Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from February 7, 2020
3. Chair’s updates
4. Good of the order
5. Title IX working group Q &A – Barbara Van Ess and Erin Rice
6. Parking Issues – Anne Eskridge, Director of UW Transportation Services
7. Adjourn

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m.

2. Review of the minutes from February 7, 2020

The minutes from February 7, 2020, were not voted on as a quorum was not achieved.

3. Chair’s updates

Bergman noted the rationale statement for FCWA’s Class A legislation on promotion criteria has been drafted and will be presented to the Senate Executive Committee on March 30. She invited FCWA members to attend that meeting. It was noted the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) voted to endorse the FCWA Class A proposal.

It was noted the Wellness Room Guidelines will remain the focus of council going forward. Bergman noted she is working on bringing the supporting materials up to date, including an inventory and status of the wellness rooms currently on the Seattle campus (UW owned and leased buildings).

4. Good of the order

A member noted the issue of scarcity of childcare for UW employees was raised in the last meeting, and she asked that FCWA consider how that item will be addressed. It was noted the waitlist for childcare offerings from UW (any campus) is of special interest.

There was some discussion of recruiting faculty for faculty councils, especially faculty members from the other campuses. It was noted the Committee on Committees meets annually in the spring to set faculty council membership for the following year.

5. Title IX working group Q &A – Barbara Van Ess and Erin Rice
Barbara Van Ess (Director of Personnel Policy, School of Medicine) and Erin Rice (Assistant Vice President, Human Resources) were present to share an update on the workings of the Title IX Policy Working Group.

The charge for the Title IX Policy Working Group includes defining the population to be categorized as “responsible employees” relating to Title IX reporting at the University of Washington, defining the expectations for the employees in that role, and building out training resources for them. The charge also involves coordinating those trainings, which is being done in consultation with the Title IX Education Working Group. It was noted UW faculty are being considered to be included in the population of responsible employees.

The Working Group is just getting underway and has had two meetings so far. They noted this is their first stakeholder meeting and welcomed comments and input for their work. A member explained she would prefer the University maintain a survivor-centered response to reporting, as opposed to implementing mandatory reporting on the part of responsible employees. She noted the University of Oregon has implemented an effective system via their University Senate, and recommended the guests look at that model to see some examples of ways to differentiate between those two forms of action.

It was noted in building out trainings and protocols for responsible employees, special emphasis should be placed on making sure the expectations of reporting students are met. Van Ess and Rice thanked members for their input, and noted they may seek further FCWA input as their work evolves. They left the meeting.

6. Parking Issues – Anne Eskridge, Director of UW Transportation Services

Anne Eskridge (Director, UW Transportation), Eric Johnson (Associate Director, Transportation Services), Brent Curtis (Events Manager, Transportation Services), and Kay Doherty (Sales & Administration Manager, UW Transportation Services) were present to respond to FCWA’s letter to UW Transportation Services expressing concern over planned changes for parking and other products available to UW employees. Eskridge noted she would like to make sure the FCWA understands that its letter has been received and the concerns listed have been heard. A PowerPoint was shown as part of the presentation and information referred to in the slides (Exhibit 1).

A slide was shown on garages and lots where new Daily Permits can be used (Slide 3, Exhibit 1). A slide was shown comparing Individual Commuter Tickets (ICTs) and Daily Permits. It was noted more advance planning will be necessary to utilize Daily Permits compared to ICTs, however employees may still use Pay-Per-Use Parking (PPUP) on campus.

Some information was shared on the ICT product and how it creates a “wildcard” element for parking infrastructure planning. Specifically, Transportation Services does not know when ICTs will be used, spaces must be held each day regardless of need. Fraud is common relating to the ICT product, which is unfair to paying customers. Additionally, roughly 50% of ICT holders request parking different from their assigned lot, creating additional difficulty for managing parking infrastructure. It was noted the Daily Permit is designed as close as possible to the ICT while negating these problems. Transportation Services believes the Daily Permit insures greater reliability for parkers, as well.
A concern for safety was raised by the council within the letter. A slide was shown on University services and resources that focus on providing safety for faculty, staff, and students on campus, especially after hours (Slide 6, Exhibit 1).

**Discussion**

A member noted it is clear that a great deal of thought has gone into this transition. She noted this is a decision that cannot be changed, and many UW employees are simply grieving a loss of something they value. She encouraged finding ways to show the same compassion for UW community members affected by this change that has been shown during the presentation, perhaps by contacting previous ICT users. It was noted Transportation Services employs 14 employees who are available to speak to individual UW community members and go over their commuting options. Additionally, a FAQ website on parking (and other) changes has been published.

After a question, it was noted that UW Disability Services is also working directly with Transportation Services and UW community members over any ADA-related needs or concerns.

The guests were thanked for attending and responding to the FCWA letter.

7. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

---

*Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, assistant to the secretary of the faculty*

**Present:**  
Faculty Governance Section 42-32 B: Margo Bergman, Ankur Suri, Lauren Lichty  
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Alece Stancin, Pamela Mitchell  
Guests: Erin Rye, Barb Van Ess, Ann Eskridge

**Absent:**  
Faculty Governance Section 42-32 A: Whasun Chung, Kristelle Calma, Judy Chen, Tyler McCormick, Samantha Robinson, Elizabeth Umphress  
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Andrea Joseph, Kristelle Calma, Lynly Beard

**Exhibits**

Exhibit 1 – 2020-03-06_FACULTY COUNCIL ON WOMEN
FACULTY COUNCIL ON WOMEN IN ACADEMIA

March 6, 2020
The previous paper ICT system seemed to support this well: most days, when our schedules were fairly standard, we had the capacity to make use of public transportation or bicycles to get to campus. On days with more complicated schedules, we had the possibility of driving: perhaps to get to campus faster, leave campus briefly for an appointment, transport visitors, or hurry home to care for sick children or other personal obligations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICTs</th>
<th>Daily Permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater flexibility with paper</td>
<td>Must take time to buy on-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We agree, it will require pre-planning compared to utilizing the former paper product.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The new system seems to reduce the flexibility of faculty members who may need to drive intermittently:

- **more planning**  
  YES - more planning will be involved

- **more financial costs**  
  YES - Daily Permits cannot be purchased w/pre-tax $$
  However, Pay Per Use Parking is available - if it works for you/your work location

- **less confidence in finding parking spaces**  
  in the most appropriate or convenient locations
  
  • We hope to build your confidence by providing the list of parking lot locations were Daily Permits will be available
  • ~10% of eligible faculty & staff purchased ICTs during the last 20 months
Daily Permit lot locations

Garages
- Central Plaza Garage
- Padelford Garage
- 4545 Garage
- Tower Garage East
- S01 Garage*

Lots
- C10, C12, C15, C17
- E02, E03, E06, E08, E16, E18, E19, E21
- N02, N03, N05*, N09, N12, N13, N22**, N24, N25, N26
- South Campus Lots*

* Allotment Approved by Department
  Only available to employees within Department
** Disability Lot
  Available only to those with a state disability placard or UW disability permit

Fewer lots available: Daily parking limited to 6 lots on campus
(Does not include Central Garage)
PPUP Facilities

- Portage Bay Garage
- E12 Lot
- W08 Lander Garage
- W45 Tower Garage
- 4545 Garage
- Benjamin Hall Garage
Perceived safety when walking alone and/or after dark may be limited if the new parking assignment is far from the building where parker is headed.

**Husky NightWalk** is a service of the UW Police Department and provides uniformed safety guards as walking escorts. The UWPD also offers the **SafeZone app** that acts as a virtual guardian and connects directly with their office. Depending on your location, you may also find the **NightRide shuttle** from Transportation Services useful.

**Safety Escort Services UWPD website:** [http://police.uw.edu/services/safetyescortservices/](http://police.uw.edu/services/safetyescortservices/)
- Husky NightWalk [206-685-9255(WALK)]
- NightRide
- UWMC Department of Public Safety
- Safe Zone App info: [http://police.uw.edu/services/safe-zone-app/](http://police.uw.edu/services/safe-zone-app/)
- NightRide shuttle info (including schedules) – on Facilities website: [https://facilities.uw.edu/catalog/nr](https://facilities.uw.edu/catalog/nr)
The faculty are feeling that a convenient benefit has been eliminated. We hope that the Transportation Services group can consider these important issues when discussing these parking changes and find practical ways to maintain previous convenient benefits for the faculty and other members of the campus community.

- TS explored harnessing the benefit of automation with the new technology AND accommodating the full functionality of the current ICT

- TS tried to configure ICTs in the software test bed - blew up the programming of other permits

- Cost prohibitive re: customization and unwise to replicate a “wild card”

- TS designed the Daily Permit as close as possible to ICTs while retaining the on-line purchase capacity, automation functionality, and parking management properties of the software
The faculty are feeling that a convenient benefit has been eliminated. We hope that the Transportation Services group can consider these important issues when discussing these parking changes and find practical ways to maintain previous convenient benefits for the faculty and other members of the campus community.

- TS made sacrifices in pursuit of the greater good
  - The 20\textsuperscript{th} century, 20+ year old ICT convenience was sacrificed

- With the constraints with the City of Seattle’s mandate to decrease parking 25\% in the next few years, ICTs were enabling the overutilization and the underutilization of parking lots

- ICT - is a convenient product with enormous flaws
  - Don’t know when they will be used - spaces held each day
  - Enormous fraud - not fair to paying customers
  - ~50\% ICT holders request OOA parking different from their assigned lot
What if the lot is full prior to arrival?
Need a reliable space.
### April 2019 (Spring Quarter) – Peak Fill Rate

#### Day of Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Month</th>
<th>Parking Lot &amp; Number of Stalls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Exhibit 1

- **C01**: 64
- **C02**: 168
- **C03**: 150
- **C04**: 174
- **C05**: 169
- **C06**: 11
- **C07**: 16
- **C08**: 80
- **C09**: 43
- **C10**: 45
- **C11**: 32
- **C12**: 47
- **C13**: 58
- **C14**: 65
- **C15**: 114
- **C16**: 250
- **C17**: 145
- **C18**: 131
- **C19**: 69
- **C20**: 31
- **C21**: 172
- **C22**: 352
- **C23**: 205
- **C24**: 117
- **C25**: 5
- **C26**: 38
- **C27**: 19
- **C28**: 88
- **C29**: 93
- **C30**: 91
- **C31**: 72
- **C32**: 107

---

**Note:**

- The table represents the peak fill rate for different days of the month, with percentages indicating the fill rate for each parking lot and number of stalls.
- The data is organized by day of the month, with entries from 1 to 29 representing each day.

---

**Explanation:**

- Each row corresponds to a specific day of the month, with the fill rate expressed as a percentage.
- The data is likely used to analyze parking demand and manage parking resources effectively.

---

**Source:**

- The source of this data is not explicitly stated in the image, but it is likely derived from a parking management system or report.