

Minutes*

Senate Committee on Finance and Planning
Tuesday, July 23, 1996
3:15 - 5:00
Dale Shephard Room, Campus Club

Present: Fred Morrison (chair), Thora Cartlidge, Patricia Ferrieri, Kathy James, Benjamin Senauer, Charles Speaks, J. Peter Zetterberg

Regrets: Craig Swan, James VanAlstine

Absent: Richard Pfutzenreuter, Peter Robinson

Guests: Associate Vice President Clinton Hewitt; Senior Vice President Marvin Marshak

[In these minutes: The biennial request, building demolition; compliance with the salary guideline; Twin Cities campus master plan]

Professor Morrison convened the meeting at 3:15 and noted that the two agenda items were the biennial request and the extent to which the 3% salary guideline had been met. The Committee should be receiving information about the extent to which it had been met.

1. Biennial Request and Building Demolition

The request is beginning to move forward, Professor Morrison reported, and noted that there had been a meeting with deans, FCC members, and St. Paul campus administrators and with the biennial request committee. There are serious concerns about the request, he said; it requests a 25% increase from the legislature, and it is fairly heavily weighted for "stuff" and not for people and programs.

Part of the magnitude of the request is the inflationary increase of 2.5% (slightly more for fringe benefits), part of the request is a very large request for technology, and part of it is a request for compensation adjustments. But only \$7.5 million, for four years, is requested for academic programs. At the last meeting, he recalled, Provost Shively presented one item for \$8.5 million; were it funded in its entirety, it would consume all of the new money for academic programs for the next four years. That clearly must be rethought, he said.

One Committee member pointed out that a large share of the request is to be a shared responsibility between the legislature and the University. The request seeks \$122 million from the legislature, with the same amount to be provided by the University. Of the University's share, \$79 million is some combination of retrenchment and new revenue. If this combination of retrenchment and new revenue were accomplished in one year, that would be the end of it; alternatively, both could be spread out over the four-year period covered by the proposal.

*These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

What percent of the current appropriation is the \$79 million, asked one Committee member? About 25% of the appropriation, or about 12-13% of the O&M budget. It would be a 13% retrenchment or 13% increase in revenue or some combination, and "that's scary," said another Committee member.

What are really driving the request up, it was said, are technology and building costs.

One of the things that has been asked is how there is to be consultation on decommissioning buildings. His answer, Professor Morrison said, is that it the function of this Committee to do the appropriate consultation and then report to FCC or SCC. The principle discussion would be at this Committee, and it can expect to have consultation on rather large buildings on the Minneapolis campus in the fall.

One Committee member said that there is a list, not created recently, of obvious buildings that could be considered. When the new Carlson School is finished, Jones and Nicholson should be vacated. The plan for capturing space is to get out of those buildings; those responsible for building codes have already forced vacating the third floor of Nicholson.

Using the space vacated by the Carlson School, the University could also get out of Scott Hall, it was also reported. Scott is not an easy building to use; it is the old School of Music building, filled with tiny practice rooms that do not make good offices. The University did invest \$1 million in Scott Hall recently for an elevator.

Norris Gymnasium can also be vacated, as soon as the West Bank project for the Dance program is completed. The University would need to relocate some Kinesiology space from Norris, but it could also come down.

The Holman building, where the University laundry was housed, can also come down; it is currently vacant. The University Press building could come down.

The big decommissioning project would be the Jackson-Owre-Millard-Lyons (JOML) complex, currently occupied by the Medical School. There are many misconceptions about space for the Medical School, because everyone sees the new Basic Sciences building going up on Washington. There is a new hospital, but the basic research facilities for the Medical School were all built in the 1920s, and are among the poorest science buildings on campus. The new Basic Sciences building is a major facility, one of the largest the University has built, but it will not enable the Medical School to completely vacate the JOML complex. It will, however, allow one or two or three of them to be vacated. Most of the money that would be saved is from those four buildings, because they cost about \$10 per square foot to operate (compared to \$3 or \$4 for Jones or Nicholson).

Including JOML, the list of buildings to be decommissioned totals approximately 650,000 gross square feet that have operating costs of about \$2.5 million per year. Demolishing those buildings would also reduce the deferred maintenance bill by a significant amount. A rough figure might be \$5 million; one Committee member speculated that the number might be higher; the buildings are terrible.

What is known about how the University compares with other universities in terms of building age, relationship between square footage and size, mission, and so on, asked one Committee member? The

University annually receives a report from the University of Missouri, based on reports institutions file; it can be said, on the basis of the information in the study, that Minnesota has the largest physical plant of the 40 or so major research universities for which the study is done, Dr. Zetterberg reported. That is not surprising, given that Minnesota has experiment stations, health sciences colleges--it is as diverse as any institution in the country. It is larger than any place he knows of.

If all of the buildings mentioned were closed, and the non-recurring costs of demolition and relocation are set aside, and the deferred maintenance eliminated, what is the annual recurring cost that would be saved, asked one Committee member? Between \$2.5 and \$3 million, it was said--about what it will cost to operate the Basic Sciences building, Dr. Zetterberg reported.

Dr. Zetterberg recalled that he had recently pointed out the University has taken down about 400,000 gross square feet of buildings, but it has not emphasized the fact. Botany and Zoology were demolished; Experimental Engineering went down before the Computer Science building was built. North Hall was taken down in the last couple of years, and three temporary buildings were demolished.

Has the University not also added about one million square feet, asked one Committee member? That depends on what one counts, Dr. Zetterberg said, and how far back one goes. In the past ten years, the new hospital is huge, and so is the new recreational sports center. The main academic buildings added have been Computer Science, Biological Sciences on the St. Paul campus, Basic Sciences next to Coffman, and the Carlson School. Civil Engineering was built in 1983. The new Minnesota Library Access Center (Archives) building, to be built, is also very large, in terms of gross square footage. One could also include the Weisman, although it is very small.

One factor that has not been considered in the discussions is the architectural value of older buildings, especially those built before 1945. Not every building should be preserved simply because of its age, but in some cases there is merit in attempting to reuse older buildings, even with the costs of asbestos removal, complying with the ADA, and meeting code requirements. There is a preservation plan being developed for the system, along with the campus master planning process (and from which it sprang), to evaluate buildings for historic and architectural value as well as "associational value" (i.e., a lot of people associate with it or that shows up on brochures and is part of recruitment and retention). Music Education might be such an instance. But there is this other element of the discussion that needs to be introduced, before buildings are hurriedly taken down in the interest of immediate cost savings.

One Committee member expressed support for historic preservation--if the University has the financial balance to do it. And a purpose for the building. If historic preservation comes at the cost of eliminating three degree programs, then there is a different consideration. Unfortunately, one must look at this in that context; one must ask if something is economically viable on a break-even basis; if the answer is "no," then the blasting caps come out.

Another Committee member agreed, but said there should be a distinction between decommissioning and destruction. When possible, and all factors justify it, both should be done. In those instances where decommissioning is justified for historical reasons, strong consideration should be given NOT to redesigning and refurbishing for a different use, because as the code and other costs are encountered, there is again harm to academic programs.

It will be a major battle to take some of these buildings down, for precisely that reason, Dr.

Zetterberg observed. There is no building on campus that does not have significance to someone, whether architectural or because they had most of their classes in it. Veterinary Anatomy will come down; it is occupied by the "roadkill clinic" (an unsponsored student group that has been using the building for years takes injured animals and treats them). The politics of addressing the situation will be tricky, and NO ONE argues that the building has any architectural significance. All of these buildings will provoke a battle, and people must keep in mind the trade-offs. Jones Hall, which is architecturally interesting, is a firetrap and has a foundation so badly eroded that engineers say it cannot be saved. The master plan probably proposes keeping all these buildings.

It does not, said another Committee member; it suggests, for example, that Norris Gymnasium be removed to open up access to the river. It is not architecturally significant and its reuse potential is low. The point should be brought up, however, not just because they are significant but as pieces of the old campus. Jones Hall is on the National Register of the old campus district.

If one takes Jones, Nicholson, and Scott out, said one Committee member, there is a big hole there. True, but it is not losing money.

Another Committee member suggested using the old buildings as a way to raise money the University could not otherwise obtain: challenge the people to whom a building is meaningful to come up with money needed to renovate it for a new purpose while preserving the exterior. Donors like to have something visible, like a building; perhaps the buildings could have hyphenated names.

One of the things the Committee must prepare for, before February 1, is a series of meetings to look at proposed actions, Professor Morrison said, and give its advice on them. Some actions might be closures; some might be temporary closures. Once the steam is turned off, said one Committee member, the building may as well be demolished; Facilities Management is looking into the minimum treatment that would be necessary to mothball a building prior to final determination of its future.

What should come to the Committee is a coordinated report or proposal, said one Committee member. There are several offices and committees concerned; all of them need to identify, building by building, the historical issues, the net savings, the consequences of closure, and so on. Facilities Management is doing this, it was said.

There will have to be a plan of action in place before the legislature meets, Professor Morrison said, which means this Committee will have to act in November and December, at the latest.

2. Compliance with Salary Guideline

Professor Morrison then told the Committee he had asked the administration for information about the extent to which collegiate units had complied with the 3% salary guideline. He distributed information about salaries, and noted some of the numbers.

Compensation plans in Professional Studies were as follows:

Law	2.48% recurring
Carlson	2% non-recurring, small # of 2% recurring
Nat Res	" "

MES	\$750 bonus per person, with only a few exceptions
Architect	2% pool for faculty/staff development
Human Ecol	2% non-recurring, small # of 1% recurring
Agric	2% non-recurring, small # of 2-3% recurring
HHH	2% non-recurring
Educ	2% non-recurring; small # of 2% recurring
Provost Ofc	2% non-recurring

Compensation plans for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering were these:

CLA	2% recurring, .6% retentions/promot/equity, 1% non-recurring
IT	2% recurring, .12% " , 1% non-recurring
CBS	2.02% recurring, .095% " , .94% non-recurring
GC	2% recurring, 1% non-recurring
Provost Ofc	2% recurring, 1% non-recurring

The Arts, Sciences, and Engineering totals thus range from 2.65% to 3.6%. One Committee member said the 1% non-recurring money has not been made available to departments in CLA, and it is not known where that money is.

Compensation for the Academic Health Center is as follows:

Dentistry	3%, apparently recurring
Duluth Med	1% recurring; 2% non-recurring bonus
Nursing	3% non-recurring
Pharmacy	2% recurring, 1% non-recurring
Public Hlth	2% recurring, 2% non-recurring
TC Medical	asking for exemption
Vet Med	1.5% recurring, 1.5% non-recurring

Basically, Professor Morrison concluded, the professional schools are at 2% non-recurring, Arts, Sciences, and Engineering at 2% recurring with some funds for promotion and equity, and 1% non-recurring perhaps, and in the AHC the Medical School is not participating. There appears to be about 50% compliance with the President's guideline.

Did the President's guideline mandate an increase, asked one Committee member? It said that except in unusual circumstances, determined by the provost, units should comply. It appears that most of the units are unusual circumstances. The guideline does not reflect the reality of the University. The guideline was 3% recurring increases.

The President said, as late May--in the Faculty Senate meeting--that this is what his position was, recalled one Committee member. In addition, the President told FCC in early June that he knew of only one college that was not meeting the standard.

One Committee member said he was in a unit that received less than the guideline, and that neither he nor any of his colleagues were happy about what had been done. Faculty have reached a degree of unhappiness beyond the normal; one of them actually called the President's Office to find out what was

happening. It is not clear anything the Committee could do would change the situation, but if it were to send a letter to the President indicating its dismay at what has happened, that might be appropriate.

The Committee agreed that such a letter should be sent, indicating shock.

What strikes him as troublesome, Professor Morrison said, is, first, that when settlements with the unions were reached last fall, the budget picture was known. The administration spent money until it didn't have enough to pay faculty salaries. That is poor planning; that is the only way it can be described. Second, the President said in April and May to the Board of Regents that there would be 3% increases, making it public to the world, when the provosts were not delivering. Moreover, the President kept saying it, rather than acknowledging that there was not enough money.

What about the other campuses, asked one Committee member? Professor Morrison said it was his understanding the union contract at Duluth provided for 3%, which will be delivered, and that Crookston and Morris both followed the President's guideline.

Another Committee member said that the matter of how money will be distributed--if merit, if recurring or not--should be a centrally-determined policy after consultation, and not left up to the provostries or subordinate units. There is no programmatic reason for the differences between the units in the salary increases delivered. In addition, it was said, one cannot understand why, when merit money is available for distribution, department chairs, deans, and provosts are expected and required to make differential decisions, while the President is not. In discussions about the \$79 million that needs to be recovered internally as part of the proposed biennial request, it also appears that the President is talking about equal distribution of retrenchment to provostries. That distinction is also not understandable. In addition, in one college, for the first time in many years, the dean did not make a distinction between departments, and the decisions were left up to department chairs.

One Committee member said that one gets the impression that selective application means that "everybody below my level will be required to differentiate, but that at my level things will be done uniformly."

One Committee member said it would be important that this information be made public to the faculty. Part of the problem in the current environment is that one part of the University does not know what is happening to another part; people may hear stories or rumors. At a minimum, the Committee should ask the President to release this information in a systematic way to deans and department heads, if not all faculty.

The way in which this was handled, however, is consistent with the way the provosts see the future, where they have a great deal of discretion over all matters pertaining to their units, including salaries. And where it may be the case that is what is happening in one area is radically different from what is happening in another. Responsibility Center Management will encourage them in that, depending on how it is done. This has been consistent with the direction in which events have been moving.

It is consistent with the three universities concept, said one Committee member, not with this as A university. This is suggestive of three separate universities that happen to exist close to one another. It may be one of the strongest arguments against the provostal system.

One Committee member recalled a meeting between a group of chairs and the provost; the provost's explanation of why the President allocated equally between the three provostries is that all three provosts are sitting at the table; if he gives to one, he has to take from another. The point the chairs made was that the same thing is true in meetings of chairs with a dean and deans with the provost. Why does this have to start at a lower level? It would be helpful to get information out to the faculty, in a condensed form.

The one area that came nowhere near meeting the President's guideline, said another Committee member, is the Professional Studies area. It is surprising that many of the AHC colleges have, where one thought there was more budget pressure. In addition to the President, if there is a letter, one should also go to Provost Allen.

Has the Committee ever written an opinion piece for the DAILY, asked one Committee member? It could do so, said another.

This set of discussions about how salary decisions are made raises the point that unionized labor and civil servants across the University are faring better in this round than are faculty, said one Committee member. They always do, said another Committee member. Does that suggest the faculty should unionize, as some have done? "I hope not!" exclaimed another Committee member.

3. Campus Master Plan

Professor Morrison then welcomed Associate Vice President Clint Hewitt and recalled that the Committee had earlier had a presentation on the campus master plan. There remain issues of concern to the Committee: the "building out" of the campus, the bridge, student union space, and "re-urbanization" (re-extending the street grid into the campus). Professor Morrison invited comments from Mr. Hewitt.

Mr. Hewitt said he wished to emphasize that the plan was the result of a layered process. He recalled that his office was directed by the Board of Regents to complete master plans for all campuses, and they wanted a degree of consistency and continuity in each plan. They also wanted each plan to be distinctive. As a result, the Board passed a resolution with four planning principles, and directed that plans be completed accordingly. (The master plans for the three coordinate campuses have been presented to the Board.)

Mr. Hewitt briefly reviewed the items that make up the "layers" of the plan, including guiding principles and "precincts." The principles adopted by the Board of Regents have three key words, he said: "inclusive," meaning that as many people as possible should be involved in the process; "practical," meaning that it can be accomplished; and "accountable," meaning that each year there must be a report presented to the Board by the senior officer of the campus indicating how conformance with the master plan is being accomplished.

One Committee member asked about the eleven principles: which one, or combination, includes something about the preservation and enhancement of the vitality of academic programs? Mr. Hewitt said that this is a physical plan, but they have emphasized that the foundation of physical planning is academic planning. Part of what was taken into account was U2000. The full document contains a discussion of U2000 and academic programs, saying that they are the whole purpose for physical planning. There should be nothing in the physical plan that is a barrier to academic planning--and if there is, it should be

changed.

In the implementation section, they have concentrated on how to keep the plan alive, how to ensure conformance with it, and how it can be flexible so unforeseen changes can be dealt with. A master plan contains illustrative proposals, something one should be reaching for, but must allow changes to be made, he emphasized.

When the master planning process started, light rail transit (LRT) was an important discussion item in the Twin Cities. About one-fourth of the way into the planning process, the University was told it should forget about LRT for the next twenty years. Their response was not to build the plan on LRT, but if it appears in five or ten years, the plan can be adapted without great cost. It will permit the University to take advantage of any opportunity that LRT might provide.

Mr. Hewitt turned his attention to the Washington Avenue bridge, which he said is the most misunderstood proposal in the plan. When they interviewed forty people and groups, the two most critical comments were "why is the University turning its back on the river and why don't we do what Cass Gilbert suggested 87 years ago?" and "the ugliest piece on the campus is the Washington Avenue bridge." So what should the plan suggest to respond to these criticisms? Of the letters he receives, those at this time of the year say the bridge is ugly; in the winter, people say they like to walk across inside. The bridge is an icon in the eyes of many, but it is one of the worst icons on the campus.

The consultants hired by the University said there would be a great opportunity if the lid were taken off the bridge. Coming east, one cannot really see the campus; what if the campus were exposed and welcoming as one drives east? There is also national emphasis on the Mississippi River; it has been declared a national heritage from Chaska to New Orleans. Taking off the cover would also allow people to see the river gorge as they come across the bridge.

There is also an important pedestrian movement system, the consultants were told. It would be possible, it was said, one could provide for pedestrian and bicycle access on the north and south sides; on the south side there could be an enclosed platform. The question of how to do this arises; this would not be a high priority in the use of University resources. This would be a long-term plan, an opportunity. The plan says that if the bridge becomes important in planning, these considerations should be taken into account. There could be other ways to respond to the visual criticism, but responding to it should be an objective. But nothing may happen for ten or twenty years.

One question raised was whether the people who planned the single-level bridge ever walked across it. Mr. Hewitt assured the Committee he always walks to the West Bank and that he understands the importance of a pedestrian bridge and separation of pedestrians from the traffic. The plan is saying one should take a look at the possibility of a one-level bridge.

He emphasized again that this is a long-term project. No one is saying that the upper level of the bridge must come down. The plan says that if there is a precinct plan for the bridge, stakeholders should be heard and something realistic should be done. In the short term, painting and maintenance will continue for both levels. There is also one condition attached to the plan: the entrance to the Weisman is at the deck level, and that must be considered. It has not been cast in stone that the upper level must come off the bridge, Mr. Hewitt concluded.

One Committee member pointed out that every year the campus officer is supposed to report on how the plan is being achieved. That is what concerns the Committee, because it appears that this is a decision that has been made, and the question is not "it is a wise decision?" but rather, "can we move to implementing this decision?"

The plan says move in a timely way, but it does not say how fast to move nor which solution to pick, Mr. Hewitt responded. Were he to review the report next year, he would report that MNDOT has decided to paint the bridge and the walkway has been repaired. But if a major improvement were to be undertaken by MNDOT, and the University were not involved, it would be subject to criticism at that time. When conformance to the plan is reported, with respect to the bridge, if there were steps taken that were out of conformance, that is where review would come.

One member of the Board of Regents asked about the things that the University just ought to start over on, his response was the institution needs to address a number of things. This plan, however, was built around the six-year capital improvement plan. It has a focus on what is already on the table.

In response to a query, Mr. Hewitt affirmed that the plan for the bridge calls for taking the deck off the bridge and provide for bicycle and pedestrian access on both sides, but put an enclosed walkway on the south side.

One Committee member said he agreed that the bridge is ugly and that there might be aesthetic value in eastbound traffic being able to see the campus. But there is a tradeoff: when one gets beyond the exteriors of the buildings, and gets inside to the offices, laboratories, and most important the classrooms--which are deplorable. When one thinks about a master plan, it should go inside the buildings. These are tough financial times, and will not be easier in the future. If forced to choose between the aesthetics of the campus and the quality of campus, one must come down in favor of the latter. The University is showing blatant disregard for its students, and one wonders why they do not rise up in arms over the quality of the environment, and the equipment in it, in which they are presumably taught.

Mr. Hewitt said is it the responsibility of the Board of Regents or the whole University to establish priorities. He said he would not debate the merits of the issues, although could point out that recent studies confirm that students make a decision about the college they will attend by the way it appeals to them when they approach it. The private colleges learned that lesson 25 years ago, and are far ahead of the University. It becomes a matter of balance, he said; if the choice is between removing the deck and improving a classroom, he would have no disagreement over which should be the priority. But if one says that the only way the deck will be removed is when there is MNDOT or federal or county money, and the University is asked for its views, then the University should not just let it happen without being involved.

Mr. Hewitt emphasized again that this is not cast in stone; the plan does not say things must be done a certain way. But it does say the University should not just sit, and put the plan on the shelf, with no attention paid to it. He is a proponent of the idea that every little decision affects the whole; even where one builds a small sidewalk can be important.

The University does have to make choices, he said. But he has observed, in the last ten years, that it has missed opportunities because it did not have a campus master plan. Faculty have often raised with

him the question of whether building plans are part of an overall scheme.

The issue is the bridge, Professor Morrison said. The only people not unhappy with the plan are the people in the planning office and the Committee member who agreed it was ugly. Those who go back and forth regularly are VERY concerned about putting vehicular and pedestrian traffic on the same level, in part because of pollution. One does not see the same breadth in planned pedestrian passageways that now exists on the deck. The plan becomes another disincentive to hold the campus together; the bridge becomes an impassable barrier. In terms of visual impression, the consultants were talking about the visual impressions for motorists; the plan will destroy the visual impression for pedestrians, who will be walking next to the heat and smoke of the buses.

The Committee member who earlier described the bridge as ugly clarified his remarks. He said he does not like the bridge, aesthetically, but that does NOT mean he supports taking the deck off and putting pedestrians on the same level with traffic.

The plan does not design the bridge, Mr. Hewitt noted, and when it came to designing the bridge, it would include one that people found desirable and safe. The same traffic that goes across the bridge goes across the bridge goes down Washington Avenue, where there are MORE pedestrians than there are walking across the bridge. Not until one gets to Church Street, it was pointed out.

Mr. Hewitt said he had been part of three studies of the bridge, including ones that proposed organizations and bookstores on it, that put lightweight restaurant on it; in both bases, MNDOT said that more support would be required. The most recent study was that the food service would put trucks on the bridge. Everyone agrees that something needs to happen to the bridge; the plan contains one suggestion and illustration. How it will be solved remains to be seen.

If the University were to learn of a proposal to replace the bridge, what would be its reaction? "Build another two-level bridge," responded one Committee member. The decision should not be made at this stage to do a one-level bridge.

The second and third issues may merge together, Professor Morrison said, and asked that the "building out" question be taken up first. Mr. Hewitt drew the attention of Committee members to a graphic of the Minneapolis campus and projected buildings.

With respect to Coffman Union, the master plan responds to an initiative promoted by the students and Board of Regents: there have been three studies about its future. One said spend \$9 to \$30 million to improve it. The second said there are great opportunities for making money if it is opened up to outside vendors. The third report, from a blue ribbon committee, said that Coffman should be preserved, and then try to achieve what Cass Gilbert had in mind. The river road parking ramp is coming down, for sure; it will need to be replaced. The Board of Regents has also said the University should spend about \$50 million for housing, to bring students back to the campus. Putting those three together, it could be a \$105 million project. The master plan says that if the ramp is to be replaced, if housing is to be built, and if Coffman is to be remodeled at \$30 or \$40 million, the three things should be put together. The plan thus shows new buildings in that area that are part of an existing initiative; it calling on the University to take advantage of the area. The plan also takes advantage of the river.

In terms of the Alumni Center, the plans have been underway for a long time, and have already

received Regents' approval. The Alumni Association and Foundation have been given a site at the corner of Oak and Washington. The master plan committee, in considering whether the two groups should build a center or move into Northrop, suggested looking at that entire part of the campus. Right now it's a ragged edge.

The city has build a new entrance into the area, Huron Boulevard; when one comes around the corner into stadium village, what is there is a huge parking lot. Is that a good introduction to the University? The Alumni Association and Foundation have referred to their project as the Gateway Center. It has been determined that perhaps the alumni facility should move to the center of the land between University and Washington, with the edge identified as the interface of town and gown, with a mixed-use building on the corner of Oak and Washington (including retail).

The schematic also includes an expanded Architecture facility, which is also already under way. If the building is not built, the plan can be modified. The Earth Science project is also included; it has received planning money. The master plan calls for siting it north of the Washington Avenue parking ramp (on the existing hockey/volleyball fields). Northrop Auditorium would also be renovated.

The only new building on the West Bank is the archives facility, which has already been funded. The plan notes the possibility of a mall on the West Bank, north of the Law School/Willey Hall.

The plan says that as the University approaches the future, when it may considering siting a building, it should consider the creation of a sense of place. In terms of filling out the campus, the plan has identified some issues as well as opportunities for building. Mr. Hewitt said he did not know when it might occur. But the new buildings are those already on the books.

The new master plan retains Coffman, one Committee member pointed out; the earlier one did not. Mr. Hewitt repeated that the master plan projects opportunities that can be explored before a decision is made. He had learned that there been a report, prepared by a Boston architectural firm, that said the University should consider spending between \$9 and \$30 million to improve Coffman--built in 1939 for a student population of 14,000; he said this would be a case to consider adapting a building as opposed to building anew. If the renovation were to cost \$30 million, a new building should be considered.

When the master plan was developed, it was said there were three options for Coffman: retain it, remodel it, or remove it. In the process of deciding, Mr. Hewitt said, he had never received as much email. A number thought it was important not to take Coffman down, and he conveyed that message to the master planning committee. He said he recommended it pursue the option of remodeling, and that is how it remains in the master plan.

Mr. Hewitt was asked if he had, from the master planning perspective, any problem with the Committee pressing on the concept of "no net new space." Mr. Hewitt said he did not.

If Coffman will be remodeled, then the question of student space that had concerned the Committee is resolved. That leaves the Washington Avenue bridge question, Professor Morrison concluded--and that remains a serious problem, he said. When FCC members discussed the master plan, they also saw it as a serious problem. The document appears to be recommending removal of the upper deck and putting pedestrians with the traffic. The Committee may wish to say something about this, he said.

Mr. Hewitt alluded to the process of developing the master plan, and noted that there are "precincts" on the campus. There are 15 precincts on the campus, and all of them should receive the same level of detailed consideration as did the Coffman and alumni precincts. Sometimes the consideration is initiated by a project. There is a Washington Avenue bridge precinct; the detailed planning has not been done. The result of precinct planning studies is to come to grips with a suggestion in the master plan. This is an important decision, Mr. Hewitt acknowledged; before anyone would take the upper deck off the bridge, the precinct planning would have to take place.

There has been no motion regarding the bridge, Professor Morrison said in response to a query, but there has been a suggestion that the Committee write a letter asking that the single-level bridge not be part of the plan. There were three issues raised: the Committee has serious problems with even putting a single-level bridge this far into the master plan, because it seems to express a preference; the second was Coffman; the third was the proposition about building. With respect to the last point, the Committee might say that University funds or bonding capacity be used in the near future. He suggested that there be a draft letter circulated to Committee members for review, with action later in August.

Professor Marshak assured the Committee there was no need to rush, because the upper deck will not be taken off soon. Professor Morrison said that the Committee might wish to bring the issue to the Board before its September meeting, at which time it is going to approve the master plan. Professor Morrison said he was satisfied with all of the elements of the discussion, but not with the predisposition in the plan about the bridge--nor, he said, is there anyone on the West Bank who likes the idea of a one-level bridge.

Professor Marshak commented on the question of new buildings. As the Committee knows, a significant component of the proposed biennial request is for technology; much of that is for wiring existing buildings. He said he would not argue for net new space, but in the decision to demolish or remodel, the cost of technology needs to be figured in. If there is a need for high bandwidth in classrooms, that argues for a facility with classrooms only, because then high bandwidth technology can be delivered to one building rather than many. Because the amount of money in the request for technology is so large, it may have an effect on thinking about remodeling versus demolition and new construction. It tilts thought more toward separated functions, rather than mixing classes, offices, and so forth, in the same facility. He said he had no data on this point, but there is a lot of money in wiring.

The Committee would probably not oppose that concept, Professor Morrison said, as long as there is the understanding that space elsewhere would be reduced. Professor Marshak agreed.

Mr. Hewitt pointed out that no net new space does not preclude new buildings. The master plan suggests better utilization, and calls for adaptive reuse before there is new construction.

Professor Marshak noted that the plan calls for demolition of Wesbrook Hall. Mr. Hewitt explained that since the long-term plan for Northrop calls for an approach on the west similar to the one on the east, and since Wesbrook's future was questionable, the plan tried to be responsive to an initiative already on the table. The plan does encourage pruning, he emphasized.

One Committee member inquired about the status of planning for a new bus turnaround on the St. Paul campus. The idea has been abandoned, Mr. Hewitt said. The bus service between the campuses will be substantially reduced in the fall, Professor Morrison noted. This comes at the same time campus

planning calls for more and different means of transportation, noted another Committee member, so there seems to be a difference between what is being proposed and what is being implemented.

One of the values of a master plan is that it causes this kind of discussion, Mr. Hewitt said. It is less important that a decision is made than is taking advantage of opportunities to do something greater. The plan is used to continually stimulate discussion, so that everyone understands all the implications before moving ahead: that is its value. He recalled that it took 25 years to close a street on the University of Michigan campus. He also pointed out that when Cass Gilbert's plan was first presented, many thought it was a silly idea. But it has survived.

One of the things the Committee discussed earlier was how it would consult on building closings. There need to be dates and a list of buildings; the Committee can then give advice.

Professor Marshak said that the problem is that if the Committee is provided a list, that is a plan with no consultation. Should there be options? Professor Morrison said there should be a proposed plan, to which there will be objections; the administration will have to make decisions, and the Committee will have to make recommendations. He agreed that the choice should not be "plan A or nothing"; the Committee will endorse a plan or recommend saving one building because of historic value.

There are two levels involved, Professor Marshak said. The first is deciding what buildings to close; the second level is what moves have to occur as a result of closing buildings. It could be either or both at the same time, it was said. There is no plan to split departments, Professor Marshak said; more problematic is a department with a related center, or a department that needs to be near a cluster of departments.

There is a detailed plan for reuse of the Management and Economics tower, Dr. Zetterberg reported, and it includes adjacency and quality of space. It would consolidate many units and represent much progress. That is the point at which the Committee hears about the plan, Professor Morrison said. There can be a plan A and plan B, Dr. Zetterberg said; Professor Marshak promised to provide them.

Professor Morrison thanked Messrs. Hewitt and Marshak for joining the meeting, and adjourned it at 5:00.

-- Gary Engstrand