GPSS Senate Meeting Minutes
November 5th, 2008
Approved January 14, 2009

Quorum present

1. President Jake Faleschini called the meeting to order at 4:40 pm.

2. Approved of the Agenda
   Jake Faleschini (President) entertained the motion to approve the agenda.
   Dave Iseminger (Vice President) moved to amend the agenda by striking number five gold star, and also relocating resolution two above resolution one because the subject matter relates to the presentation directly before the resolutions. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Approved of the Minutes
   Jake Faleschini (President) entertained a motion to approve the October 1st minutes. Shawn Mincer (Social Work) so moved, seconded by Anna Batie (Jackson School). All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Introducing Tim Hulet
   Jake Faleschini (President) introduced Tim Hulet, the new GPSS Treasurer.
   Tim Hulet (Treasurer) said thanks to everyone who came out to support him. He is a first year graduate student at Evans school, working on the degree in public administration. Tim grew up in Issaquah for about 18 years of his life before he went off to school at BYU in Utah. Now, he is happy to be back serving at the University of Washington as the Treasurer for GPSS.

5. Presenting the Gold Star Award
   Jake Faleschini (President) entertained the motion to skip the Gold Star Award since it had been taken off from the agenda and moved to the legislative agenda before the guest speaker came. John Liston (Communication) so moved. Mitchell Kaufman (Philosophy) seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed.

6. Legislative Agenda Preview/ Local Control
   Dave Iseminger (Vice President) incorporated feedback from previous legislative agendas from the students and Senators who attended the meeting last time into the new one. He said that the committee decided to turn the list of bullet points to “top priority items” on the front. That way, when too much information was being presented at the same time, the legislators at least had a chance to see what the crucial issues were. Dave further pointed out that the importance of the legislative agenda was to grant him the
authority to talk about the issues. Without this piece of paper, he could not address the issues in Olympia. **Dave** reminded Senators to keep things written down as fairly broad and flexible as possible, so the topics could be applied to the bill generally. For instance, a better policy statement would say, “GPSS supports state funding for child care program.” This will make anything that falls into the child care category easier for **Dave** to lobby on. He further highlighted some of the interesting issues on the agenda such as the university libraries supporting students traveling for research, and the push against the university North campus from the other campuses. Lastly, **Dave** asked if anyone has questions, comments or concerns, please talk to him in advance before Thanksgiving to make the December meeting less cumbersome and more time-efficient.

**Jake Faleschini** (President) gave credit to **Dave** for his hard work to bring up the agenda last night since he had been running a fever.

7. Guest: City Council Member Licata

**Jake Faleschini** (President) introduced **Council Member Licata** who has been friends with University of Washington for a long time and welcomed him to talk about transportation issues affecting University of Washington students, and how that might change now that Proposition 1 has passed. He was also looking at the light rail and how that would change the university district and also looking at more rapid transit buses coming from other areas into the university districts and also maybe the extension of light rail.

**Council Member Licata** said that the plan was to expand Sound Transit system in perhaps between ten to twenty years. The plan would be financed by a sales tax increase of 0.5 percent, or an additional five cents on a ten dollar for each retail purchase. He then explained what the council would do to provide funds to extend the light rail project from the University District to Northgate. It was critical to get the rail reach there in order for the rail system to really make sense. By terminating it in University District as its final destination centre, it was not a good location for people who drive to park. He suggested going up to Northgate, there was a bus hub out there which allowed them to have easier access to University District and all the way down to the airport, using buses to supplement the Sound Transit system. The money from Sound Transit would also allow, at the initial stage, to go to the East Side. It would be questionable how much fund was needed. There was an equitable arrangement agreement with three areas since Sound Transit actually covered three major areas. It was more than just King County, because the heavy cross traffic for light rail, Shoreline, downtown Seattle and King County were mixed up. It looked like there would be a large pool of fund available. At this point, Council said it was unclear how exactly it was going to work out. As far as the students were concerned, the two major issues appeared to be: what is the actual configuration of the sound transit stop that would be near Husky Stadium and Hagget Hall. He tied it into the 520 renovation issue and said it looked like that 520 was going to be six lanes. The local community still wanted four lanes. He didn’t think it was going to carry the day.

**Council Member Licata** explained since Initiative 985 failed that would mean that it would retain high vehicle rate. The actual configuration was still being negotiated with
the University of Washington as it was coming to close agreement. The other major concern was the vibration near the tunnels. He thought that the engineers would have to work out the solutions. Overall, he stated that the number of people who commute to the University of Washington, their traffic was very high, second only to downtown. What the Sound Transit vote did was to put most of the money into the light rail, 2% of the money went to bus line, some called Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Those lines were primarily going to East Side and downtown Seattle. His concern on the council had been to make sure that the council worked with the county. The bus in Seattle was controlled by the county, specifically by Metro, which at one time was independently run. He said that the downside was that the city of Seattle now is very independent about how the money was spent. Consequently, the new fund came into metro now was divided into the formula called 20-40-40, of which 20% went to bus lines in Seattle, 40% went to the east and 40% went to the south. Therefore, Seattle was not getting as larger share of the fund as in the past. Many busses came down to Seattle with commuters ending up being empty going back up.

Council Member Licata posed another question: how to make buses work more efficiently? He came up with the possible solution to increase the ability to encourage people to take the bus in the city. He passed out two sheets. One referred to the city-wide street car network, one of the branches extended from South community to University District. The other blue sheet showed the cost for the streetcar network. He implied that streetcar was a fixed rail, and it was not as expensive as light rail, but it was also not as flexible as light rail. The cost of the other branch was so heavy that even if streetcar system did go up to university district, they still needed the U-subsidy paid by local district or local business. Council Member Licata thus explained that the way the bus hour works in Seattle is that Metro assigns bus hours. The bus hour generally is 80 dollars an hour, and street cars run 120 dollars an hour. So they are about 50% more expensive. The public will be taking more bus hours to run the street cars and operate on a smaller footprint in the city. Logically, the street car system would eventually carry out more passengers, but the study didn’t seem to show that. Council Member Licata then went on saying that the concept of Bus Rapid Transit is the government wants to provide efficient, cost-effective, reliable transit service, in some way, the rail system is the best choice. He analyzed that dedicated rail system has more reliability which is the highest motivator for people to take the same type of bus transportation service, if cutting off the reliability, people drop off; because they believe they have more reliability if they drive their own cars. The attractive advantage of the Rapid Bus Transit system is the lower cost. He reminded that the downside of BRT is a significant amount of labor cost because of bus drivers. The Bus Rapid Transit system has proved to be very successful in foreign countries, but in the United States, only few cities have tried it. It seems that Los Angeles is one of the best examples. Shoreline has put lots of money into fixing up low avenues and it works for transit, vehicle and business along the line. They have the money to do that. In our current budget we cut out all these funds. The only thing we passed is the major transportation project. Right now, there is one way street, Mercer, going from the Seattle centre to I-5. And then a parallel street close to Virginia which takes most traffic from I-5 going to Seattle centre. They actually received the proof from the council. Paul Schell and his team decreased the construction and be a modest cost. When Greg Nickels...
became the mayor, he got rid of the couplet and changed both streets to two-way, primarily Mercer, literally doubling in size with twin lanes in each side, one side for parking. As a result, the project has grown from 19 million dollar project to 220 million dollar project. This project has been criticized. The cost has run over and it does not provide the solution we have expected. All the studies show more pollution and more danger. Because the council has the money, it has to make the decision next year. The major problem is that this project has drained the money away from another project. He finished the high level quick summary and opened the floor for questions.

**John Liston** (Communication) asked if there are any elevations for underground busses.

**Council Member Licata** answered they will be underground all the way through the university district and ended up at roughly 65th and Roosevelt. From there it becomes elevated.

**Anna Batie** (Jackson School) asked whether there are plans to improve the east Greenlake and north Wallingford areas. She indicated that quite a few graduate students take the 44 and 48 in east-west zones but the buses are full in busy times. As a result, they have to wait for another half an hour to get on the next bus.

**Council Member Licata** responded that the solution was to increase the bus frequency to create a better service. He stated that the city conducted a survey on the Seattle bus plan and they set goals for reliability of current frequency. However, the metro had not met the goal that they set on any of the groups. They had only met the goal of maintaining the frequency of 15 minutes and service for 12 hours a day. The reliability was another measure. There were a lot of improvements to be done. He restated that the evaluation of the proposal on street car was very important.

**Jake Faleschini** (President) asked how GPSS could get the information to look at the neighborhoods, how they were being serviced, and how to participate in the process.

**Council Member Licata** repeated the question and then responded there were multiple agencies and they all based on the federal funding. They had capital plans and program plans. Because the economy crisis we were in right now, King County government had to take a 90 million dollar cut just this year, and the city Seattle had to take a 30 million dollar cut. The problem now was they are shrinking. The largest single constituency group in Seattle that is the least organized is bus riders. GPSS would be the causes, too. He suspected that many of the GPSS memberships probably take the transit. GPSS should take up the challenge. What he would like to suggest and to work with GPSS was that to craft or request for that information which was to plan to. There is a specific state call group for that function. For overall transit, there is none that he knows of which addresses that issue. Creation of participations will be good help.

**Shawn Mincer** (Social Work) asked about urban planning.
Council Member Licata repeated the question how the city looks into revamping, renewing and updating their neighborhood plan. There were 32 neighborhood plans drawn ten years ago. The council was updating in a very minor way. In the past, the council had dedicated staff, money available, came up with the plans and very detailed document throughout the city. This time, the mayor’s decision was that since a lot of work was done, the council was going to take a quick deal with the city to see what the council needed to change. He commented that the council was a little bit more aggressive. This year, 2009, the council decides just to focus on three neighborhoods which are largely impacted by sound transit, light rail. Because the cut back in staff of the city, approaching statewide solution by neighborhood plans doesn’t work so well. Again, he emphasized that citywide stakeholders are really needed to be to look at the transit problem.

Jake Faleschini (President) thanked Council Member Licata and moved the meeting back to the presentation of local control.

6.1 Legislative Agenda Preview/ Local Control

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) highlighted the priority items on the front of the page. The first was tuition setting authority, the second was mental health, and the third was child care. Dave then explained I-601. It was passed in 1993. There was much pressure to reduce spending. I-601 limited government spending. Kelly Merrick (Policy Analyst) further explained that Washington State had increased demand for higher education, but at the same time, there was a budget ceiling of a certain amount. Dave continued giving a brief overview on I-601.

Nicholas Nasrallah (Psychology) requested a clarification on what percent of legislative spending represented higher education.

Kelly Merrick (Policy Analyst) said she would do more research on it.

Anna Batie (Jackson School) asked if Legislators could amend I-601.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) replied whether they can or not, they have.

Richard Lum (ASUW Office of Government Relations, non-Senator) asked if it was known that voters chose not to amend I-601 to include higher education.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) responded that Kelly would research the background. He continued talking about local control. There were two completely separate issues regarding tuition setting authority: “Who has the power? What legislations have that power?” Up till 2003, the legislators had complete control over everyone who was not a resident undergraduate, and then they dedicated that authority to Board of Regents with no string attached. After 2009 the tuition, the “who” possibilities would be the legislators and the Board of Regents.
Jake Faleschini (President) commented as a side note that the Board of Regents set the tuition in almost every other state school in the country.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) asked everyone to shift from the “who” question to the “what” question. If GPSS picked a side between the legislators and the administrators, it was going to be a lose-lose situation.

Liz Williams (Evans School, non-Senator) wanted to know how much legislative budget was for higher education.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) answered it was 10.9%. He continued to say that the underlying issue from his stand point was to achieve a predictable, reasonable tuition rate. Dave’s recommendation was to try to get a safeguard and restrictions on the tuition amount, and to stay out of the discussion on who had that power. The safeguards were at the end of the resolution, in the memo. The logical question to ask, he said, was what happened if the tactic fails? Dave suggested avoiding complexities. Another question people kept asking Dave multiple times was “why don’t you go ahead and let us know which side we should pick?” He answered it was not his role to make that decision, but it was his role to put it out for the Senators to look for the sense of direction for that question. If there was some negotiating, it could be addressed. He stated why it was important to pass the resolution that day. First, a formal Senate approval to state where GPSS was going would allow him to represent Senate better. This was necessary for meetings in Olympia with other student lobbyists. It would be very helpful to go in and say that GPSS focused on the certain issues. Second, they were doing pre-session panels with legislative officials. If Dave did not have the authority from the body, that would be a huge unfortunate waste of that opportunity.

Jake Faleschini (President) said that he had been in the negotiation with the administration for the last three to four months. GPSS got the endorsement from the Executive Committee at the end of this summer to send out the memorandum. Before GPSS leadership went over the details of the local control, it tried to think this through as much as possible. Initially they were going to oppose local control, after researching this summer they found that it was not necessarily the case that legislator control equaled lower tuition rates, or that regent control equaled higher tuition rates. That just had not been the case. Because of that, they asked whether or not it was the right policy to take, especially when GPSS considered that the issues for students were not who controlled the tuition, as much as what tuition rates were going to be, etc. Once GPSS clarified that, they really tried to consider what position to take. Traditionally, students had been opposed to the local control, but after being in the negotiation with the legislators, the ones Jake and Dave had been talking to, this new position was the right position to take.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) reminded everyone that the question had been shifted from the “who” to the “what” now. He recommended not talking about “who” for now, discussing the “what” instead.
Jake Faleschini (President) said that he had been assured by the administration that if they were going to see tuition rate increase caps, they would put that into the language of the bill.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) stated GPSS would get back to the “who” question if needed. For the moment, he would rather try not to.

Noah Benson (GBLTC) asked if there were legislators who cared about the academic budget.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) responded that there were definitely legislators who cared much about the issues, and they would definitely be on people’s minds. In 2003, when the tuition issue came out there was a lot of vote trading.

Mark Zelinka (Atmospheric Sciences) asked if there was a formal definition for “reasonable, predictable and affordable tuition.”

Kelly Merrick (Policy Analyst) said it was an interesting question because she had spent quite a few hours looking for definitions but currently there was no Washington code for that term.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) said that every university had a different definition regarding tuition. He then introduced the tuition chart.

Sarah Reyneveld (Law, non-Senator) asked what the bill would look like.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) responded, first, GPSS was not 100% sure about the bill because he had not seen it yet. Probably not all indications were going to be in the bill. He asked rhetorically why GPSS was doing this resolution today. Passing the resolution would give more authority behind this policy position to be able to go set up meetings with legislators. Dave said it was an important piece of the puzzle for GPSS to explain in the next two months. Hopefully, sponsors would be found by January12.

Sarah Reyneveld (Law, non-Senator) asked where the high figures came from, what sources.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) said they came out during the September headquarter meeting. They liked the idea of policy language about tuition. Those were very carefully worded. They liked policy positions on it which basically went into the memo.

Jake Faleschini (President) commented, internally, he had spoken with faculty and people on board that if GPSS did not get the cap, GPSS would come out and discuss about completely opposing local control in order to make sure reasonable, affordable tuition was secured. He had been assured that if GPSS agreed on a correct number, they would actually put that in the bill for the students.
Sarah Reyneveld (Law, non-Senator) asked what that number was.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) answered that right now the resolution said 7%.

Jake Faleschini (President) said that it was something GPSS going to talk about, the number as a body/group.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) read the Resolution.

Yutaka Jono (Secretary) asked if there were changes made since the Monday version.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) answered that the only change he had made was a few sponsors added on the top of the Resolution. Dave then entertained a motion to pass the pre-prepared amendments (as presented) to Resolution 2.08-09.

Anna Batie (Jackson School) so moved. Noah Benson (GBLTC) seconded.

Majority support.
1 objection
Motion carried

Phuong Nguyen (ASUW) proposed “graduate and professional students” replacing the language of “non-graduate students.”

Jason Padvorac (ASUW) brought the focus back to the local control question. He suggested that it would possibly put ASUW in a precarious situation.

Sarah Reyneveld (Law, non-Senator) reframed the debate. It seemed that the school had been getting far, unfairly raising the tuition for graduate students. Students had no way to predict how much it would go up.

Trond Nilsen (Industrial Engineering) said that people were supporting the same issue of controlling tuition, but not having the same opinion on the “who” question yet.

Richard Lum (ASUW Office of Government Relations, non-Senator) said that just because the language was neutral on the issue did not mean it was of no consequence. It showed there was a policy reversal/change.

Noah Benson (GBLTC) stated that graduate students and undergraduate students were on the same boat.

Richard Nobles (Psychology) suggested getting through the resolution, and then moving forward debating the specific issues as they came up. However, at the same time, given that this was the graduate student body, a legislative stand point was needed in going down to Olympia. He urged this body to vote on this resolution now.
Jason Padvorac (ASUW) responded that first, ASUW supported better tuition policy, ASUW was not arguing against that. Second, ASUW actually included graduate students.

Kris Anderson (Art History) moved to close the debate.
Anna Batie (Jackson School) seconded.
Sean Hughes (Scandinavian Studies) objected.

A vote was taken.
A question of division was called.
23 ayes
20 nays
7 Abstentions
The debate was not closed.

Jake Faleschini (President) added that GPSS would work on the resolution to make sure that GPSS had policy that was agreeable to everyone.

Richard Lum (ASUW Office of Government Relations, non-Senator) said it was not always the case that ASUW was neutral. ASUW either had to be against local control or it had no position on it.

Yutaka Jono (Secretary) made a point of order, to only discuss pertinent issues.

Scott Mackenzie (Neurobiology and Behavior) argued that GPSS represented graduate students’ interests. He did not think it was right for GPSS to deal with an issue based on someone else’s decision about local control being better or worse than any other control means. The opportunity should be left available for each student government body to decide.

Jason Padvorac (ASUW) spoke on behalf of the ASUW Student Senate. He reaffirmed the ASUW Student Senate position against local control and respected the fact that the function of GPSS was to address the interest of graduate students.

Yutaka Jono (Secretary) asked a question of privilege, and stated that the floor should be given to the people who have not spoken yet.

Mitchell Kaufman (Philosophy) wondered if GPSS could compromise and focus on asking the “what” question, instead of the “who” question.

Anna Batie (Jackson School) motioned to take a vote on closing the debate.
Noah Benson (GBLTC) seconded.
All were in favor.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) moved to the main motion on the floor [to approve Resolution 2.08-09].
Richard Nobles (Psychology) seconded.
Majority support
1 objection
2 abstentions
Motion passed; the resolution was adopted.

9. Resolution 1.08-09
Yutaka Jono (Secretary) presented the amended Resolution 1.08-09 and urged everyone to vote in favor of this revised version.

Discussion on the amendment ensued.

Mathew Vechinski (English) wondered how the students were going to be represented for their programs or departments, by one or two Senators.

Yutaka Jono (Secretary) replied that the reason why it said “A” seat and interim for the moment was because there was only one student that was interested in serving, as far as he knew. However, he was open to making it equitable.

Mathew Vechinski (English) said he was not sure why Senators had to approve this for the interim seat.

Yutaka Jono (Secretary) said that it was because there was no official process for non-degree granting units and currently the bylaws only specify how to approve seats for degree granting units.

Scott Mackenize (Neurobiology and Behavior) asked whether this person would be representing people who had previously been in the program.

Yutaka Jono (Secretary) said that his understanding was no because the seat would be representing the people in the interdisciplinary program as of currently. As they moved on, they would have a home department which there would already be Senators.

Jake Faleschini (President) added that the graduate school had reached out to GPSS to ask the Senate to be as inclusive as possible with these interdisciplinary programs.

Jonathan Kocarnik (Public Health Genetics) asked whether this interim seat was going to be the only interdisciplinary program in Senate.

Yutaka Jono (Secretary) replied that GPSS had created the seat for one other interdisciplinary program at the end of last academic year. He believed it was molecular cellular biology. So, this would not be the first time. However, he believed that molecular cellular biology was a degree granting program whereas this one specifically was not.

Jonathan Kocarnik (Public Health Genetics) asked if there were specific curricula taken in the program for the interim seat.
Yutaka Jono (Secretary) was told by the GPA that the student who originally applied to become the Biochemistry Senator was not in the department yet, until he finished the program. This was why Yutaka had the final clause amended in the new version, to have a research done about how it would be in terms of double representation.

Rich Nobles (Psychology) moved to close the debate.
Noah Benson (GBLTC) seconded
The debate was closed.

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) moved to vote on the resolution as amended.
Anna Batie (Jackson School) seconded.
All were in favor.
Motion passed unanimously.

10. Resolution 3.08-09
Dave Iseminger (Vice President) entertained a motion to adopt Resolution 3.08-09.
Lindsay Morse (Classics) so moved.
Shawn Mincer (Social Work) seconded
All were in favor.
Motion passed.

11. Resolution 4.08-09
Jake Faleschini (President) entertained a motion to approve the memorial resolution.
Shawn Mincer (Social Work) so moved.
Anna Batie (Jackson School) seconded.
All were in favor.
Motion passed.

Jake Faleschini (President) lead the moment of silence per the resolution.
A moment of silence was observed.

12. Announcements

Dave Iseminger (Vice President) announced that there were some fliers on the back table highlighting panel discussions on November 13th, 14th, and 24th at the HUB. Everyone was encouraged to come. There would be open forums, with questions and answers.

Jake Faleschini (President) announced that the Summit would be coming up on November 20th. So far there were three panels that were going to be held during the day. It would be called the Second Annual Washington Higher Education Summit. There would be high level politicians and legislators in the room to discuss social, institutional and physical/mental health issues in the state of Washington. GPSS would love to have Senators attend panels on issues that are relevant to their areas of study. Also, GPSS would try to focus on the big picture to get legislators in and on the process of working with the university to deal with the current issues facing Washington. Jake also attended...
National Association of Graduate Professional Students the previous week in Minneapolis. He spoke on the importance of this organization and hoped to work with strong leaders in creating the agenda for the Western regional meeting.

**Yutaka Jono** (Secretary) encouraged Senators to donate extra books for Mortar Board book drive, and the details were in the weekly email. **Yutaka** also announced that 2008 FIUTS cultural fest performance would be on Friday, November 7th. He reminded the Senators that it would be a GPSS sponsored event, and to please send invitations to other students.

**Jake Faleschini** (President) said that over the following two weeks, GPSS would be sending a couple of Senators to Texas.

13. Adjourn
**Yutaka Jono** (Secretary) moved to adjourn.
**John Liston** (Communication) seconded.
Meeting adjourned at 6:27 pm.