Minutes[*]

Senate Committee on Finance and Planning
Tuesday, September 16, 2003
2:15 - 4:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Charles Campbell (chair), Dan Feeney, Michael Frankosky, Thomas Klein, Joseph Konstan, Michael Korth, Yi Li, Kathleen O'Brien, Richard Pfutzenreuter, Rose Samuel, Al Sullivan, Sue Van Voorhis, Warren Warwick, Susan Carlson Weinberg, Michael Volna

Absent: Calvin Alexander, Brittny McCarthy Barnes, Stanley Bonnema, David M. Brown, David Chapman, Charles Speaks, Thomas Stinson, Terry Roe

Guests: Associate Vice President Laurie Scheich (Auxiliary Services), Mr. Bob Baker (Parking and Transportation Services); Associate Vice President Steve Cawley; Senior Vice President Frank Cerra

[In these minutes: (1) parking; (2) new financial system; (3) University-Mayo collaboration; (4) football stadium; (5) ad hoc committee on a summer semester]

1. Parking

Professor Campbell convened the meeting at 2:35 and welcomed Associate Vice President Scheich and Mr. Baker to the meeting to discuss Parking and Transportation issues. Shortly into the discussion of parking, Professor Campbell welcomed the two new student members of the Committee, Rose Samuel (who served previously with distinction) and Yi Li, and he also welcomed Dr. Sullivan as a new ex officio member from the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

Mr. Baker said that he was uncertain, after reviewing the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee, what issues it wished him to address, so he prepared a brief general presentation of budget and financial data. Professor Campbell asked him, before he began, where Parking and Transportation is in its 2004-05 budget planning cycle; Mr. Baker said it has not begun. Parking at the University is an 8-month business, he said, from September to May; during the winter break and the summer months the demand for parking drops dramatically. It is too early in the year for them to begin planning. Professor Campbell said he hoped that there would be an opportunity to talk about what impact this Committee might have and how it fits into the process.

Mr. Baker then reviewed quickly with the Committee the areas of responsibility of Parking and Transportation (parking, including total number of ramps, garages, spaces, meters, etc.; transportation, including U-Pass, paratransit, campus shuttles, etc.; and surfaces, including campus streets, sidewalks and plazas, vehicular bridges, pedestrian bridges and skyways, and bike lanes, paths, and racks). The Twin Cities campus has a total of 20,174 parking spaces. Parking and Transportation is responsible for 14.3 miles of campus streets, 46 miles of sidewalks and plazas, 3 vehicular bridges, 7 pedestrian bridges and skyways, 5.95 miles of bike lanes, and 6500 bike hoops/racks.

[*] 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 represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

The majority of parking income is from contracts (52%); the remainder is transient (39%), special event, and meters/other. Of parking expenses, 31% is debt service (largely due to structures recently built) and 11% is for capital projects; the remainder is payroll, utilities, repairs and maintenance, etc. The inter-campus bus service accounts for 16% of expenses. The capital plan for 2003-04 ($10 million) includes debt service, East River Road Garage water control, Oak Street Ramp elevators, structural repairs (floors and ceilings, etc.), and other items. Mr. Baker reviewed briefly the projected capital expenses through 2007-08 for each facility on the Twin Cities campus; the total is $9.2 million. He commented that in the future, because they have changed from primarily lots to primarily structures, they know that they will need to increase their investment in capital repairs, so they must put aside funds for that purpose. Professor Campbell asked about the debt service; Mr. Baker said they believe it is stable, at about $7-8 million annually, assuming there are no more projects. Is the parking debt service included in the University's total debt service figure that Mr. Pfutzenreuter recently reported, Professor Campbell asked? It is, Vice President O'Brien said, even though it has revenue to support the debt service.

Mr. Baker then noted that the original plan called for continuing rate increases of about 10%, but that with the current economic situation, they imposed budget cuts, staffing reductions, saved money on the East River Road Garage, and enhanced revenue in order to levy only a modest rate adjustment. Mr. Baker outlined the budget cuts and revenue increases, including elimination of nine full-time positions. He said that they were sensitive to the issues that had been raised by the Committee last year, which is what led to the budget cuts.

Professor Feeney recalled that the Committee in the past has expressed concern that use of bus passes would reduce the demand for parking but that Parking and Transportation continued to build facilities. Now there appears to be enough flexibility in the system to allow reserved contract parking. Is that what should be done? Should the system allow those who are able to pay to have reserved spaces? Mr. Baker said that based on the vacancy rate, they started the reserve contract plan. As he told the Committee last April, he said, reserved parking is a standard industry practice; they initiated the plan in response to requests from individuals for many years. The requests increased once the Mayo Garage in the Academic Health Center had to be closed.

Mr. Baker reviewed the elements of the reserved contract plan: it is limited to existing contract holders, the total number of reserved spaces available is 449--3.12% of the total number of spaces, 69% of the spaces have been applied for after two weeks, and 47% of the applicants are faculty, 53% are staff. The program will not affect capacity, night school access, or hourly parking availability for events. Mr. Baker said that they have received both positive and negative comments on the plan. He noted also that there is no waiting for contacts in several Twin Cities ramps; they have reduced public parking and added contracts at the 19th Avenue, Washington Avenue, and University Avenue ramps. They are looking at the data for the 21st Avenue ramp and the Law School lot.

Professor Feeney said he was concerned about excess capacity and debt service. If bus ridership increases, will there be a need for parking rate increases to cover the debt service because there are fewer people parking on campus? Mr. Baker related that the first week of classes parking facilities were not full but since then there have been more cars parked. It has taken at least 25 years to solve the problem of parking demand, he said, so it is no longer a problem. He said he did not know if there will be a problem in a few years but agreed that debt service could affect rate setting. There may be a need to increase rates because of a decline in occupancy rates, but they also need to be sensitive to issues of the marketplace, low-income faculty and staff, negotiations with the bargaining units, and increases in health care costs. He noted that he and his staff all pay the same rates that everyone else does.

Professor Konstan reported that he has a reserved contract space. The problem is that he found it worth buying. The Committee last year thought $10 per month was too little to charge; he said he sees it as a bargain. That observation goes to the issue of price gradation, he said. Prices should be based on proximity to where one wants to be, not whether the space is above or below ground. Does Parking plan to revisit the issue of rationalizing market demands versus the academic objectives of the University? Mr. Baker conceded that he does not always know how the academic mission exactly relates to parking but they try to be sensitive to costs for their customers--the students, faculty, staff, and guests of the University. If one compares contract rates at the University to its nearest markets, the University rates are about one-third to one-half of the market (the two downtowns). The hourly rate is aimed at guests and must be high enough to discourage students from parking all day at an hourly rate but not so high that visitors are deterred from coming to campus.

One example, perhaps not a good one, of integrating parking with the academic objectives might be to offer priority in parking for students enrolled for a full load, Professor Konstan said. And why is the reserved contract parking such a bargain, he asked. They have not tried to integrate student parking into the cost structure, Mr. Baker said; they are trying to encourage students to leave their cars at home. The U-Pass is $50 per semester, which is "a steal" compared to the cost of a car. There are student parking contracts. In terms of reserved contract pricing, he said he tries to be a conservative fiscal manager and introduced a new product at a price that people would find acceptable. That rate could increase in the future.

Mr. Klein observed that the Committee has stayed away from making recommendations on a parking-space-by-parking-space basis and has instead advised on reductions and revenue increases. But the Committee is looking for feedback; it provided counsel on adjustments in reductions and revenue in order to avoid cost increases, but it appears there was no effort to re-run the numbers to avoid a contract rate increase by exercising other options. The Committee has not heard whether its advice last year was usable.

Mr. Baker said he appreciated the fact that the Committee was not micro-managing and that the Committee appreciates the expertise of those who meet with it. They did look again at the numbers and what they could cut. They believed that for the long term they had developed a good balance and that they needed all of the elements of the plan--budget and staff cuts and revenue enhancements--to make it work. They took the University's economic conditions very seriously.

The Committee had a spirited discussion last April, Professor Campbell said, which led to a motion passed unanimously both by this Committee and the Faculty Consultative Committee that made recommendations different from what Parking brought. A number of people have asked how the Committee's recommendations affect what is done. Mr. Baker commented that he serves at the pleasure of Associate Vice President Scheich and Vice President O'Brien and has been in the position for 15 years. In addition, he has a highly-trained and expert staff. They put together the best package they could and then talked about the resolution passed by the Committee. Their recommendations went up the channels to Vice President O'Brien and to the President; they were told to proceed according to the plans they had presented.

Vice President O'Brien said that she takes the ultimate responsibility. It was her recommendation to the President. They brought the package to the Committee and to Vice President Carrier to review the impact on the University community. She said she disagreed with the assumption made by the

Committee that certain parking rate increases would have an impact on some segments of the University but not others; everyone parks everywhere. She said she made the recommendation to the President to continue with the plan as proposed. She said she did not return quickly to the Committee because the plan was available to it. She argued in April that the plan was balanced and tried to implement a sound business plan, with modest increases now in order to avoid bigger increases in the future.

What is the target for the number of contract spaces available, Professor Warwick asked. Ideally, it would be about 110%, Mr. Baker replied. Now it is at about 90%. There is a group that Parking should survey, Professor Warwick suggested: those who park two miles away from campus, fill up city streets, and cause neighborhoods to complain. Why do they park so far away? Is it for the exercise or because of the cost? If it is cost, would it not be better to lower the rates and sell 110% of the parking?

Mr. Baker said that they do visit neighborhoods and are aware that the campus population affects the streets. There are also programs offered by the cities to help avoid that problem. They have inquired about those who park so far away; they have learned that some people are so cheap that any price would be too high for them, so they walk 2-3 miles. They also have to be sensitive about prices; he operates a business and is not allowed to run a deficit, he said. Up until two or three years ago there were significant waiting lists for parking; now there are not.

Mr. Klein said that the crucial question for him was whether Parking and Transportation could have followed the recommendations of the Committee as well as carry out its other plans. Part of the plan was to build a department reserve; the amount to be used for the reserve, relative to the increased income from the rate increases, was the salient point. Funds could have been set aside in the reserve and the rate increase avoided. It is still not clear why the Committee recommendation was not viable.

Vice President O'Brien said she answered this question in the spring but would do so again. She has had responsibility for major parking systems; the only bigger system in the state is the one operated by the City of Minneapolis. She said she was appalled that Parking and Transportation had no reserves in place to protect itself and said she would have been derelict in her financial duties if she did not create one, so directed Mr. Baker to develop a reserve. But it is possible that other tradeoffs could have been made, she agreed. But there are sound financial management reasons for creating the reserve.

Professor Campbell noted that Mr. Baker had received a copy of the resolution concerning reserved contract parking adopted by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs. How does he respond to it? Vice President O'Brien said that as a result of questions from Faculty Affairs, a week ago they put on hold the reserved contract program and did an analysis. They have decided to make it a pilot program, with a limited number of contracts, and see how it works. They will provide the information to the Faculty Affairs Committee (which, she observed, had not asked them to consult with it).

Vice President O'Brien said she was pleased that they could be here early in the year. She has been involved in setting up a review process for support and service units; comments made at these meetings are helpful. Her expectation is that they will consider directions for next year in January or February, and it is then that this topic should again return to the agenda of the Committee.

Professor Campbell thanked Mr. Baker and Vice President O'Brien warmly for their comments.

2. New Financial System

Professor Campbell turned next to Mr. Volna and welcomed Mr. Cawley to the meeting. Professor Campbell reported that he had attended the meeting of the Finance and Operations Committee of the Board of Regents, as he is supposed to do in his role as chair of this Committee; during the meeting, the Regents asked him (Professor Campbell) whether there had been full consultation on the proposed new financial system. He said there had been. Since then there have been new developments, including a Board resolution.

The Board resolution recommended the University proceed with implementation of the new system ("representing a net $4.2 million decision based on savings from the existing maintenance contract and the $5.1 million cost of the financial system") provided that there is no new information that adversely affects the project and the administration approves. They are still modeling the actual costs, Mr. Volna said, and there would remain the two phases, the trailblazing effort for about 18 months followed by full implementation. They do not have a good idea of the budget but it will probably be in the range of $15-20 million. The Board was insistent that over the next three or four of their meetings they be provided a more detailed budget, Mr. Volna reported. The model developed by Associate Vice President Pfutzenreuter extends the Enterprise tax by three years, to 2011. They have consulted with the deans, who support the project.

They are comfortable with the extension of the tax, Professor Campbell asked? Their concern was that the tax be stable and not increase, Mr. Cawley said. They also wanted to know what guarantees exist. The maintenance costs are manageable and could decrease. His sense of the deans' concerns, Mr. Volna added, was that they wanted the project to be on time and on budget and that folks in the colleges have a product they can use. They have agreed to establish a council of college financial officers and coordinate campus representatives that they will meet with regularly so that those individuals can reassure the deans and chancellors that the new system will meet their needs.

There has been no change in the situation vis-à-vis Oracle and PeopleSoft. Oracle extended its tender offer to mid-October, Mr. Volna reported. Internally, they concluded they needed to decide if a merger/acquisition would help, hurt, or have no effect on the University's contract; they have decided that with the guarantees in place, the University can go forward even if the two companies merge. (If Oracle does not acquire PeopleSoft, some other company might.) The Regents and the deans thought that was a reasonable conclusion. There are also maintenance savings in the contract for the PeopleSoft products the University already has, Mr. Cawley reported; the Regents' resolution provides that if the University determines it wants to move forward, the President can exercise the authority to execute a contract.

When would the typical department be affected and when must it begin to prepare for change, Professor Korth inquired? And will Financial Forms Nirvana be eliminated? Mr. Volna said that a representative sample of departments will be involved in phase one, the trailblazing effort; it will be three years before departments will need to start using it. Mr. Cawley said, apropos FFN, that there will be a web front-end routine, whether it is FFN or something from PeopleSoft. FFN is also the routing engine for the REPA forms and for EGMS, Mr. Volna said, so the University will need to look at whether to keep two systems.

Professor Campbell thanked Mr. Volna for his presentation and said he appreciated how thoroughly he has consulted with the Committee; he wished him the best of luck. Mr. Volna responded that he expected to return frequently for additional discussion.

3. The University-Mayo Collaboration

Professor Campbell now welcomed Senior Vice President Cerra to discuss the Minnesota Partnership for Biotechnology and Medical Genomics.

Dr. Cerra said the University is in the formative stages of developing a relationship with the Mayo Clinic; he distributed copies of a handout that was used with the Board of Regents at their September meeting. The idea started about three years ago, when he and the chair of the Mayo board were on a group that looked at issues of patient safety; they talked about where the two institutions were going and where the state was going in bioscience/biotechnology. The two organizations have made significant investments in the bioscience/biotechnology fields and in the discussion the two of them realized that if the organizations can come together they would both be able to do better.

This is an attempt to bring the two institutions together, Dr. Cerra told the Committee. Between the two of them, they account for 99.99% of external research funds in Minnesota; together, they rank fifth nationally in receipt of research funding. Mayo is more focused in its research; the University is more broad-based.

There are four policy issues associated with the Partnership:

-- Is the mission consistent with and/or does it further the mission of the Academic Health Center and the University?
-- With respect to the $70-million collaborative research proposal in upcoming years, to what extent will it compete for University resources or affect its priorities?
-- Also with respect to the $70-million collaborative research proposal, to what extent will it compete for legislative appropriations?
-- What is the competitive advantage of the partnership and how is its value quantified?

The competition in the bioscience fields is stiff, Dr. Cerra said, and the biggest bidder for projects is in the northeastern corridor of the country. It has more money and is making more investments. It is not, however, very far ahead of the University and Mayo. There are a number of factors that drive the effort, even though the University and Mayo have co-existed in the state for about 90 years and not done that much together. The intent is to use the strengths of the two organizations to create synergy (e.g., the tissue bank at Mayo, the stem cell research at the University). Part of the effort involves basic research, part would translate the research into something that can be used in clinical trials; in this respect, Mayo has perhaps ten times the capacity of the University to conduct clinical trials.

There is also no place else in the world where the biomedical industry is as close to and articulated with the medical device industry, Dr. Cerra said. This is also one of a small number of institutions that have agriculture, plant, and human science all in one place, that has made investments in them, and which faculty can move among. The University has invested $1 million in genomics education; it has received $19 million in NIH funds that can be attributed to that $1 million investment.

The first phase of the partnership is a demonstration project to show that the two organizations can work together. Faculty will work on research for the next two years funded by the partnership, at the end of which period there will be applications to NIH to continue the work. The application process for research proposals is closed; a committee with representatives from both institutions will make grants. There will be $3 million divided among 4-8 research groups to do key experiments so that they can obtain NIH grants in the future. To ensure quality, experts are being used to critique the grants as they have been written.

The business model is that this will not be a third entity; there will be an inter-institutional agreement that will define how PIs will be identified, how grants will be administered, what rules will be followed, and so on. There will be discussion in the future about commercialization; the questions about how to interact with the private sector and which patents and technology office will be used have not been answered yet.

The partnership calls for about $70 million to be invested over the next 2-3 biennia, or about $10-12 million over each of the next 5-6 years. The money will be used to fund infrastructure and leverage grants so they are competitive for NIH funding. About $3-6 million will be used for commercialization.

The ultimate success of the partnership will depend on the government creating an environment for new businesses to grow, such as research parks, Dr. Cerra said. But the University cannot be hamstrung on where the technology goes: They are working to keep in Minnesota the intellectual property that may result from the partnership but they intend to commercialize it. The $70 million is to be outside the University's legislative appropriation and the faculty will continue to set the research agenda; legislative support for the partnership cannot have tails about what the funds will be used for.

The response rate to the request for grant proposals was very satisfying and showed considerable enthusiasm; there were about 30-40 groups making proposals between the two institutions.

Professor Campbell said that it was hard for him to believe, after having been at the University for 30 years, that a $70 million item would not count as part of the University's allocation. Dr. Cerra said that all share that concern. The way the partnership has been planned is that it is to be in the Governor's budget unattached to the University's budget. It will be a task to keep them separate but they hope to succeed. There is a meeting later in the fall with the Governor and representatives from Mayo and the University and this issue is one of the items on that agenda.

There is much to think about here, Professor Campbell said, and there will be further questions. Has the partnership been presented to the Research Committee, he asked? It has, Dr. Cerra said, and added that he has an obligation to keep people informed; he will meet with the Committee to whatever extent it deems appropriate. It was agreed that sometime in January or February would be timely.

Professor Campbell thanked Dr. Cerra for joining the meeting.

4. The Football Stadium

Mr. Pfutzenreuter now distributed copies of a one-page handout entitled "Stadium Feasibility Analysis" and said that the Committee was the first group to see it. It describes what has been going on in the administration to assess the stadium issues.

The effort started about a month ago, he said, and is geared to determining what kind of stadium the University would want in terms of seats, concessions, suites, the cost of construction, maintenance, revenues and market potential, and how the University might use a stadium to enhance campus, local, and statewide community. The final report will include many details, including an architectural plan, a site plan, a transportation plan (including whether or not a ramp/garage will be needed and the number of parking spots that can be retained on the site), concept sketches, design guidelines, project schedule (it will take 3-4 years, including an Environmental Impact Statement that will take 12-18 months), the project's business model, preliminary community and neighborhood feedback, and cost estimates. The cost estimates and architectural plan will organized around four primary components: site/land/environmental issues (the site will require a clean-up at a cost of about $20 million); the stadium district (transportation and roads, utilities, and urban design); base stadium (field, seating, primary locker rooms, concessions); and facility enhancements (interior finishes, suites, club seats and whether or not to have a club, and score boards). With respect to the latter, Mr. Pfutzenreuter observed, one can buy a low-cost faucet at one store or pay more at another store; if one buys cheap, one usually has to buy another faucet in a couple of years. The University could build cheap but then would likely have to pay more later.

The University has retained the same consultants that it used when there was a live proposal for a Gopher-Vikings stadium.

The study is expected to be completed by early November, 2003, and will cost about $125,000, paid for with privately-donated funds.

Ms. Samuel recalled that when she was last on this Committee a couple of years ago, there was talk about cutting sports, that football did not make money, that even if there were a new stadium there was no guarantee that people would attend the games, that there are opportunity costs in donated funds, and so on. Professor Nantell observed that Mr. Pfutzenreuter has talked about a business plan for the STADIUM; one could expand it to a business plan for intercollegiate athletics. This is for a stadium with a substantial private donation, Mr. Pfutzenreuter noted, but that will not be enough. The goals are (1) to see if a stadium on campus improves athletic revenues overall (there needs to be a winning team but the goal is to cut the O&M subsidy), and (2) increase community building on campus. The stadium business model includes more than just football, Professor Nantell pointed out; Mr. Pfutzenreuter concurred.

Professor Warwick asked if the stadium would include a track. It would not, Mr. Pfutzenreuter said, but it would accommodate soccer.

There were concerns about infrastructure costs when the proposal was for a joint-use stadium with the Vikings, Professor Feeney recalled; while one hopes for at least 30,000 to 40,000 for each Gopher game, will all the potential infrastructure costs be included in the analysis? They will, Mr. Pfutzenreuter affirmed. The study will fully cost the stadium so the University knows. There has been no decision about whether a ramp will be needed. When the Vikings were involved, there would have been a ramp needed, at a cost of about $80 million. Mr. Pfutzenreuter said he was confident that the amount of road moving, transit costs, and parking will not be of the same magnitude as would have been required for a joint-use stadium. This will be a 45,000-50,000-seat stadium and one hopes more students will attend. The Gopher-Viking stadium would have had 70,000 seats with a lot of traffic; this one would have traffic but not of the magnitude of the earlier proposal.

How did the situation get to where it is now after everything fell apart last year, Professor Nantell asked? The President said the University needed to step back and deal with its budget problem, Mr. Pfutzenreuter said, which it did. Then the donor appeared and got the University thinking again about a stadium. What is the plan to get community support, given the state budget situation, Ms. VanVoorhis asked? Those efforts were initially derailed because of all the publicity, Mr. Pfutzenreuter said, but there is a plan that is starting. The University is still talking with the donor; he said he did not know what would happen.

All the signals from the Governor and legislators are that the 2004 session will likely be the one where they deal with stadium issues. The University must have answers to the questions that will be asked if it is to be included in any state action. If it is not, the University football team could end up in Blaine, which is not the situation in which the University wants to find itself.

When the administration went through the analysis of the cost of athletics to the University, Professor Campbell recalled, and looked at the possibility that football might be able to help pay the bills, the report from then-Vice-President Brown indicated that even if all football games were sold out at the Metrodome the increased revenue would be about $3 million per year. Would that number be larger in an on-campus stadium? That number was based only on ticket sales, Mr. Pfutzenreuter said; the University receives nothing from any other source at the Metrodome. In a University stadium, there are opportunities for revenue from sponsorships, advertising, suites, club seats, and so on--the revenue possibilities go well beyond ticket sales. The stadium would probably not double current income; these questions are why the University has retained one of the consulting firms it has--it can help understand and project income from a stadium.

The Faculty Consultative Committee developed a list of concerns, Mr. Klein said; it should be provided to the consultants. Mr. Pfutzenreuter agreed. In terms of one question, about a power source, this stadium would not require a lot of additional power because it will be open-air. They are also planning on space for the Marching Band and are talking with Recreational Sports about other uses. But heating the space adds a lot of costs, he noted.

Would the stadium be expandable if the team started winning, Ms. VanVoorhis asked? That will depend on the cost, Mr. Pfutzenreuter said. To be able to expand requires more and deeper footings, and so on. There is an argument, from the marketing people, that the focus should be on a small stadium that can make the game a good experience rather than having it too big with empty seats. But the possibility of building for future expansion will definitely be considered. There are a lot of pressures on the University to keep the price down; others are pinching themselves and insisting that people be realistic about the likely cost.

Is there an effort to start looking at the broader implications, Professor Konstan asked? For example, might there be symposia series or breakfasts before the games? In terms of fund-raising, will the President give the Foundation a list of priorities for people who say they want to contribute to football so that they can be asked if they would also give to the colleges? Mr. Pfutzenreuter said he knows people are worried that fund-raising for a stadium will detract from other opportunities; no one can say it will not, but the President and Mr. Fischer at the Foundation are convinced that a lot of people would not give money to the University except for a football stadium. With respect to activities associated with a football game, the answer is absolutely yes, Mr. Pfutzenreuter said. The goal is to achieve a sense of community on game days so the University would want to do more than play a football game.

Professor Feeney asked if students and student fees would be a significant element of funding for a stadium. Mr. Pfutzenreuter said that nothing was off the table until the University knows the cost of a stadium. No one knows what the money would buy or what one would get.

Professor Campbell thanked Mr. Pfutzenreuter for the report.

It was also agreed that the Committee would develop a new list of principles, building on the list that the Faculty Consultative Committee prepared last year, and that Professor Feeney would prepare a draft.

5. Ad hoc Committee on a Summer Semester

Professor Campbell reported that the Committee had been asked to nominate two individuals to serve on the ad hoc committee to investigate the possibility of establishing a summer semester. He said he had asked two people, Professors Chapman and Konstan, to serve; both are willing. The Committee approved the suggestions unanimously.

Professor Campbell adjourned the meeting at 4:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota