

With short notice provided to committee members an urgent meeting of the Traffic and Parking Committee was convened on Monday, April 9, 2012. I was unable to attend due to conflict with a class of which attendance was mandatory. Civil Service Council member Karin McClure attended this meeting as my proxy. I learned earlier from committee chair Todd Sigler this meeting was called at the request of the Chancellor's Office. Financing for the re-routing of Lincoln Drive around the west end of the Communications Building was the sole item on the agenda for this meeting.

Chancellor Cheng attended this meeting to present her reasons on why the previously approved fee schedule for parking rates are insufficient and will need further increases for FY13. With funding released by the governor for the Communications Building expansion the university administration had inadequately planned for the \$2.5 million expense of re-routing of Lincoln Drive that should have been factored into total cost of the Communications Building project.

Chancellor Cheng acknowledged with Parking Division financing this portion of the project this would greatly deplete Parking Division's reserve funds thus calling on the need to increase parking fees beyond the previously proposed fees recommended by the Traffic and Parking Committee for FY13 and approved by the Chancellor.

Brian Mager, Manager of Parking Division, presented an alternate set of fee increases above what had already been approved, which Cheng had asked him to put together.

- Parking Division's proposed new rate structure for staff parking:

Less than \$24999.99	\$80
\$25,000.00 - \$39,999.99	\$120
\$40,000.00 - \$64,999.99	\$145
\$65,000.00 -	\$160

- The original recommended staff parking rates by the Traffic & Parking Committee and approved by the Chancellor's Office for FY13 were as follows:

Less than \$24,999.99	\$75
\$25,000.00 - \$39,999.99	\$110
\$40,000.00 - \$64,999.99	\$134
Greater than \$65,000.00	\$150

- For a comparison the current rates for FY 12 are:

Less than \$24,999.99	\$70
\$25,000.00 - \$39,999.99	\$103
\$40,000.00 -	\$125

A motion was made and seconded to approve the additional increases sought after by Chancellor Cheng. The motion was passed with one dissenting vote by Civil Service Representative (proxy), Karin McClure. I concur with Karin McClure's vote and would have also voted **no** on this same proposal as presented if I was able to attend.

I cite three rationales for this reasoning. First, if the administration cannot adequately plan they need to be held accountable; not granted legitimacy cover through constituency committee approval. Since the expansion of the Communications Building, while certainly a good thing, has been a known event to happen in the future. It is clear the administration poorly anticipated all the needs required for this Communications Building project that will now start to proceed. Second, since FY13 recommendations were already agreed upon the administration's '*crisis management*' should not be enabled by their demanding additional financing after the fact. And finally, the administration needs to develop better funding schemes for projects than through placing disproportionate burdens on staff and students. Staff and students already incur great costs at this university either in the form of low salaries (for most of the university staff) and ever increasing fees the students have to pay.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary S. Beer

UJBC meeting 4/24/12

January minutes were approved.

HR reported that 283 have retired so far this FY. Another 48 will retire in May, and about 100 in June.

Benefits Choice is slated to begin in June; CMS does not yet have information on our insurance choices. There is a new medical flexible spending limit of \$2500 (rather than \$5000 as in the past).

Kim reported from Springfield that starting in April there have been 23 resignations and 63 retirements, with some departments almost totally wiped out. Some people hit the 80% max years ago and have overpaid into SURS, therefore they would lose thousands of dollars if they stayed. Many of these are faculty with 30-40 years of experience. Some have grants and will be back to continue their work post-retirement. Bruce mentioned a bill in the legislature that would limit the salary a retiree could earn when returning to work. Kim stated that for these people, the important thing is being able to continue their life's work and they would work even for a reduced amount. SURS is coming May 1st, and many people have meetings that day to determine whether they can retire. Kim was asked how many employees SIU-Med has, and she replied it was around 1900.

Jeff said that he has a conference call on April 25 with the We Are One labor coalition.

Bruce was in Springfield all day April 23. SUAA will be fighting Gov. Quinn's pension proposal that was released on April 20. The proposal would increase the employee contribution from 8 to 11%. He said the "hardest part" is how the universities would have to pay a portion of the pension. Under the proposal, the employing unit is responsible for paying a portion of the employee's pension. Whereas K-12 and community colleges can raise taxes, universities do not have a tax base. Bruce reported that Dr. Poshard said all of the university presidents are upset about the Quinn proposal.

Bruce also reported on HJR49, which went through the House 113-0. The Senate is voting today, and will very likely approve the measure. The resolution states that it would take a 3/5 vote of the governing body of an institution to increase benefits, and it goes down to the individual. If the Senate does pass the bill, it would go on the November ballot. Part of the concern is that it will cost \$70M just to have this vote, then there will inevitably be costly litigation to pay for as well. Another concern is that it could mean that a 3/5 vote is required for any aspect of the Constitution. A 3/5 vote also means that the majority is no longer in charge, rather the minority would be.

Bruce said that Dick Lockhart, SUAA lobbyist, does not think Quinn's proposal will pass. Bruce also stated that the 50% tuition waiver bill has come back to life; legislators could repeal this benefit also with their GA waivers and claim that they've saved the state money (i.e. political grandstanding). Bruce said that we really can't expect answers until the January session, after

the election when there are many lame ducks still in the GA who no longer have to worry about being held accountable.

Dick Lockhart says that what we can expect is 1) retirees will be asked to pay a portion of their health benefits, and current employees will likely pay more; 2) we will probably see a 3% increase in our pension contributions; 3) COLA will likely be reduced: instead of being based on the previous year, it would be based on salary upon retirement (i.e. non-compounding). The feeling is that they won't reduce the COLA for those already retired. SUAA is "holding" a suggestion that pensions over \$50K should be taxed; since the average pension is roughly \$30K, the majority would not be affected. Currently no pensions, public or private, are taxable by the state.

Lastly, Bruce reported that Linda Brookhart will be on campus on May 7. The date is significant because May 6 is the final day to consider bills, so on the 7th she will know exactly what is happening this session.

The next UJBC meeting will be held June 26.

Reported by Karin McClure