Feasibility Report contains key elements/sections listed by Anderson | +
Applies clear, well-defined criteria to evaluating each alternative in the evaluation section | +
Substantiates claims for or against alternatives by reasoning and citing relevant evidence | ✓ +
Avoids false assumptions or overgeneralizations | ✓
Methods defined and referenced in entire document (shown how they yielded results) | ✓
Contains well-placed, easily comprehended and relevant graphs | ✓
Represents stakeholders ethically; presents information accurately and fairly | ✓
Uses hierarchy in design | ✓
Defines and uses key terms across the document | ✓
Contains both in-text citations and a Works Cited Page; uses either the APA format | ✓ -
Uses clear prose, variety of sentence structure, and correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation | ✓
Acknowledges counterarguments or objects readers will likely have | ✓
Smartly and clearly extend claims from the executive summary in the appendices | ✓
To: Dr. Stavenhagen
From: Accessibility Group
Subject: EWP 407 Feasibility Report- Improvements to Accessibility at SUNY-ESF
Date: May 2nd, 2017

Dear Dr. Stavenhagen,

We are pleased to present to you a feasibility report on accessibility options that can be implemented on the SUNY-ESF main campus. We have enjoyed the educational opportunity to research this issue that we all care about, as well as the opportunity to contribute to greater inclusivity on campus. It is our hope that the results of this report be considered by the administration, as we constructed it with this audience in mind. However, if there are any additional changes that you feel will make it stronger before it gets passed on to the provost, K. Shanahan will make any revisions after the Spring, 2017 semester has ended.

Sincerely,
Accessibility Group:
Kaitlyn Shanahan, Brenna Galligan, Corrine Hurd, Julia Silva & Steven Lukazsek.
Accessibility on SUNY-ESF Main Campus
Feasibility Report

Prepared by: Brenna Galligan, Corrine Hurd, Kaitlyn Shanahan, Julia Silva, and Steven Lukaszek

Prepared for: Dr. Nosa Egiebor, Provost and Executive Vice President

SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry
May 2, 2017
Table of Contents

Introduction ........................................................................................................... 1
Overview of Alternatives ....................................................................................... 2
   Shuttle Service Option A: Ride Request Form Schedule ................................... 2
   Shuttle Service Option B: Continuous Shuttle Schedule ................................... 2
Methods ............................................................................................................... 3
   Secondary Research .......................................................................................... 3
   Primary Research .............................................................................................. 3
Criteria ............................................................................................................... 4
   Accommodation to the Greatest Number .......................................................... 4
   Ease of Implementation ...................................................................................... 4
   Cost .................................................................................................................... 4
Evaluation .......................................................................................................... 4
   Shuttle Service Option A: Ride Request Form Schedule ................................... 4
      Accommodation to the Greatest Number ...................................................... 4
      Ease of Implementation ............................................................................... 5
      Cost ............................................................................................................. 5
   Shuttle Service Option B: Continuous Schedule ............................................. 5
      Accommodation to the Greatest Number ...................................................... 5
      Ease of Implementation ............................................................................... 5
      Cost ............................................................................................................. 6
Conclusion ......................................................................................................... 6
   Recommendations ......................................................................................... 6
   Reasoning ...................................................................................................... 7

Appendices ........................................................................................................ 8
   Appendix A: Survey Results, Questions, and Analysis .................................... 8
   Appendix B: Stakeholder Analysis .................................................................... 10
   Appendix C: Ride Request Form ...................................................................... 11
   Appendix D: Shuttle Route ............................................................................. 12
   Appendix E: Shuttle Service B Schedule ......................................................... 13
   Appendix F: Interview Notes .......................................................................... 14
      Mary Triano: Assistant Dean for Student Affairs .......................................... 14
      Brian Boothroyd and Gary Peden from the Physical Plant ......................... 14
      Dr. Valerie Luzadis- Interim Provost, Vice President .................................. 15
      Mrs. Judy Kopp - Syracuse University Office of Disability Services (ODS) ...... 18
Bibliography ...................................................................................................... 20
Executive Summary

Introduction

Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 requires that “no individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place” (United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division, 1990). To meet this standard, institutions employ different strategies to accommodate people with disabilities. For instance, some implement shuttle services, some install numerous ramps located around their campus, and some alter their building features to efficiently meet ADA requirements. When an institution goes above and beyond ADA compliance, it promotes inclusion and increases diversity on the college campus. The aim of this feasibility analysis is to find potential improvements for the state of physical accessibility on SUNY-ESF main campus, specifically travelling between school buildings.

While SUNY-ESF makes sufficient accommodations for individual students as needs arise, we are looking for opportunities for systemic improvements to accessibility; which will promote equal access to educational opportunities for all students, as well as equal access for faculty, staff, and visitors on SUNY-ESF main campus. We aim to further enable students with disabilities to access educational facilities quicker, easier, and more efficiently than before. This initiative also serves as a platform for continuing to advance innovation, inclusion, and diversity.

According to the mission statement of the college’s Student Diversity and Inclusion Office, the office “exists to support underrepresented students and to foster a campus community where cultural diversity is valued and appreciated. The programs and supports aim to prepare all members of the ESF community to effectively interact with others in an increasingly diverse and global society.” (State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry, 2017) Accessible environments benefit everyone, not just people with disabilities. Therefore, in order to promote inclusive education, we should continue to strive to eliminate any social and physical barriers that may deter our campus from being inclusive of all students.

Student support was approximated by surveying 172 students, and analyzing the results of the survey responses. The survey results show that, overall, accessibility on campus is important to students, regardless of whether or not they personally have disabilities. 55% of students feel that ESF main campus in not sufficiently handicap accessible, and 61% of students responded that accessibility on campus is important to them. 68% of students believe that a financial investment should be made to improve accessibility. Survey results and analysis can be found in Appendix A.

To increase accessibility around campus, we initially examined two alternatives. One was to provide an intra-campus shuttle service using accessible transportation around campus, while the other was to reconstruct the outdoor areas with more ramps and accessible platforms. After initial research, we decided to focus our efforts on analyzing the feasibility of two variations of the shuttle alternative, which we labelled A and B. We talked to several contacts that have helped us analyze how our alternatives could be applied on campus. We interviewed contacts from the Physical Plant, Student Affairs, Office of Disabilities, and the Interim Provost/Vice President. Each contact gave us useful information that we needed to determine the feasibility of these alternatives. A shuttle service has the potential to be a cost effective method to improve accessibility on ESF main campus, and thus increase diversity and inclusion.
Overview of Alternatives

Implementing a shuttle service would help provide access to classes and on-campus activities for students, faculty, staff, and visitors with temporary and permanent disabilities that affect mobility. Two shuttle service alternatives are proposed. Many aspects of the two shuttle services, A and B, are similar. The major difference is how the route schedule is organized. The layout of the shuttle route can be found in Appendix D.

Another alternative was to reconstruct the outdoor areas of the main ESF campus by primarily adding ramps and larger platforms to areas where there are stairs, as well as the possibility of also renovating the back road behind the buildings with sidewalks. Unfortunately, through our research, it was found that we do not have enough knowledge of engineering and landscape architecture to make sufficient determinations about this alternative. However, the information that we could get still has value, and is presented to the fullest extent possible. Because sufficient analysis of campus renovations required more technical expertise than we had access to, we shifted our focus to determining the feasibility of a handicap accessible shuttle service.

Shuttle Service Option A: Ride Request Form Schedule

Under shuttle service A, students that are registered with mobility needs will receive a ride request form at the beginning of each semester (or as needs arise for cases of injuries). An example of this form can be found in Appendix C. The schedule and routes for the van(s) each semester would be arranged based on these responses. The shuttle will run to any ESF building and to SU if there is a need based on class enrollment. Additional rides for on-campus activities, organizations, and clubs can be requested and approved.

Shuttle Service Option B: Continuous Shuttle Schedule

Under shuttle service B, students with and without disabilities would have the opportunity to utilize a daily intra-campus transportation system. Individuals would have to carry a pass to ride. Students with disabilities will be given a pass, and students without can purchase one. This transportation system would run on a continuous schedule. An example of the shuttle schedule can be found in Appendix E. Rides would be provided to and from Centennial Hall, designated parking areas, and all campus buildings. Similar to many other shuttle services, pickup and drop-off times may be affected by seasonal weather conditions. The shuttle service would continue until about 5 p.m., and night rides will only be available to the students with physical disabilities that have requested for rides past 5 p.m.
Methods

Secondary Research

To begin this feasibility study, we did initial research on information regarding accessibility on college campuses. We also started by looking at the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and reviewed several documents and government sites about ADA compliance. Additionally, we read case studies regarding ADA lawsuits with colleges and universities. We were most interested exploring topics such as ADA requirements, reconstruction costs and barriers, and different strategies to improve accessibility on campus. We took a primary focus on how other institutions accommodated people with disabilities within their community. We found that several colleges have implemented shuttle services to accommodate travel within a campus; and that often times these campuses have an Office of Accessibility and Transportation or Transportation/Disability Coordinators to oversee these shuttle programs (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Cornell University, and Harvard University, 2017). This research assisted us in formulating specific questions for our contacts within SUNY-ESF to determine how similar programs could be implemented onto our campus.

Primary Research

We interviewed contacts from different departments of the SUNY-ESF administration, to get information and feedback from all sides. We interviewed Mr. Brian Boothroyd and Mr. Gary Peden from the Physical Plant. They gave us great feedback on our alternatives, and helped us decide to explore the shuttle service options more deeply. They also shared with us what they know about the campus, and helped us come to the conclusion that we do not have the technical background knowledge to sufficiently analyze all the complexities around campus renovations. In addition, they helped us estimate costs to purchase vehicles for the shuttle service alternatives. We also contacted Ms. Christine Langlois from the physical plant, who gave us additional cost estimates via email.

We interviewed Dr. Valerie Luzadis, the interim Provost and Executive Vice President, to figure out the financial implications of our proposed alternatives, as well as how our goals fit into a holistic perspective of the college’s future. Additionally, we interviewed Ms. Mary Triano, the assistant dean of student affairs, who often works directly with individual students with registered disabilities on SUNY-ESF campus. Lastly, we interviewed Ms. Judy Kopp, from the Office of Disability Services. Through this interview, we were able to learn about the current methods that both SU and ESF have to attend to students with disabilities, and we were able to get more information on ADA compliance. All notes from the interviews conducted can be found in Appendix F.

Additionally, in order to find out the student opinion on our feasibility study, we surveyed 172 students with questions regarding accessibility on ESF main campus. This brief survey asked three Likert Scale questions that indicate how important this issue is to the student, and then one final question asking whether the student prefers the shuttle service or campus renovations. We handed out printed surveys to our peers in the computer labs, our classes, Gateway Center, etc. to get a proper random sample. We produced Likert Scale graphs to represent the spread of responses, and calculated the trends of the survey results. The survey questions and results are shown in Appendix A.
Criteria

The following criteria were used in the evaluation of which alternative would be the most suitable for improving accessibility on SUNY-ESF main campus.

Accommodation to the Greatest Number

There are many different types of physical disabilities, some are more visible than others. In other words, some require a wheelchair or the use of a walker while other disabilities, such as arthritis, don’t require the use of any equipment. There are also temporary physical disabilities that may require the use of crutches for a few weeks. In general, different disabilities create different challenges, and therefore often require different solutions. A valuable alternative will accommodate individuals who use wheelchairs, as well as individuals with temporary injuries, severe asthma, joint problems, etc.

Ease of Implementation

Accessibility can be accommodated in various ways. Some ways include reconstruction of outdoor areas to add ramps and platforms, provide shuttle services that go around campus, renovating doorways and elevators, etc. It is important to factor in the ease of implementation for each alternative, to determine which is the most feasible. For instance, the time it takes to implement or integrate the alternative onto the main campus should be considered. Some options can take years to finalize while others may take only months. Additionally, the amount of labor needed to implement the alternative must be considered as well, including whether people must be hired to work on the project.

Cost

As with any institution, we must work within a budget. The costs for the alternatives were estimated through interviews with members of the physical plant including Mr. Brian Boothroyd, Mr. Gary Peden, and contact through email with Ms. Christine Langlois.

Evaluation

Shuttle Service Option A: Ride Request Form Schedule

Accommodation to the Greatest Number

An accessible van service would accommodate any person that has a doctor verified form, and is registered with ESF as a person with temporarily or permanently limited mobility. This alternative would be very versatile to different disabilities, including wheelchairs, crutches, severe asthma, and joint problems.
Ease of Implementation

This option would be fairly easy to implement. If this option were pursued, it could likely be implemented in less than a year. It would most likely require the purchase of a new van or minivan (rather than retrofiting an existing vehicle). Additionally, this option might require more than one van and driver if there is a high demand and scheduling conflicts (i.e. two or three students needing a ride in opposite places at similar times). ESF already owns vehicles, so the insurance and maintenance of these vehicles would simply follow the same processes and procedures that are already in place for existing vehicles.

Cost

Accessible wheelchair vans cost approximately $25,000 (Major Vehicle Exchange, 2017), and would be the immediate cost of option A. A full size accessible van would be budgeted at approximately $40,000, an accessible mini-van $30,000, and retrofitting an existing mini-van at $15,000 (Gary Peden, 2017). Since this option is only provided for students who requested a form, cost may be lower because it would not be running on a schedule that runs in half hour intervals like option B. Instead, it would only be running when needed. If demand is high and the van is making a lot of trips, the cost could surpass that of option B. However, the cost cannot be the burden of the students that require this service, so it would need to be absorbed into the college’s yearly financial responsibilities. Additionally, the hourly rate for a driver would be $13.88, and the cost to use a current ESF fleet vehicle would be $10.00/day and 40 cents per mile (Langlois, 2017). This may be cheaper than option B since the driver would only be getting paid for certain hours, instead of having a full 40/hours per week schedule every weekday.

Shuttle Service Option B: Continuous Schedule

Accommodation to the Greatest Number

A continuous shuttle would accommodate every type of disability, as well as students without disabilities. This alternative is slightly more versatile than Shuttle A, because even if an individual feels uncomfortable disclosing their disability, they are still able to utilize the shuttle service.

Ease of Implementation

This option would be fairly easy to implement. If this option were pursued, it could likely be implemented in about a year. ESF would have to buy or rent a wheelchair accessible shuttle bus that could seat twelve to eighteen passengers. Having a set schedule would mean only one driver is needed at a time. ESF already owns vehicles, so the insurance and maintenance of these vehicles would simply follow the same processes and procedures that are already in place for existing vehicles.

Cost

The initial cost associated with option B would be the cost of purchasing an accessible shuttle bus, this would be approximately cost $35,000 (Major Vehicle Exchange, 2017), but prices vary and the decision is ultimately up to the institution and their budget. Cost of fuel will likely be higher because it is running more often than the van, depending on demand. An additional cost for this option would be to
make an accessible opening in the fence between the Standart parking lot and Centennial Hall, where the shuttle would pick up and drop off students. Lastly, the salary for a full time shuttle driver (40 hours per week) would be $28,865. The hourly rate would be $13.88. The cost of a current ESF fleet vehicle is $10.00/day and 40 cents per mile (Langlois, 2017).

However, the cost of this alternative could be offset in two different ways. There could be a requirement that those who want to use the shuttle have to show a bus pass; students, faculty, and staff with disabilities would receive a pass, and individuals who do not have disabilities would have the opportunity to purchase a pass. If made available to all students at any time, a transportation fee could be implemented into the student bill.

Conclusion

It would be in the best interest of the ESF community to invest in Shuttle Service Option A, which would accommodate students, faculty, and staff with permanent or temporary disabilities based on forms filled out each semester. This shuttle service would be the best alternative, because it is more cost-efficient than Shuttle Service Option B, would be fairly easy to implement, and it is highly versatile to different types of physical disabilities. Additionally, this alternative would be specific to students, faculty, and staff with documented disabilities, so it would ensure that their needs are being met. This shuttle service would allow for flexibility with scheduling, and fluctuate each semester. This shuttle service would avoid the need for reconstruction by making use of the pre-existing infrastructure.

Recommendations

After collecting data through surveys, research, and interviews, we recommend that more information be collected to implement Shuttle Service Option A. More information will be needed to determine means of funding for this service and shuttle driver positions. Different options can be considered for shuttle driver positions. We recommend that, to start, the duties be an added responsibility to an existing staff position or work study position. Further research could be conducted to see if students without disabilities would be interested in utilizing a shuttle service. If a high demand is found, then Shuttle Service B could be implemented.

As previously stated, we initially proposed an alternative to renovate the outdoor areas of ESF main campus, which would primarily consist of adding ramps and larger platforms to areas where there are stairs, as well as looking for improvements to the road that runs behind the buildings Baker and Marshall. While we did not have enough technical expertise to fully analyze this alternative we believe it should still be considered for future research. These types of renovations would be more beneficial to individuals who use wheelchairs than those with other types of mobility issues. Through interviews with members of the Physical Plant, we found that the campus renovations would be very labor intensive. They said that it will involve hiring a design consultant, contracting for construction, and the project needs to be advertised and bid on. The process could take up to a year before the actual construction begins. The construction process would take a long time, and high amount of labor. We were not able to estimate the costs of renovations, but to our surprise, according to members of the physical plant, cost is not the most limiting factor standing in the way of adding ramps. Underground infrastructure creates
many complications, which will likely require outside consultation. Currently, ESF incorporates the necessary improvements needed to increase accessibility through its alterations of school buildings. We believe that this practice should be continued and expanded to put a greater emphasis on accessibility during all construction projects.

It was found through our research that some individuals are uncomfortable disclosing their disabilities (Triano, 2017). In some cases, this discomfort can be minimized by ensuring confidentiality, but we also believe that it is important to promote a welcoming environment at an interpersonal level. We recommend that sensitivity training for faculty be required at the start of each year. Sensitivity training will promote inclusiveness in every classroom, and deter behaviors that may offend individuals with disabilities. This training would help raise awareness for those with disabilities, and create a more accepting environment.

Creating a safe online community for students with disabilities is another way of providing support. Supporting students with disabilities is important, as it provides them with opportunities to feel comfortable in joining social groups, clubs, and class discussion among other things on campus. The amount of support provided will shape their college experience. An online community would allow students with disabilities to connect with others prior to coming to ESF.

Reasoning

According to the members of the physical plant, people have considered a shuttle service before, but haven’t studied and pursued it in great depth. We believe that the shuttle service alternative can support a wide variety of individuals with disabilities, and would be a relatively cost efficient alternative. It focuses primarily on students with physical disabilities that have mobility limitations. Our goal was to accommodate those students so that we can potentially expand the SUNY-ESF community by diversifying and including all types of students.

The topography and history of SUNY-ESF main campus present several challenges to improving accessibility around the outdoor areas, which require creative solutions. SUNY-ESF sufficiently accommodates individual students as needs arise. However, it has been our impression that there is perceived lack of demand for accommodations, for physical disabilities, as well as for sight and hearing impairments. A perceived lack of demand is not a reason to postpone systemic improvements. The more accommodations for individuals with disabilities we have available, the more welcoming our campus will be.
Appendices

Appendix A: Survey Results, Questions, and Analysis

Figure 1. Student consensus on Accessibility on SUNY-ESF Main Campus

![Student Consensus on Accessibility](image)

Figure 2. Student consensus on alternatives for improving accessibility on SUNY-ESF main campus (n=172)

![Student Consensus on Alternatives](image)

Survey Analysis:
The ESF student body consists of approximately 1,650 undergraduate students and 600 graduate students. In order to gather data that represented ESF student perspectives of accessibility on SUNY-ESF main campus, 172 students were surveyed, approximately 7% of the student population. Participants responded to the survey using a 5-point Likert scale (from 1 = “Strongly disagree” to 5 = “Strongly agree”). Paper-based surveys were distributed during regular class times in various locations on main campus including but not limited to: Jahn and Baker Laboratory, Gateway Center, and Marshall Hall. The survey was composed of 4 questions:

1. Do you think ESF is sufficiently handicap accessible?
   - 1  2  3  4  5

2. Do you believe ESF should make a financial investment to improve physical accessibility barriers on campus?
   - 1  2  3  4  5

3. How important is disability access on ESF campus to you?
   - 1  2  3  4  5

4. Circle one:
   Which option do you like better?
   - Ramps, sidewalks and physical changes to campus buildings
   - ESF Disability Shuttle/Bus Services

Figure 1 shows student consensus on accessibility on ESF main campus. When students were asked if ESF campus is sufficiently handicap accessible, 41 students strongly disagreed, 48 students remained neutral, and 8 students strongly agreed. The mean of all the responses to this question was 2.4, the median and mode were both 2 (disagree). When students were asked how important disability access on ESF campus is to them, 50 students strongly agreed, 43 students remained neutral, and 11 students strongly disagreed. The mean of all the responses to this question was 4.9, the median was 4, and mode was 5. This means that the majority of students surveyed strongly agree that accessibility on SUNY-ESF campus is important to them. When students were asked if ESF should make a financial investment to improve physical accessibility barriers on campus, 77 students strongly agreed, 29 students remained neutral, and 8 students strongly disagreed. The mean of all the responses to this question was 3.7, the median and mode were both 4 (agree).

Figure 2 shows student consensus on alternatives for improving accessibility on ESF main campus. Students were provided two options: (1) reconstruction and (2) disability shuttle service. When given the two options, 122 students chose reconstruction, 37 students chose disability shuttle service, and 8 students either wrote in “both,” remained neutral, or wrote in their own option.
# Appendix B: Stakeholder Analysis

This chart identifies the individuals and groups that are likely to affect or be affected by the outcome of our project. This information can be used to assess how the interests of these stakeholders should be addressed moving forward. This isn’t to say that these are the only stakeholders that are likely to affect or be affected by the outcome of the project, but can serve as a starting point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>IMPACT How much does the project impact them? (Low, medium, high)</th>
<th>INFLUENCE How much influence do they have over the project? (Low, medium, high)</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE What is important to the stakeholder?</th>
<th>PERCEIVED RISKS AND BENEFITS</th>
<th>STRATEGY FOR ENGAGING STAKEHOLDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students, faculty, and staff with disabilities</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Students: Enjoy benefits of college experience without difficulty Faculty and staff: Enjoy benefits of teaching and working at a college without the difficulties</td>
<td>Risks: Lack of... Access, inclusion, flexibility with time, rights, and weather conditions Benefits: Newfound support system and positive experience</td>
<td>Monthly accessibility forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Maintaining a physical environment in which teaching, research, and service to the community can be achieved effectively and efficiently</td>
<td>Risks: Underground infrastructure would hinder reconstruction Benefits: Shuttle service would surpass underground infrastructure</td>
<td>Email, text, or call to collect information about infrastructure barriers and purchasing and/or retrofitting an old van</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Student Affairs &amp; Office of Disability Services</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Support the enrollment, academic success and wellbeing of every student</td>
<td>Risks: Financial investment, minimal amount of staff to provide services Benefits: Increased accessibility would strengthen their ability to support all students</td>
<td>Email, text, or call to talk about services offered between SU and ESF, and talking about extending the ESF services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Recruit, admit, and serve an eligible, diverse student population</td>
<td>Risks: Financial investment, infrastructure barriers, lack of demand and drivers Benefits: Increased accessibility would allow for more diversity on ESF main campus</td>
<td>Email, text, or call to talk about improving accessibility and recruiting students, faculty, and staff with disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Ride Request Form

(Modelled after example from University of Illinois Disability Resources and Educational Services, 2011)

SUNY COLLEGE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE AND FORESTRY
RIDE REQUEST FORM

STUDENT NAME: ___________________ EMAIL: ___________________

(please fill out all information)

CAMPUS ADDRESS: __________________

(please fill out all information)

CELL PHONE: ___________________ SEMESTER: ___________________

(please fill out all information)

Hours of operation for spring/fall semester when classes are in session are 7:30 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

STANDING RIDES REQUESTED TO CLASS AND FROM CLASS:

Day of Week: __________ TIME: __________

Pick up from: ___________ Drop off To: ___________

Day of Week: __________ TIME: __________

Pick up from: ___________ Drop off To: ___________

Day of Week: __________ TIME: __________

Pick up from: ___________ Drop off To: ___________

Day of Week: __________ TIME: __________

Pick up from: ___________ Drop off To: ___________

This form is to be used ONLY by students, faculty, staff, and guests with documented disabilities who are members of the SUNY-ESF community. All participants must make an appointment with the Student Affairs Office within 24 hours of filling out this form to insure proper arrangements are made, such as pick-up points and times etc. The Student Affairs number is (315) 470-6660 and is located at 1 Forestry Drive Syracuse, NY 13210 110 Bray Hall. Please call if you need to cancel any transportation services at any time.
Appendix D: Shuttle Route
## Appendix E: Shuttle Service B Schedule

**ESF Shuttle Service Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESF Shuttle Service Schedule</th>
<th>Centres</th>
<th>Baker</th>
<th>Jay/Marshall</th>
<th>Bay/Watson</th>
<th>Hick/Moon</th>
<th>Gateway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 a.m.</td>
<td>7:35</td>
<td>7:40</td>
<td>7:45</td>
<td>7:50</td>
<td>7:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>8:05</td>
<td>8:10</td>
<td>8:15</td>
<td>8:20</td>
<td>8:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>9:05</td>
<td>9:10</td>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>9:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>9:35</td>
<td>9:40</td>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>9:50</td>
<td>9:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>10:05</td>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>10:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>10:35</td>
<td>10:40</td>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>10:50</td>
<td>10:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>11:05</td>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>11:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 a.m.</td>
<td>11:35</td>
<td>11:40</td>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>11:50</td>
<td>11:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>12:05</td>
<td>12:10</td>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>12:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:35</td>
<td>12:40</td>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>12:50</td>
<td>12:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>1:05</td>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>1:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>1:35</td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>1:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>2:05</td>
<td>2:10</td>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>2:20</td>
<td>2:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>2:35</td>
<td>2:40</td>
<td>2:45</td>
<td>2:50</td>
<td>2:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>3:05</td>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>3:20</td>
<td>3:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>3:35</td>
<td>3:40</td>
<td>3:45</td>
<td>3:50</td>
<td>3:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>4:05</td>
<td>4:10</td>
<td>4:15</td>
<td>4:20</td>
<td>4:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>4:35</td>
<td>4:40</td>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>4:50</td>
<td>4:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**After 5 PM**
Transportation available to those registered with limited mobility

**SHUTTLES MAY BE AFFECTED BY WEATHER AND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS**

*All runs end with a drop-off at Centennial and Standart at the last listed times*

---

Monday-Wednesday-Friday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre/Standart</th>
<th>Baker</th>
<th>Jay/Marshall</th>
<th>Bay/Watson</th>
<th>Hick/Moon</th>
<th>Gateway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30 a.m.</td>
<td>7:35</td>
<td>7:40</td>
<td>7:45</td>
<td>7:50</td>
<td>7:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>9:05</td>
<td>9:10</td>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>9:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>10:35</td>
<td>10:40</td>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>10:50</td>
<td>10:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>12:05</td>
<td>12:10</td>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>12:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>1:35</td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>1:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>3:05</td>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>3:20</td>
<td>3:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>4:35</td>
<td>4:40</td>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>4:50</td>
<td>4:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuesday-Thursday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre/Standart</th>
<th>Baker</th>
<th>Jay/Marshall</th>
<th>Bay/Watson</th>
<th>Hick/Moon</th>
<th>Gateway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30 a.m.</td>
<td>7:35</td>
<td>7:40</td>
<td>7:45</td>
<td>7:50</td>
<td>7:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>9:05</td>
<td>9:10</td>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>9:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:05</td>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>10:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>11:05</td>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>11:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>12:05</td>
<td>12:10</td>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>12:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>1:35</td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>1:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>3:05</td>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>3:20</td>
<td>3:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>4:35</td>
<td>4:40</td>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>4:50</td>
<td>4:55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Centres/Standart**

- Centre
- Standart

---

*Page 13*
Appendix F: Interview Notes

Mary Triano: Assistant Dean for Student Affairs-

Interview conducted by Kaitlyn Shanahan on Feb. 21, 2017

- Her work mainly focuses on individuals rather than the systemic.
  - She has made cases for systemic change, but she said she is glad we are doing this project because the it may have more weight coming from a group of students rather than just coming from her.
- She said the shuttle service has been talked about but never implemented in the way that we are describing.
  - The shuttle service at SU is only for medical transport for permanently disabled students to get to and from doctor's appointments. That program is not offered to SUNY-ESF students.
- Work study positions are generally paid minimum wage. Even though it is through the federal FAFSA program, I think the school is allotted a certain amount of that money for work study positions. And then obviously each student is allotted a certain amount.
  - She said that Rebecca in the financial aid office would be a good person to talk to about the specifics about work study positions, so we should contact her when we are calculating the cost of this option.
- She didn’t know about any specific grants, but she said that grants.gov would be a good place to start, to see if there are any federal monies available. And the Department of Health would be a good place to look for money from New York State. Also maybe look for philanthropic foundations.
- As for parking, there are lots that have an accessible shuttle service that students with physical disabilities are directed to.
- Some students are resistant to disclosing their disabilities, whether it be to ODS, their professors, or both.
- The one thing that all faculty members are trained on is how to respond when a student approaches them with a registered accommodation letter.
  - It is on the student to tell their faculty members about the accommodations that they need.
  - The training is more about protocol than empathy. (I’m strongly paraphrasing here)
- Cost is a big barrier, but physical problems that prevent construction may be just as problematic.
- She talked a lot about how things are just as challenging inside the buildings as they are around the outdoor areas of the campus.
  - I feel like to keep the scope in check, we should just focus on outdoor areas. However, we should revisit this idea after meeting with physical plant.

Mr. Brian Boothroyd and Mr. Gary Peden from the Physical Plant-

Interview conducted by Kaitlyn Shanahan and Julia Silva on Feb. 23, 2017

1.) What do you think the problems are and solutions?
- "We talk about it quite a bit, it’s a big issue"
- "In terms of physical obstacles: roadway from chapel doesn’t even have a sidewalk, but it is tight for space but if we do a sidewalk the rates are not handicap friendly"
- "ideally would like to have accessible entrances off of the quad to each school building
- been relying upon interior vertical access"
- "We want to put some sort of a ramping system on stairs leading up to quad from near gateway"
- **Brian: I wouldn’t say Financial is a big stumbling block, it’s more of the work and how it can affect other systems: piping, steam, telecommunications

*Other information pertaining to the question:
-for every one inch vertical, we need 12 inches horizontal for a handicap ramp
-need a 5 foot landing

2.) **What does “altered” really mean, how much do you need to change the current infrastructure of ESF?**
   - “any new work you do within that footprint should meet the requirements of ADA”
   - “any type of renovation, even in bathroom, must comply to ADA”

   **Brian:** historically, ESF does not exactly attract students with physical disabilities because of the course work. I.e. forestry programs are not exactly prone for handicap students.

3.) **Is there any other information you have that can help us?**
   - “We asked our program manager with the construction fund to work a program study for a consultant to come in so he can evaluate the campus and find suggestions to improving accessibility” (The plan kind of fell through)
   - “This is going to be a big project, the discussion has been swirling around.”

4.) **Thoughts on ESF vans?**
   - “We could try to retrofit a van with a ramp, or just purchase it”
   - “There is no accessible van currently”

5.) **What would you want us to focus on, what research could we do to help physical plant looking forward?**
   - “crunching numbers to see what it takes to do a shuttle service”
   - “we used to do a shuttle, it was more geared towards faculty providing shuttle from here to bray so people don’t have to walk”

6.) **How long would it take? [pertaining to reconstruction]**
   - “gonna involve hiring a design consultant”
   - “We would need to start contracting for construction”
   - “The project needs to be advertised and bid”
   - “The process from concept start to getting it out the door for construction takes about 1 year before the actual construction begins”
   - “not to mention getting the money to start”

   *Other notes during the interview:

Gary: “one thing we didn’t mention is that some buildings like Bray and Marshall fall under SHIP0, which pertains to historic preservation”

“Ideally you want to bring handicap individuals as well as ambulatory individuals Part of the law, no discrimination”

8.) **Do you know any grants we could look into?**
   - “We do not know of any grants”

9.) **Is ESF actually considered ADA compliant? If someone wanted to pose a lawsuit against ESF, would that be possible or are we exempt?**
   - “I would bet that if someone wanted to press a lawsuit, they could and they could probably be successful. Im sure that anyone could come up with compliance issues that we could address.”
   - “There is almost an industry that preys upon large facilities that would sue people for ADA compliance for the most minor issues, like if a rail is not near enough stairs. Going after universities, hospitals, stadiums. Whether it is really pushing the agenda for accessibility or if it is a money grab, I am not sure.”

Dr. Valerie Luzadis- Interim Provost, Vice President-

*Interview conducted by Kaitlyn Shanahan and Brenna Galligan on Feb. 24, 2017*
   - When students with disabilities show interest in coming to ESF, accommodations are made to suit their particular needs
• This connection is made through the admissions office with Mary Triano
• Small percentage of students with disabilities on campus, so there isn’t necessarily a “need” for large scale accommodations
• USA has been interested in accessibility issues
  o Where initial campus visits serve as a deterrent, where a lack of accessibility pushes students with disabilities away
• Shuttle services had once existed
  o Served as a solution to parking issues (when people couldn’t park on main campus)
  o Set up on a time-basis, ran during certain hours, every 15 minutes
  o Only for faculty during school hours (8am-4pm)
  o Valerie stated, “Standart parking lot is close campus parking”

• Prior research (any study done):
  o Research ensues as projects happen
  o Physical plant oversees the master plan
  o Anytime there is an analysis done for any building, accessibility is taken into account
  o Seriously constrained by how money can be spent
  o Capital expenditures → used for physical buildings/grounds,
    ■ Separate allocations from the state cannot be spent for operating expenditures, only for physical buildings/grounds
    ■ Very limited by the state, Governor’s budget of 3.5 billion capital for SUNY (64 Institutions) is being proposed and would be dispersed over a five year period
    ■ If this budget passes, there will be more money for capital expenditures
    ■ capital is only one element of it, SUNY-ESF is landlocked and connected to Syracuse University through contract
  o Operating expenditures → an ongoing cost for running a product, business, or system
  o Critical maintenance → maintenance costs

• Academic research building:
  o Tucked into hillside alongside Bray (side closest to the Dome)
  o From an administration standpoint, we know access is an issue and concern
  o Every time there is a physical change, access is part of the plan,
  o Valerie stated, “we want to be more than ADA compliant”
  o Changing the quad so it has gradation, pathways, and access is harder than you think → underground structure that has to be moved
  o Grade of campus affects people and their ability to access buildings because of the landscape

• Quad plan
  o Serve as a leverage point for further improvements, opportunity for more access points

• Road behind baker
  o Needs to be improved with respect to disability AND safety

• Grants for physical changes (grants.gov → federal)
  o Little to no knowledge of grants that are available
• Key point: Because ADA is mostly regulatory, there may not be as many grants
• ADA is mostly regulations and court action, if you are not compliant → you go to court
• It is a matter of the law, rather than choice

• Work study cost:
  • Hourly, determined based upon financial aid
  • Not everyone is eligible, paid 9.75 (through financial aid office)
  • Work study as support for students rather than work from students

• Shuttle service alternative(s):
  • We shouldn’t limit ourselves to what kind of position the shuttle service would fulfill (work study or student assistant)
  • We shouldn’t limit the service to just students with permanent disabilities, but also faculty, staff, and students with temporary disabilities
    ■ Could help support entire community rather than just a small section of the community
  • We should keep in mind that accessibility encompasses more than just permanent disabilities

• Shuttle service (work study):
  • Added responsibility to current work study position in the police section
  • Student would be on-call as a driver
  • Way to increase the efficiency of the service and work study position
    ■ Possible scenario: Someone was available on demand, but when they aren’t on demand they are fulfilling other responsibilities of their position (put in a footnote?)
    ■ By virtue of utilizing time, the cost of the overall endeavor lowers
  • Pending Questions:
    ■ What vehicle would be used?
    ■ Perhaps we could do a cost analysis of retrofitting an old van vs. buying a new one
    ■ Cost of vehicle → gas mileage, upkeep, labor (time)
  • How much it costs during the total hours of usage (X number of minutes)
    ■ Spatial and temporal
    ■ Look at the time of the first class and time of the last class for each school day to determine its hours of usage (ex. 7:45 am - 9:50 pm)
    ■ Calculate it by a weekly basis

• Intracampus transportation
  • Different way of funding it, through student fees
  • It is not our job to determine where the money would come from, but provide our client with the costs (both social and monetary)

• ADA and ODS post technical standards
  • Basic requirements students/faculty should know going in
  • Upfront communication

• NYS supports disability services, in working with SU, ESF has a contract that provides what is needed in the given year, if additional expense is needed, part of the operating funds are used to acquire what needs to be acquired
You never know who will need accommodations at big public events, so you can guarantee that they will be provided
  * Timing matters for cost expenses* (if an interpreters is hired a few days before an event, the cost will be very high)

- Resources to look into:
  - Campus plan for diversity: Accessibility section
  - Plan can be found online, Campus (IDE) Inclusion, diversity, equity
  - US Green Building Council, accessibility section
  - Janice Omara, human resources
    - May know information about Work Study
  - Chief Leroy, University Police
    - # of handicapped permits that they give (How frequently in a year do you have students asking for temporary handicapped permits?)
  - Christine Langlois, Asst Director, Physical Plant for Maintenance Operations
    - May know information about old shuttle service
    - calanglo@esf.edu

Mrs. Judy Kopp - Syracuse University Office of Disability Services (ODS)

Interview conducted by Steven Lukaszek on Feb. 28, 2017
1. Is there a shuttle service for students with physical disabilities?
   - Transportation method for use for people with permanent disabilities (also a service under a different name for people with temp. disabilities)
   - Right now ODS is using a golf-cart like transportation service

2. Now, can both types of transportation be used by ESF students, too?
   - ESF health services has changed recently, but some services (ie writing accommodations) is still controlled by SU ODS
   - SU ODS was recently charged with the fact that they don’t provide enough medical transportation around campus
   - About the ODS golf-cart transportation
     - ODS has new access to 2 golf carts, one available to travel on the public road and one that must stay on campus ground
     - These both services don’t restrict ESF students

3. Is ESF currently ADA compliant?
   - No direct comment on this question (mainly unknown by ODS) but in general, it is unknown by SU ODS if ESF is or isn’t compliant with the ADA laws
   - It was suggested that there are always some type of ADA breach somewhere
   - As with physical ADA laws, buildings that were renovated in any way, the new structure must be ADA compliant, and buildings before (some certain time, ie 1920’s) that weren’t changed don’t necessarily need to be changed.

4. Are all of these new regulations applicable to everyone complying with ADAA?
   - There are three different titles, three different types of regulations; a public university, a private university, and public grounds
   - ESF has to comply with the state school laws that are labeled under title 1 and SU under title 2

5. Do you know if there are any current plans to improve accessibility on ESF campus?
   - SU ODS is not very sure with all plans to do with ESF, but they are definitely certain about SU
• It was recommended to talk to the ESF disabilities co-ordinator, Mary Triano, to get more information regarding this topic.
• We now just have a bunch of information regarding to SU but it seems to be extremely similar to the conditions and laws of ESF.

6. **Specifically on ESF campus, do you know if there have been any complaints?**

• Again, because SU ODS is not associated with ESF anymore, most of this question is not applicable

7. **Why might this all “take a little while”?**

• Why might changes due to the ADA laws might take a while to be enacted?
• ODS says that because there is already a solution in place for people to try, and finding the perfect fix to individual problems, might take a little while.
• Again, for further information on the timing of these ADA laws, contact Mary Triano at ESF

8. **Who would you recommend we talk to about ADA laws and all of this, specifically on ESF campus?**

• Mary Triano at ESF and the ADA officer at ESF, every campus has someone in charge of ADA compliance.
• Find out who ESF’s health services provider is and talk to them to talk more about transportation services.
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