilities Master Plan has many components. There wasn't a whole lot in the Master Plan for what I will call parking and transportation. Some data was flawed. BU was also growing larger than planned. We knew that we probably needed to be thinking more about parking and transportation. That led to the idea to bring in a consultant. Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates was hired, engaged with the institution and produced a report.

UUP (Benita Roth): So the report is done?

Management (Brian Rose): Yes. It is a draft and labeled a draft. I'm not looking to put that in the closet somewhere. It is big report. It is not an easy file to ship around electronically. It is useful and has a lot of data and pictures. Where to park, busses, areas of conflict, so it is rich in data. That data is already, at this point, 14 months old but we never had that before. I would argue anyway that there was an important benefit in collecting it. Secondly from the report we have ideas and recommendations. Some of them are based on other institutions and some are based on our data. A handful we ran with that are not controversial. Example: bus routes and how to route them. Then there is another series of recommendations that would have represented an enormous cultural shift in the institution, "Hey, we'll pay you not to park here." Ideas we are not even ready to have. So if you pardon the pun, we put them in the parking lot. We need more conversation.

The next stage was to talk about what can we afford, which ones recommendations would work, and what would be the impact of this. The stakeholders group is meant to provide a way to kind of have that dialogue. It is not an implementation body. If the university adopts through its University Council [or Counsel – not sure here of what was meant in this context] a set of parking regulations, they would also require bargaining. Certainly I've got no desire to work around that. I think we've got some tough decisions ahead and some challenges. We have an even bigger problem on the transportation side. Five years from now we will be running a 5 million dollar deficit. And so really this is my view, it is kind of a long process with some interesting challenges. We are not going to be able to make quick decisions. Structurally, here is the reality about the stakeholders group: everybody would think of parking as the subcommittee they want to be on. If I gave everyone choices, we wouldn't have any on the other subcommittees. We assigned the CSEA representative to parking not UUP because there were already members on it who were employees represented by UUP, and nowhere to be found was a CSEA representative. Structurally what we are trying to do is create a context of meaningful conversation and sharing of data. The old structure of the parking committee left some

things to be desired: I don't want to create this impression that this was a wonderful example of shared government. There are new challenges – for example, University Plaza is adding 750 beds in the next year, which creates an opportunity to shift how students come and go from campus rather than by car. We are looking at putting a walkway in between the plaza and campus that leads away from the parkway and thinking about shuttle bus opportunities.

UUP (Benita Roth): How many people now are part of this stakeholders group?

Management (Brian Rose): I think it is somewhere between 17-20.

UUP (Benita Roth): Did you survey these people?

Management (Brian Rose): No.

UUP (Benita Roth): We (UUP) were not told there would be a new structure (i.e. the stakeholders group). We were asked for a representative for a parking and transportation study group. We make a distinction between someone who is a UUP member on a committee or group, and who is a *UUP* representative. I'm mindful that there are other UUP represented people in the group. But there was also two people who were let go without knowing in advance that this would occur.

Management (Brian Rose): The stakeholder group is a broader group with a broader agenda. We have a Parking Appeals Committee, which we have left untouched. The Parking Advisory Committee was not the Supreme Court with lifetime appointments.

UUP (Benita Roth): From our standpoint, the way it came down. I'm still a little confused as to what this group is going to do.

Management (Brian Rose): In the short term they are triaging. We identified those ideas that are at least potentially feasible and worthy of more conversation. For example, an idea for a transportation hub. We were able to identify one location to get buses off the brain road. Cons: location will be a busy place. Pros: if you look at traffic safety and expense associated with it, it might be worth the tradeoffs. We would come up with pros and cons in a discussion. Yes, pursue that. No, not a good idea.

UUP (Benita Roth): Assuming you get some more recommendations, what is the next step?

Management (Brian Rose): Let's say changing who can park where. A -- you (UUP) would tell me what we have to bargain, and B -- we would have to know what's the process for approving that? At a minimum, the BU Counsel [or "council" -- not sure what was meant here by context]. I'd like the Parking and Transportation Stakeholders Group to be a standing group with a dialogue. Building trust and that is going to take some time. Get people working and talking and keep moving.

UUP (Benita Roth): Have you made the people on it public?

Management (Brian Rose): I haven't, but I could.

UUP (Benita Roth): It would be helpful if the university knew there would be somebody they could talk to. We would like it to be public, and UUP would like to see the draft report [BR's note: this was sent to me via access to a Google drive]. It would be good for the wider UUP to know who was part of the stakeholders group – we now have 1750 employees, and parking is part of the Agreement. I would like a copy, and I would like to know who is part of this group. I won't push the issue of moving Bob Snyder's spot right now. We see a difference between being just a UUP member on a committee/group and being a UUP representative. I'm not imputing any ill will here, but the whole process has been a little less clear than we had hoped. We hope it becomes more clear. We have safety issues on campus, near misses all the time. Something needs to be done again, because we are going to grow and have satellite campuses. The students seem to be getting richer, so there might be more drivers.

Management (Brian Rose): Nationwide we see a decline in drivers; here there is a slower decline in drivers in the student age group.

UUP (Heather DeHaan): We have extensive conversations on parking at our Executive Committee meetings. Shortage of spots, cars circling to find spots, and more competition, lighting is terrible, and yet we have more classes at night.

UUP (Fran Goldman): I know you have the speed signs on campus. Of the three, I think only one is now working.

UUP (Benita Roth): When members come to us and ask us those questions, we should be able to say "you should go talk with someone who is having these discussions, and when they are meeting." We don't want to control you (meaning management), we just want some information.

UUP (Darryl Wood): I'd like to add that if the chapter is aware of what the institution is doing, we can resolve the problem. The more information that gets shared, the more information that gets told to members.

Management (Brian Rose): I have no problem sharing the names and sharing the report and appendixes. We just created the group, and my goal with consultation I wanted to be able to have the conversation around real data. We are just beginning the process of talking about it. The intent has always been that the information is being shared in the stakeholders group and sharing the information outside of it will happen. I understand your concerns about subcommittees (driving agendas for the whole group). Because of my belief in the interdependencies on these, it would fail if these subcommittees did not come back to the full committee for discussions.

UUP (Darryl Wood): Early on, there were questions of parking costs vs. revenues. There was an arbitration where the State tried to have employees pay to park. A great deal of data was provided about what it costs to park. Arbitration said that is all well and good, but it is not the real issue. The issue of registration fees has been expected: BU can charge a minimal for a rise. This year it went from \$20 to \$25. One could argue that if the university could “demonstrate” that it costs \$1000 a year to register your vehicle, they could raise the registration fee. I have a little bit of difficulty that argument. Largely there is a bunch of stuff that they could have done differently.

Management (Brian Rose): I’ve read the arbitration agreement. So has the consultant. I am aware of this.

Management (Joseph Schultz): We might get something that works for everything here.

UUP (Benita Roth): The clearer you can be with us as stakeholders, the happier we will be. When we can give our members information, it makes our job easier in the long run.

Management (Brian Rose): Thank you for having me.

UUP (Benita Roth): If they put a walkway in (between University Plaza and campus), how long would it be?

Management (Brian Rose): Depends. I can get there in 15 minutes, but I walk fast.

Ongoing items:

Start UP NY – At the last meeting, UUP expressed its concerns about the possibilities going forward of Start UP companies buying faculty and/or professional’s time, which would mean a subsidy of businesses by the university, e.g. if a faculty member was awarded a course release for Start Up work. Management offered to do research on this issue and get back to us. Update?

We also expressed our desire that we be informed of UUP-represented employees who receive release time or otherwise have their time bought out by Start Up NY businesses.

UUP (Benita Roth): Any plans or contemplation of course release for Start Up work by faculty?

Management (Joseph Schultz): If there was, there would be a complete buy out of that faculty by the company. The campus would be fully reimbursed by the company. [BR’s note – I highlighted this because it represents a statement of intent by management]

Dateline and getting information to employees: At our February meeting, management stated that there would be some changes to Dateline’s format. Is there any further news about this? Once again, our concern is that its format buries news that all our

members needs and that the necessity to “opt in” has kept some employees out of the loop.

Management (Joseph Schultz): Dateline is scheduled to be revamped for fall and there are not a lot of details at this point.

UUP (Benita Roth): If they are planning a fall revamping, they should get input from us in some sort of way before that.

Cell phone policy: We understand from the last meeting that a policy is in the works. Update?

Management (Joseph Schultz): Proposed policy out there, no update other than that. JoAnn (Navarro) has drafted a proposed policy to take to senior staff.

Contribution to mission info/data/meetings: At the last meeting, Provost Nieman offered to put up a statement on the web re: the intent of the contribution to meetings and urging depts. to share info generated for the meetings widely. Update?

Management (Joseph Schultz): Don said they are working on it.

Campus Construction budget: Given the severe cut in campus construction dollars, what kinds of effects will this budget cut have on UUP-represented employees (for example, but not limited to, Physical Facilities, some of whom are hired as temporary 90% hires)? What does the budget look like for the next several years?

UUP (Benita Roth): Given the limited construction budget for campus, what's up?.

Management (Joseph Schultz): In the big picture, there is hope that this capital construction situation can get better. It is in a state of flux at this point. It sounds like there is a very large push to get the amount larger, but there may be a different distribution model. Very big picture, the distribution method is not set in stone. In the next month or so we will know if we have more funds.. At this point, we don't have any plans to reduce capital project coordinators (i.e. members' positions).

UUP (Darryl Wood): A comment - everyone is going to expect that we will have a bad year or two, but it will come back. It might be good to keep them (the capital project coordinators) because they are trained and have experience.

Management (Joseph Schultz): At this point, there is no expected reduction.

UUP (Benita Roth): Are there any proposed changes in having contractors, as much as possible, be unionized?

Management (Joseph Schultz): In the big picture, it (a construction project) goes out to bid.

UUP (Darryl Wood): If there are governmental bids, they have to pay prevailing wage. In New York State years ago there had been issues about non-union subcontractors coming to campus and my memories of that conversation would be that although they didn't have total control they would work to see that that did not occur.

Management (Joseph Schultz): Can you send me that language?

UUP (Darryl): I will send to you the exact language.

“Below the Line” Agenda Items

(As agreed to by UUP and Management during the October 2011 Labor Management meeting, agenda for these meetings may include “below the line” agenda items that are added after the agenda is set. These items can be discussed formally or informally (no notes) at the current Labor Management meeting if both parties agree, or can be postponed to the next Labor Management meeting upon request of either party.)

Campus Climate Survey:

UUP (Benita Roth): At the February Labor Management Meeting we were told by Valerie Hampton that the Campus Climate Survey was done and the results would be presented on March 11 in the Mandela Room. Two sessions were scheduled to accommodate people. No announcement was made for this.

Management (Joseph Schultz): All I know is that there is a delay.

UUP (Benita Roth): Since it was a survey of everybody it does affect terms and conditions of work and we are very interested in knowing what it says -- we strongly encourage for that delay to end and for those sessions to be put in place.

Management (Joseph Schultz): I will get you an update on that.

UUP Binghamton Chapter Vice President for Academics:

UUP (Benita Roth): Let me introduce to you Susan Seibold-Simpson. Heather is stepping down as VP for Academics, and Susan is running unopposed. She is a faculty member in the Nursing School, and she is going to shadow for the next couple of months.

Management (Joseph Schultz): Welcome.

Meeting ended at 2:17 p.m.