

SCFP SUBCOMMITTEE ON TWIN CITIES FACILITIES AND SUPPORT  
SERVICES (STCFSS)  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
NOVEMBER 20, 2007

[In these minutes: Campus Master Plan Update, Library Cavern Capacity]

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

PRESENT: George Wilcox, chair, Keith Carlson, Anne Falken, Bernadette Corley Troge, Steve Fitzgerald, Denny Olsen, Laurie Scheich, Lorelee Wederstrom, Andrea Backes, Gary A. Davis, Gordon Girtz, Daniel Malmo, Amber Melaney

REGRETS: Michael Berthelsen, Patrice Morrow, Howard Towle

ABSENT: Sean Hanner

GUESTS: Director of Planning & Architecture Orlyn Miller and Vice President for University Services Kathleen O'Brien

OTHERS ATTENDING: Gwen Sutter for Lyndel King

I). Professor Wilcox called the meeting to order.

II). Professor Wilcox welcomed Vice President for University Services Kathleen O'Brien who was invited to provide the committee with a Twin Cities Campus Master Plan update. Vice President O'Brien introduced herself and her colleague, Orlyn Miller, director, Planning & Architecture.

Mr. Miller began by noting that the Master Plan ensures that the physical campus serves the University's academic mission. He emphasized that the driver behind the Master Plan is the University's academic programming and not the physical buildings themselves. In addition, the Master Plan:

- Establishes the framework for the long-term evolution of the University campus.
- Creates a vision for the future, which builds upon the existing physical attributes of the campus.
- Assures that the unique qualities of the campus will be enhanced and that targeted areas will evolve.

Mr. Miller outlined the 1993 Board of Regents' campus master planning principles, which, he noted, were the catalyst for the University's Master Plan:

- Create and maintain a distinctive and inspiring vision for the physical development of each campus.

- Enrich the experience of all who come to campus.
- Maximize the value of the University's existing physical assets while responding to emerging/changing physical needs.
- Maintain inclusive, accountable and timely processes for creating and implementing the Master Plan vision.

Before the most recent process to update the Master Plan was undertaken, Vice President O'Brien convened a working group to review the Plan to determine whether the principles upon which it were based were still applicable. The working group concluded that these principles were still valid, but needed some modifications. Guiding principles for the Board of Regents' master planning principles include:

- Instilling a genuine sense of community.
- Identifying, preserving and enhancing natural features of the campus.
- Creating a cohesive system of open spaces.
- Achieving balanced systems for movement and access.
- Promoting optimization and rationalization of campus facilities.
- Increasing the mix of uses on the campus, including housing.
- Developing connections with the larger community.
- Fostering accessibility and a sense of safety and security.
- Promoting architectural integrity.
- Preserving historic buildings and landscapes.
- Facilitating and ensuring healthy collaborative ventures.

Vice President O'Brien noted that updating the current Master Plan would not be a consultant driven process, but rather expertise and input from within the University community would be sought. Involving faculty, staff and students in the process should serve to give constituents more ownership over the Plan. The Master Plan is intended to be a living document; one that is integrated into the daily operations of the University and its decision-making processes. The charge to the Steering Committee was to:

- Align and integrate the Master Plan with University core processes such as strategic positioning, academic planning and funding;
- Take advantage of the major initiatives scheduled for the next decade;
- Focus on "growing a campus" rather than building buildings;
- Instill principles of sustainability so that the new plan will make the campus better for future students, staff and faculty;
- Optimize the distinction of being the largest research University that bridges the Mississippi River;
- Increase ownership of the Master Plan by the University community, and ensure broad and meaningful consultation with key constituencies.

Steering Committee discussions led to the creation of 5 issue-based work teams:

1. Enhancing the Campus
2. Natural Features and Open Spaces
3. Movement and Access
4. Community Connections, Collaborative Ventures & Safety

## 5. Design and Preservation

Each of these teams have been assigned principles from the 1996 Master Plan to focus on, and each have been given overarching questions to address, which include:

- How can the guiding principles enhance the University's learning environment?
- How should the University's guiding principles be aligned with its strategic positioning efforts?
- How should sustainability principles be incorporated into each of the work team's efforts?
- What benchmarks should the work teams use to report on their progress?
- How will technology impact each of the guiding principles?
- What can be done to ensure that the updated plan will be operationally better?
- How should support for spaces and systems that work on campus be memorialized?

In closing, Vice President O'Brien shared with the committee the schedule for updating the Master Plan. She noted that while the Steering Committee started its work in the fall of 2006, the work teams were not convened until February 2007. The work teams will continue their work into spring semester 2008. Then, in late spring/summer 2008, the Steering Committee will pull together the findings of the work teams and craft a draft report for the Board of Regents. Before final Board of Regents review and approval of the Master Plan is sought in the fall of 2008, the Steering Committee will once again consult with key groups on campus via public forums.

Questions/comments from members included:

- Have any final decisions been made regarding whether the light rail line will run at-grade or below ground? Vice President O'Brien noted that preliminary engineering, which is generally a 2-year process for a project of this scale, commenced in September 2007. She expects an early draft of what an at-grade line and a below ground line will look like for the campus in the next couple of months. A final decision will likely be made by summer 2008.
- Will the Master Plan have a theme for the campus, or will it be an eclectic mix of architecture? Mr. Miller stated that there are traditional parts to the campus (e.g. the Mall) and other parts of campus that are far more eclectic (e.g. the Knoll area). Feedback gathered at the forums indicated that the University community preferred an eclecticism of different types of architecture. The most important outcome of this planning process, noted Mr. Miller, is that all buildings that are built on the campus should look like they belong on the Twin Cities campus of the University of Minnesota. The primary way to accomplish this goal is by recalling specific materials and color (e.g. Hasselmo Hall). He added that landscape development (e.g. plants, lighting, signage, street setbacks) also serves to tie the campus together.
- What will be the final product of updating the Master Plan? Will there be a document that has maps and graphics for people to reference? Vice President O'Brien noted that there will definitely be a document that people can refer to. This document will include not only maps, but guiding principles, and information on issues impacting the campus such as technology and landscaping.

To put the campus size in perspective, Vice President O'Brien stated that the University of Minnesota has 28 million gross square feet, with 22 million gross square feet on the Twin Cities campus. This is larger than both downtown Minneapolis and downtown St. Paul combined. The University has a lot of space, much of it complex space. She added that 70% of the University's buildings are over 30 years old. All of these factors combined make managing the University's space very challenging.

- Are the conversations between the City of Falcon Heights and the St. Paul campus part of the master planning process? Mr. Miller stated that these discussions are informing the master planning process, but not part of the master planning process per se. Vice President O'Brien added that a lot of what is happening on the St. Paul campus has to do with the environment; many faculty members are using the campus as a living laboratory. Policies on how to assign outdoor space will need to be developed.
- Is cyberspace included in the Master Plan? Mr. Miller stated that each working group has been asked to address how technology, both physical and programmatic, will affect their particular area of focus. The Utility Master Plan is also looking into a longer-range plan for dealing with technology infrastructure issues.
- Does the Master Plan drive investment at the University? Vice President O'Brien noted that the University has a six-year capital planning process, which, for the most part, has driven capital investment; however, now that more work is being done in terms of academic strategic planning, this is driving the University's capital planning to an ever-increasing degree. The Master Plan is intended to provide the framework for how projects are undertaken versus what projects are undertaken.
- It would be interesting to learn more about the University's Utility Master Plan. Vice President O'Brien reported that there is a campus Utility Master Plan, which is currently being updated. This plan looks at future utility needs and also where utility redundancies should be built into the system.
- On an unrelated note, have there been conversations about adding student housing? Vice President O'Brien reported that the University conducted a study a couple years ago on whether the campus had an adequate amount of student housing. The conclusion drawn from this study was that the University had an appropriate number of beds for freshmen. However, there was a significant need for affordable graduate and professional student housing close to campus.

Professor Wilcox thanked Vice President O'Brien and Mr. Miller for attending today's meeting and providing the committee with information on the Master Plan.

III). Professor Wilcox welcomed Associate University Librarian Peggy Johnson. He noted that Ms. Johnson was invited to provide the committee with information on space issues confronting the Library's collections.

Ms. Johnson noted that the above ground portion of Andersen Library is the service point for the Library's special collections, archive data, and also houses exhibit space. Below

ground are two storage caverns. Each cavern is 600 feet long (approximately 2 football fields) by 65 feet wide and 23 feet high. The facility was funded by the state to provide storage for lesser-used materials from the University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus, and other libraries from across the state. The University's cavern that houses its archives and special collections is at 96% capacity. The other cavern, Minnesota Library Access Center (MLAC), is divided by use – 40% of the space has been allocated for use by libraries from across the state, and 60% is reserved for Twin Cities campus materials. The University's portion of MLAC is currently at 85% capacity.

During the 2007 – 2008 fiscal year, the Library will move another 150,000 volumes out of Wilson Library, which is at capacity, into the University's portion of MLAC. Once this move has been completed, there will only be space for roughly another 100,000 volumes. It is estimated that by the end of 2009 at the latest, the University's portion of MLAC will be full.

The Library is looking into identifying other potential storage spaces, both on and off campus. (Environmental factors, e.g. temperature and humidity, need to be taken into account when looking at alternative locations as well as making sure items can be retrieved).

The Library also needs more programming space for its archives and special collections. To deal with this problem, noted Ms. Johnson, thought has been given to expanding the above ground portion of Andersen Library, although this is not on the University's capital plan. In terms of storage, another cavern is also being discussed. There is enough space for 5 additional caverns. An issue facing construction of another cavern is that there is ground pollution on this site.

Questions/comments from members included:

- What is the utilization of the 40% of the MLAC facility that has been earmarked for use by other libraries? Ms. Johnson noted that these libraries are also at 85% capacity, however, they are moving materials in at a much slower rate than the University.
- Is there duplication of materials stored in the caverns? Yes, there is duplication in the state's portion of MLAC, modest duplication in the University's portion, and there is duplication between the University's portion and the state's portion. There is also some duplication by the Library in terms of materials in the caverns and materials on its shelves. These items include some monograph books and journal runs. Ms. Johnson added that there are a lot of different initiatives going on in the CIC ranging from identifying options for shared storage space to how to collaborate when it comes to sharing materials.
- What fraction of the University's collection has been 'googlized'? This project has not yet started. While the University has not been told when this project will start, it is optimistic that it will be an early participant because of the high preponderance of unique materials in its collections.
- How frequented are the University's libraries by faculty, students and staff in light of technology and being able to access many materials from a remote location?

- Ms. Johnson reported that the libraries have seen a 12% increase in traffic when comparing September 2006 to September 2007. The libraries are very busy.
- Are there plans to have a cafŽ in the Biomedical Library? Ms. Johnson stated that this had been discussed, but because there are so many venues in close proximity to the Biomedical Library that a decision was made not to put a cafŽ at this location.
  - The Library should explore using the old Art School space as a storage facility until the pollution-contaminated site on the West Bank can be cleaned up and another cavern can be built. Ms. Johnson stated that this has been considered. Currently, however, there are many competing building and renovation projects in the queue. Also, funding for a new cavern is an issue. The University Librarian has discussed the space needs of the Libraries with the Provost and other campus administrators on various occasions and will continue to raise awareness regarding this situation throughout the University community.
  - Has there been a decline in journal subscriptions over the past 10 years? Ms. Johnson reported that the University is back to where it was prior to having to undertake a massive cancellation.

Professor Wilcox thanked Ms. Johnson for her presentation.

IV). Hearing no further business, Professor Wilcox adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate