

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY
MINUTES
OCTOBER 29, 1970

The first regular meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly was held in 45 Nicholson Hall on Thursday, October 29, 1970. Signing or checking the roll as present were 100 voting members (75 faculty and 25 students), 5 members of the Administrative Committee, and 53 non-members. President Moos presided. Vice Chairman Eli Rosenfield presided during the last part of the meeting.

The following items were considered and action was taken as indicated.

I. MINUTES OF APRIL 30, 1970
REPORTED FOR ACTION

Approved

II. OFFICERS OF THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY
REPORTED FOR ACTION

The chairman of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly has designated the following as officers for 1970-1971:

Clerk — W. Donald Beatty
Abstractor — David Cooperman
Parliamentarian — Ralph Miller

Approved

III. ASSEMBLY AND CAMPUS COMMITTEES
REPORTED FOR ACTION

Campus Committee on Business and Rules: Roger Page (chairman), Donald Beatty (ex officio), Ronald Brown, John Cound, Eleanor Fenton, Frank Sorauf. Students: Ken Doyle, David Truax.

Assembly Committee on Educational Policy: Stuart Hoyt, (chairman), May Brodbeck. Paul Cashman (ex officio), Orval Driggs, Russell Hamilton, Stanley Kegler (ex officio), Norman Kerr, Toni McNaron, Wallace Russell, William Shepherd (ex officio), James Wernitz, Albert J. Linck. Students: Lonna Malmshemer, Randall Tighe, Robert Sweet.

Campus Committee on Convocations and the Arts: Roy Schuessler (chairman), Kenneth Graham, Norton Hintz, Joseph Kwiat, William C. Rogers, Ross Smith (ex officio), Arnold Walker, Donald Zander (ex officio), Paul W. Larson (ex officio). Students: Mary Cummings, Barbara Koenig, Michael Stoller.

Campus Committee on Educational Services: Cletus Schertz (chairman), Clarence Boeck, Russell Burris (ex officio), B. M. Dornblaser, C. Luverne Carlson (ex officio), Fred Johnson, Kenneth MacCorquodale, Burton Paulu (ex officio), Neville Pearson, Duane Scriber (ex officio), Edward Stanford (ex officio), Frank Verbrugge (ex officio). Students: Jeanne Bear, Ronald Ezuck, Janice Mayeron.

Campus Committee on Honors Programs: Rutherford Aris (chairman), Mary Corrigan, John Hill, John MacGregor, Joseph Schork, D. Burnham Terrell (ex officio). Students: Wayne Krefting, Ernest Rose.

Campus Committee on ROTC: Paul Quie (chairman), Frederick Adelman (ex officio), William Beard (ex officio), William Broughton (ex

officio), Ernest Coleman, William Howell, Arthur Johnson, Rodney Loehr (ex officio), Morris Nicholson, Ludwig Spolyar, John Webb. Students: Michael Carroll, Ronald Foss, Charles Glynn. Alumni: William Harris, Burton Genis.

Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics: Jerome Moss (chairman), Donald Beatty, Hale Champion (ex officio), George Donohue, David Giese, Eloise Jaeger, Mérie Loken, Eugene Pfeider, Max Schultze (ex officio), Marshall Ryman (ex officio), Dale Stein, Stanley Wenberg (ex officio). Students: Todd Andrews, Michael Banks, Robert Randle, John Patrick Wolfe. Alumni: Harry Heltzer, Ronald Simon.

Assembly Committee on Student Affairs: Richard Blue (chairman), Clyde Parker, John Clausen, Miriam Cohn, Russell Hamilton, Walter K. Johnson, Peter Martin, Lawrence Smith (vice chairman), Frank Wood, Donald Zander (ex officio), Lud Spolyar (secretary). Students: Vijay Gupta, Rod MacPherson, Alan Margoles, Jane Nielsen, Susan Pappas, Curtis Pratt, Amy Ribble, Allan Badiner, Joyce Seelen, Barbara Silesky, James Stein, Cliff Swanson, Robert Sweet. Alumni: Charlotte Boyles, Grace Gohdes.

Campus Committee on Intramural and Extramural Activities: Vera Schletzer (chairman), Eloise Jaeger (ex officio), Kenneth Graham (ex officio), Glen Gullickson, Keith McFarland, Ed Siggelkow (ex officio), Mary Wyvell. Students: Cynthia Hoger, Roger Nunn, Judith Schoeberl, Floyd Tweten, Gregory Ustruck.

Campus Judiciary Council: John O'Brien (chairman), William Brown, David French, James Reeves (ex officio), Harlan Smith. Students: Nicholas Barbatsis, Joan Buehrer, Warren Dorn, Howard Schwartz, Steven Smith.

Campus Foreign Student Committee: James Kingsley (chairman), Charles Fairhurst, Warren Ibele (ex officio), Theodore Kellogg (ex officio), Phillip Kernan (ex officio), Carolyn Rose, Forrest Moore (ex officio), Betty Robinett, William Rogers (ex officio), Joseph Schwartzberg, William Wright (ex officio), Selmer Engene. Students: Jonah Chu, Eileen Crowley, Margarita Gangotena, C. V. Mathai, Masaki Madono.

Approved

IV. SPECIAL NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORTED FOR ACTION

The Chairman of the Assembly appoints the following as members of a nominating committee to nominate candidates to fill, by the election procedure, 1971-72 vacancies on the Assembly Steering Committee: **The Assembly Steering Committee is also the Assembly Executive Committee and forms the Twin Cities membership of the Senate Consultative Committee.** Vernon Ruttan (chairman), Rutherford Aris, Adele Donchenko, William Gardner, and Frank Sorauf.

Approved

V. REPORT OF THE TWIN CITIES ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE REPORTED FOR ACTION

On or about October 1, 1970, a group of ten elected members of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly forwarded, through the Clerk of the Assembly, a request to the Chairman for a special meeting to discuss the "Proposed Increase in Fees for on-Campus Parking." Following discussion with the Assembly Steering Committee, it was agreed that the request for a special meeting would be withdrawn with the understanding that the item would be placed on the docket for the regular fall meeting, and that any increase in fees would be postponed until November 15, 1970. Reports will be made by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning.

CARL A. AUERBACH
Chairman

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES
AND PLANNING
REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

To provide some perspective and setting for the discussion about parking and related matters, the Assembly Committee on Resources and Planning makes the following observations:

A. On September 11, 1967, the report of the ad hoc Committee on Circulation and Parking entitled "Long-Range Goals and Immediate Program" was forwarded to President Moos. In a covering letter particular attention was directed toward the following items:

1. The projected 1980 parking needs. The committee (ad hoc Committee on Circulation and Parking) strongly urges that all possible steps be taken to reduce these needs. The highest priority is the need for the University to actively encourage and lend support to development of an effective metropolitan mass transit system.
2. The need to begin immediate development of additional parking structures with an appropriate adjustment of parking charges to finance these developments now and through the next decade.
3. The need for effective University cooperation with other agencies to insure wise development of highway facilities to and through the University community. Most important are: the tunneling of Washington Avenue and the development of increased capacity for Snelling Avenue and Route 280.
4. The need to improve intracampus bus service and continue studies leading toward more effective transit services when appropriate technologies become available.
5. The need to support policies to reduce vehicular traffic within the campus and to separate, insofar as possible, vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic.

The Resources and Planning Committee stresses the importance of the fifth point. To a substantial degree, the physical safety and health of members of the University community and the attractiveness of our campus will be measured by the degree to which we achieve this goal. *It constitutes an important planning principle for the campus.*

B. The physical expansion of the University since 1945 in response to rising enrollment has had a profound impact on Southeast Minneapolis. The uncertainty surrounding the University's long-range goals and space requirements have made community planning nearly impossible. Recently the Board of Regents has informed the surrounding community that the present boundaries of the Minneapolis West Bank Campus are fixed and, with two possible major exceptions, the boundaries of the Minneapolis East Bank Campus are fixed as well. (The first exception is that the Veterans Administration may elect to build a facility to the east of the planned Health Sciences complex. The second is that there may be a realignment of the eastern boundary depending on the route of the connector from the Dartmouth interchange and the one-way pair, University Avenue S.E. and Fourth Street S.E.) To alter in any substantial way the boundaries of the Minneapolis East-West Bank Campus would, in the committee's judgment, constitute a breach of faith with the community. *Thus as a second planning principle the committee agrees that the present Minneapolis Campus boundaries should remain fixed, except for the two possibilities cited above.*

C. The Twin Cities Campus is one of the four largest traffic generators in the seven-county metropolitan area (together with the central business districts of Minneapolis and St. Paul and the strip surrounding the south section of I-494). As with all metropolitan areas we have a transportation problem. It is certain to grow worse before it improves. The University's sheer size, its position as a public institution, and its educational philosophy require that it contribute toward the solution of this area-wide problem. *As a third planning principle the committee*

believes the University should actively encourage and support the development of an effective metropolitan public transportation system.

D. In our present circumstances these principles, separately or in combination, provide a framework for decision. The development of the Bierman Field recreational-sports facility on the East Campus removed 1,150 places in the summer of 1970; eventually 1,650 spaces will be lost. Work on the Health Sciences complex on the East Campus has taken 90 spaces. Construction on the Performing Arts Building on the West Campus will probably begin this academic year claiming 320 spaces. In total, over 2,000 spaces have been lost, or will be, during this academic year. In addition the river flat lots (capacity 1,150 cars) are leased by the University from the Minneapolis Park Board which can reclaim this space on 90-day notice. The Park Board has informed the University (letter dated June 9, 1969) that it should be prepared to discontinue the use of this area as a parking area no later than December 31, 1973. It is estimated that presently 6,000 vehicles park along the streets of Southeast Minneapolis at the sufferance of the Minneapolis Police Department since the city's ordinance allows only 2-hour parking. This in itself constitutes an imposition on the citizens of the immediate community.

Principles 1 and 2 indicate that multi-level parking facilities should be constructed on the periphery of the campus. The four facilities (two West Campus, two East Campus) are consistent with these planning principles. The fifth facility for St. Paul has not been located as yet since academic and physical planning for that campus are in progress. Access to the interior of the campus from the peripheral parking facilities should be provided by an intracampus circulation system.

With the advent of public ownership of the Twin Cities bus system it is possible to meet the special transportation needs of certain areas. *We urge that routes, schedules, and fares for express facilities be arranged in order to attract the widest possible acceptance of this service.* The present express bus routes are an important first step in this direction.

E. Summary and Recommendations

1. The Assembly Committee on Resources and Planning is persuaded, because of the existing deficit of parking spaces, the loss of spaces due to campus construction and development, and a further need due to anticipated growth, that the size and location of the proposed facilities are consistent with the above planning principles.

2. The committee is further persuaded that a substantial increase in the revenues generated by parking is required, both to sustain present operations, and to provide resources for the required construction and maintenance of new facilities.

3. The committee is in the process of reviewing the scheduling of construction, the financing of construction, and the relation of these factors to the proposed rate increases. The results of this study will be reported to the Assembly at the earliest opportunity.

4. There remain unresolved issues such as equity among users, curbside parking in the community surrounding the University, and parking income allocation. To assist in the resolution of these issues, the Assembly Committee on Resources and Planning proposes the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Parking, with representation from all affected parties (including representatives from the surrounding community) to work cooperatively with the Central Parking Office.

Members of the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning

John Borchert	Roger Wilk	Ken Zimmerman, ex officio
Robert Mulhausen	Peter Hames	Hale Champion, ex officio
Hosni Iskander	John McLaren	William Shepherd, ex officio
Hugh Peacock	Thomas Mortenson	Donald Smith, ex officio
Vernon Ruttan	William MacNally	Stanley Wenberg, ex officio
James Wertz	John Neter, ex officio	Warren Ibele, chairman

Accepted

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

Since Vice President Hale Champion first announced the proposed changes in parking rates and arrangements on September 23, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (hereafter SCFA) has invested 8 hours of meetings and many additional hours of informal discussion and thought to the consideration of the parking problem. We have received and considered numerous communications from our faculty colleagues. Vice President Champion has made himself available to all our meetings and there has been a liberal interchange of arguments and counterarguments. The recommendations of SCFA represent the outcome of this process.

BACKGROUND ASSUMPTIONS

The Senate Committee on Resources and Planning has discussed factors affecting the future supply of parking spaces (loss of River Flats to the Park Board, loss to new construction, planned additions through the construction of five additional ramps, the decision of the University to fix the boundaries of the Minneapolis Campus and not to encroach further upon adjacent business and residential neighborhoods). In our discussion we accept these factors as given.

A Review of Issues and Principles

The number of issues and principles which may be adduced for their solution is great. We review—but only in outline—the issues and principles. In addition, we comment on principles where it seems helpful. Finally, we have included our Committee Recommendations—“SCFA recommends”—at appropriate points. Our recommendations are numbered to facilitate reference.

We would like to assure our faculty colleagues that we have carefully sought to digest all of this considerable menu of argument and counterargument. We might add that some of the foods on our menu did not go well together and the committee has experienced some symptoms of indigestion. As we will make clear later, the committee feels it needs some time for its meal to settle.

I. The Parking Budget: Items for Inclusion or Exclusion

The “parking budget” consists of an account in which all parking-related revenues and expenses are entered. The following items might be considered controversial.

- A. *Maintenance of the University Police Department.* Vice President Champion has stated that, until now, many expenses of the University Police Department have been included in the parking budget. He has pledged that beginning July 1 only those police expenses directly related to parking will be included.
 1. *SCFA approves* the exclusion of nonparking police expenses from the parking budget.
- B. *Parking-Related Buses vs. Intercampus Buses.* “Parking-related buses” are those which carry people to and from parking lots. The regular intercampus buses are *not* parking-related buses. Vice President Champion has stated that expenses of parking-related buses should be included in the parking budget.
 2. *SCFA concurs:* Expenses of parking-related buses (but *not* other buses) should be included in the parking budget.

C. *Land Acquisition and Transfer.* According to Vice President Champion, the costs of land acquired specifically for parking purposes has been included in the parking budget at original cost.

However, University-owned land *not* specifically acquired for parking has been transferred from one use to another without benefit of accounting entries. Presumably transfers have taken place in response to judgments regarding the relative social productivity of various usages. Presumably the long-range plans of the University reflect these judgments.

The only land acquisition now contemplated is the Burlington Northern lot. It is proposed that each year's payment on the lease be included in the parking budget for that year.

3. *SCFA approves* the treatment of land acquisition and transfers as outlined above.

D. *The Validity of Parking Budget Accounts and Estimates.* Both public and private discussions with faculty members disclose a deepset suspicion of both the items and dollar amounts charged to the parking budget in the past. Similar doubts appear to exist with respect to the future cost estimates upon which the proposed parking rate increases rest.

It is clearly in the interest of both the faculty and the administration that any questionable items or estimates be identified and evaluated. From the conceptual viewpoint the skills of the economic analyst are required while the determination of what is included and what is excluded requires the skills of a professional auditor.

4. *SCFA recommends* that the Departments of Accounting and Economics be asked respectively to designate one or more auditors and one or more economists to review past entries in the parking budget as well as the cost-revenue estimates upon which the proposed parking rate increases rest. *SCFA recommends further* that the reviewers be asked to report their findings to SCFA by November 27. In turn, SCFA, after acting on them, will transmit them to the Twin Cities Assembly.

II. Accessibility to Parking

At present between 200 and 250 faculty are on waiting lists and do not have access to contract parking, regardless of price.

5. *SCFA recommends* that every faculty member have access to a contract parking lot even if close-in space for parking on a day rate basis must be reduced. See "Social Productivity" arguments below for justification of this treatment.

Given the backlog just cited, faculty members are at present forced to pay for parking even when they don't need or use it—in order to reserve their right of future access. This is the case for many faculty members when they are away on sabbaticals, leave-without-pay, or just for the summer.

6. *SCFA recommends* that no parking fees be levied when persons are absent for one term or more. *SCFA further recommends* that their right to contract parking be preserved when they resume their regular on-campus University duties. (This recommendation will be met if the faculty parking queue is reduced to zero.)

III. Consultation and the Effective Date for New Parking Rates

In November 1969, SCFA asked Vice President Champion to review the parking situation and in particular the principles lying behind long-range planning in this area. Mr. Champion demurred on the grounds that a special committee was considering the entire parking problem. The subject was discussed for perhaps 15 minutes in the May 1970 meeting of SCFA. At that time no hint whatsoever was given that proposals for substantial increases in parking rates were just over the horizon. Thus, neither SCFA nor the AAUP could take account of this factor in making recommendations to the University administration regarding faculty compensation.

The revelation of the proposed drastic increases came on September 23 when Vice President Champion asked SCFA and the Senate Committee on Planning and Resources to meet with him—at breakfast, no less—to receive and react to proposed new parking rates.

In all fairness to Vice President Champion it should be noted that these discussions were held up because the 1970-71 parking arrangements and the related parking rates depended heavily upon the renting of a 2,000-space lot from Burlington Northern Railroad as well as the establishment of an express bus system with the help of the Metropolitan Transit Council. Unfortunately Burlington Northern was in bureaucratic disarray following its June merger and the Metropolitan Transit Council only took possession of the Twin Cities Bus Lines a week before our meeting.

Because of the relative lack of time for meaningful consultation and because of the complicated arguments which must be sifted out, SCFA is not yet ready to make recommendations regarding pricing to the Twin Cities Assembly.

7. In the meantime SCFA recommends that (1) no change in parking rates become effective until January (except for the Burlington Northern rates already announced), and (2) that SCFA report its recommendations regarding parking rates to the Twin Cities Assembly for consideration at its next meeting.

IV. Principles Related to the Pricing of University Parking

We felt that it would be useful for our faculty colleagues to know the range of arguments which we have considered. These are set forth below.

A. Income Effect

An \$80 increase in parking fees is equivalent to an income loss of anywhere from about \$105 to \$125, depending upon the faculty member's marginal income tax rate. (For example, given marginal income tax rates of .28 and .08 for the Federal and Minnesota governments respectively, a person must receive money incomes of \$119 in order to spend \$80. The difference is the \$39 of income taxes he will pay.) Depending upon the income increment received this year, the increase in parking fees would eat up anywhere from 10 percent to 25 percent of the increase in income. This, in a year when increases in general price levels are expected to just about equal the average increase in faculty compensation.

B. Faculty Recruiting Effect

For other Big Ten universities parking fees are much lower than either present fees or those proposed, ranging from \$23 per year at Michigan to \$60 at Ohio State for the cheapest contract parking.

Offsetting the higher rates at Minnesota are the attractions of a metropolitan area, matched only in Chicago by Northwestern and the University of Chicago.

If the University makes contract parking accessible to all faculty members, this would remove one major competitive disadvantage.

C. Social Productivity Argument

Faculty, more so than students, are useful to others. They must be present on campus most of the time to be useful to students, other faculty, and the public. Anything—either a waiting list or a high parking fee—which keeps faculty from being present on campus will reduce their usefulness.

This is the basis for the SCFA recommendation that every faculty member have access to a contract parking space.

It is an open empirical question as to whether the proposed 84 percent increase in contract rates will affect the amount of time faculty spend on campus.

D. Prices and Rational Resource Allocation

A first principle is that users of a product should pay the cost of providing the product. Thus, users of parking should be charged fees which cover amortization of parking structures, current operating expenses (attendants' fees, plowing, etc.), parking-related bus services, depreciation of structures, parking-related police services, and leases of non-University land. This is to say that the parking budget should be, approximately, a zero-profit operation.

A second principle is that, approximately, users of parking in a particular year should bear the costs of providing parking services in that year. That is, while most would prefer fairly stable fees over time, there should not be large subsidies of users in one year by users in another.

Prices to particular users should not only be differentiated by the quantity and quality of services provided, but also in the interest of securing socially desirable movements of cars and people.

Specifically, prices should be differentiated by:

Quantity of Space Provided. Small spaces and less than average rates should be provided for parkers with small cars.

Quality of Space. Thus, users of *garages* should pay more. It is possible to argue that the price should be sufficiently high to reduce the queue to zero, the profits therefrom reducing the cost of parking to other users.

Proximity. Contract and day-rate lots in convenient locations should pay more than is charged in geographically remote lots, e.g., Burlington Northern.

Time of Day, on day-rate lots. The total size of the parking lot depends upon the number of users *at the peak hour*. Hence, these should bear more of the cost than nonpeak users. The principle would be to set a price high enough so that there was no queue. The additional revenues could be used to reduce prices at other times of day.

Time-of-day differentials would not be applied to faculty users of contract lots on the argument that their duties require them to come and go intermittently from campus.

An additional principle is that all persons receiving the same class of service would be charged the same. Thus, a person on a paved but undeveloped lot would pay the same as a person using a ramp of equal accessibility despite the fact that the provision of a ramp space is more costly than the provision of an open lot space. That is, costs would be aggregated for all in the system receiving the same class of service. Then, the aggregated cost would be shared equally by all users in the group.

The Traffic Jam Effect. A final principle is that near-in parkers as well as non-University drivers passing through the University "neighborhood" at peak hours have an interest in the prevention of traffic jams. By extension this means that these two groups have an interest in providing attractive substitutes for near-in parking. One possibility, the Burlington Northern lot, was mentioned above. A second possibility is the provision of express buses or other subsidies to mass transit users.

The reduction or elimination of traffic jams affects both near-in University parkers and non-University passers-through. Thus, it is reasonable that parking revenues collected from near-in parkers be used to subsidize both the Burlington Northern lot and mass transit. It is also evident that there is a public interest in a mass transit subsidy which might be recognized through a legislative subsidy. The gain to the public would be fewer I-94 and Highway 280 traffic jams.

**RECOVERY OF FACULTY-STUDENT-VISITOR
SUBSIDIES TO LAW AND ORDER**

As noted much earlier, many expenses of the University Police—and not merely the parking-related police activities—have been in the parking budget until now. Thus, in effect, users of parking—faculty, students, visitors—have been subsidizing law and order on the campus.

8. SCFA recommends that the extent of this subsidy be ascertained and, if possible, be recovered retroactively to be applied to reducing parking fees at the margin.

**COMPARISONS OF UNIVERSITY PARKING ARRANGEMENTS
WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS**

Big Ten Universities

In all institutions all faculty have access to contract parking at rates ranging from \$23 per year to \$60 at Ohio State for lot parking.

Students are allowed on-campus parking only at Chicago, Iowa, and Minnesota.

Both existing and proposed Minnesota rates far exceed any rates charged in our sister institutions.

However, none of these institutions has anything like the population density observable on the Minneapolis Campus. One special case is Chicago which, though it has a large commuting student body, is well served by both subway and railroad commuter systems.

State Employees in the St. Paul Complex

Rates charged are as follows:

Open lots	\$36 per year
Ramps:	
Top Deck	\$48 per year
Covered, but cold	\$60 per year
Covered, heated	\$90 per year
Capitol Square lot	\$60 per year

Again, University rates are higher. Again, however, population densities are probably appreciably lower at the State Capitol (though the committee currently lacks exact figures).

Sub-Executives in Downtown Minneapolis

It is our impression that employees in most businesses pay for their own parking and renting spaces from commercial parking companies. Rates range from \$180 to \$360, depending upon location.

Here University rates are lower. Further, population density is probably lower at the University than in the heart of the loop.

Sub-Executives in Suburban Businesses

Our impression is that most such businesses provide parking without charge as a condition of employment. Given the lower population density, the extent of the subsidy is probably not great.

PARKING AS A FRINGE BENEFIT

At the very first meeting held with Vice President Champion, one of the first questions asked was the possibility of treating parking fees as a "fringe benefit"—that is, as a part of faculty compensation under which the University makes a direct payment into the parking budget and hence this payment is not counted as part of faculty money income for tax purposes.

Vice President Champion raised three objections. The first was that the provision of differential benefits with salary adjustments ultimately to faculty members would not qualify under IRS regulations as a legitimate fringe benefit. Professor Scallen, a member of the Law School faculty and of SCFA, confirmed this judgment. Since that time Professor Scallen has considered the matter and feels that in certain forms parking fees could qualify as legal fringe benefits. More definite judgments, however, require more time and thought.

The second objection was that prices would have their desired resource allocation effect only when they were highly visible. Treating parking fees as fringe benefits would reduce their visibility. At the time, members of SCFA were convinced. Now we have doubts. We feel that contract lot parkers—mostly faculty—are likely to be highly unresponsive to price changes (in terms of shifting to other arrangements) while day lot parkers—mostly students—are likely to be responsive. If correct, this removes a cogent argument against converting parking fees to fringe benefits.

The third objection is one of equity and of resource allocation—the interest of parkers vs. those who have no need for parking (those who walk, cycle, or bus to campus).

The strong "pro" argument is that conversion of parking fees to a fringe benefit basis would reduce its cost by one-third due to reduced income taxes.

SCFA is now reconsidering this entire issue, but does not feel that it is ready to report as yet.

Members of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs include: E. Scott Maynes, *chairman*; Thomas G. Boman, Isabel Harris, Eric Klinger, Robert C. Morris, Stephen B. Scallen, C. Arthur Williams, consultant and former chairman; Hale Champion (*ex officio*), William G. Shepherd (*ex officio*). Because of schedule conflicts, Eric Klinger of the Morris Campus did not participate in any of the discussions on parking. Thomas Boman of the Duluth Campus has been present at one of the three meetings in which parking was discussed.

Accepted

VI. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES

1. REPORTED FOR ACTION

The following recommendations, directed toward clarifying some Assembly procedures and improving others, were adopted by the University Senate last spring. They are now presented to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly as rules for the conduct of Assembly and Assembly Committee business.

1. In the Twin Cities Assembly and all of its committees, standing or special, the motion to table shall be debatable.

Rationale: Under common parliamentary procedure, the motion to table is not debatable. One result of following this procedure is that debate may be ended by the simple majority vote required to pass the motion to

table, although the long standing tradition in American deliberative bodies is that a two-thirds majority is required to end debate. (The motion for the previous question, which is the appropriate motion to end debate and which is not itself debatable, requires two-thirds.) The committee believes that the Assembly's interests would be best served by having the motion to table debatable so that argument for and against tabling can be heard. If a member wishes to end debate, he should move to close debate ("the previous question") on either the main motion, an amendment, or a motion to table, and obtain a two-thirds majority.

2. The quorum for Assembly committees, standing or special, shall be a majority of the members.

Rationale: This is in accordance with usual parliamentary procedure, but a specific statement on the matter in the Assembly Handbook brings it directly to the attention of the committees. A committee needs to know under what conditions it may do business.

3. Each Assembly committee, standing or special may determine for itself who may be present at its meetings other than duly appointed or elected members of the committee and may make its own rules of procedure.

Rationale: Of course a committee must have authority to control its own meetings and this statement is directed toward reinforcing that principle. If a committee votes to admit non-members, it may determine what participation if any is to be accorded them. Even when non-members are permitted to be present, a committee may move to executive session for part of a meeting. Included among non-members in these procedures are representatives of the press.

Among the issues to be considered in determining the attendance of non-members, especially representatives of the press, is the committee's need to bring its proposals to a certain stage of development before they are released to the public. On the other hand, many issues benefit from public hearings as a procedure for developing committee positions. It is for a committee to decide when public meetings are needed and at what time its recommendations are ready for consideration by others.

4. The Assembly meeting room shall provide a clear and definite identification of the area reserved for Assemblymen; no Assemblyman (except authorized alternate) shall have access to the Assembly floor except with the explicit permission of the chair. There shall be a system for identifying Assemblymen (or authorized alternates) in order to permit their seating and appropriate voting.

Rationale: With the broader attendance now possible at Assembly meetings (any faculty member or student), the room arrangements must be somewhat more formal and more carefully controlled than was previously necessary.

5. If the chairman of an Assembly committee, standing or special, or, in his absence, a single member designated by him, is not an Assemblyman, such chairman or member shall be extended the privileges of the Assembly floor, including making motions, in connection with a report of his committee or any activity of the Assembly which pertains to the business of his committee. He may not vote, however.

Rationale: A committee's ability to serve the Assembly is severely limited if the committee chairman can not engage directly in the parliamentary maneuvers often necessary to protect and further the interests of his committee. Presentation of the committee report, handling amendments and other challenges, and general representation of the committee's purposes require that the chairman be authorized to make motions. This proposal is a bylaw change and should be acted on by the Assembly under rules governing bylaw changes.

6. In Assembly deliberations, priority of recognition shall ordinarily be give to Assemblymen (and chairmen of committees) over non-Assemblymen.

Rationale: The Assembly constitution states that non-Assemblymen may speak "at the discretion of the Assembly" and this positive, operational statement seems to follow directly from that provision.

Approved

2. REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

The approved dates for the meetings of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly and the University Senate, together with the deadlines for the submission of materials for the dockets are as follows:

1. Twin Cities Campus Assembly

Winter quarter, February 4, 1971

Docket material due, January 22

Spring quarter, April 29, 1971

Docket material due, April 16

2. University Senate

Fall quarter, December 3, 1970

Docket material due, November 20

Winter quarter, March 11, 1971

Docket material due, February 26

Spring quarter, May 27, 1971

Docket material due, May 14

The committee requests that you please mark your calendars accordingly.

Accepted

VII. REPORT OF ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

1. REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

The Big Ten Conference has approved an 11-game football schedule which will include not less than 8 games against Conference opponents. Minnesota will attempt to play 11 games starting in 1971. The approved 1971 and 1972 schedules are reported below.

The Conference has also approved an amendment to its regulations which permits members to use their athletic facilities for contests by professional sports teams or organizations for pre-season contests scheduled at least 15 days prior to the opening contest of any Conference member in that sport. The use of facilities for occasional practices by professional teams is permitted. Use of athletic facilities at other times may be authorized by a majority vote of the Athletic Directors.

In March 1969 the University Senate authorized participation of freshmen on varsity teams in sports other than basketball and football. Information to date indicates that such competition did not prevent student-athletes from attaining satisfactory grade point averages; freshmen who have competed earned a 2.62 grade point average, while freshmen student-athletes who did not have varsity competition earned a 2.54 grade point average.

Accepted

2. REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

Approved Schedules

BASKETBALL 1970-71

December	1	North Dakota
	5	Iowa State
	8	Marquette
	10	Loyola — at Loyola Stadium
	21	Bradley
	22	Drake — at Des Moines, Iowa
	26	University of Evansville — at Evansville, Indiana
	28	Virginia Commonwealth University — at Richmond, Va.
January	2	Notre Dame — at South Bend, Indiana
	5	Niagara University
	9	Purdue
	12	Indiana — at Bloomington, Indiana
	16	Purdue — at Lafayette, Indiana
	23	Ohio State
	30	Michigan
February	6	Illinois — at Champaign, Illinois
	13	Michigan State
	16	Iowa
	20	Michigan — at Ann Arbor, Michigan
	23	Northwestern — at Evanston, Illinois
	27	Illinois
March	2	Ohio State — at Columbus, Ohio
	6	Wisconsin
	9	Michigan State — at East Lansing, Michigan

CROSS COUNTRY, 1970

October	3	Wisconsin — at Madison, Wisconsin
	10	Indiana
	17	Michigan State — at East Lansing, Michigan
	24	Drake
	31	Iowa
November	7	Northwestern — at Evanston, Illinois
	14	Big Ten — at East Lansing, Michigan

GYMNASTICS, 1970-71

December	5	Big Ten Invitational — at East Lansing, Michigan
January	8	St. Cloud State
	15	Mankato State — at Mankato, Minnesota
	16	Illinois (Chicago Circle)
	23	Michigan State
	30	Indiana — at Bloomington, Indiana
February	6	Michigan
	13	Iowa
	20	Wisconsin
	27	Illinois — at Champaign, Illinois
March	5, 6	Conference Meet — at Columbus, Ohio
April	1-3	NCAA Championship — at Ann Arbor, Michigan

HOCKEY, 1970-71

November	13, 14	Duluth — at Duluth, Minnesota
	20, 21	Michigan State
	27, 28	Colorado State — at Colorado Springs, Colorado
December	5 or 6	U.S. Nationals
	21	Boston College — at Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

22 Boston University — at Boston, Massachusetts
 26 Polish National Team — at Zug, Switzerland
 28 Chaux-de-Fonds — at Chaux-de-Fonds
 29 Swiss National Team — at Lyss, Switzerland
 30 Swiss National (tentative) — at Geneva, Switzerland
 January 8, 9 Duluth
 15, 16 Michigan Tech
 22, 23 Michigan State — at East Lansing, Michigan
 29, 30 North Dakota
 February 5, 6 Wisconsin
 12, 13 North Dakota — at Grand Forks, North Dakota
 19, 20 Wisconsin — at Madison, Wisconsin
 26, 27 Michigan
 March 3 U.S. Nationals — at Metropolitan Sports Arena, Mpls.
 11-13 WCHA Playoffs

SWIMMING, 1970-71

Nov. 19-21 Water Show
 December 5 Minnesota Intersquad
 January 9 Big Ten Relays — at Iowa
 15 Michigan — at Ann Arbor, Michigan
 16 Michigan State — at East Lansing, Michigan
 23 Northwestern — at Evanston, Illinois
 29 Ohio State and (tentative) Brigham Young
 30 Indiana
 February 6 Iowa State and Nebraska
 13 Wisconsin and Purdue — at Madison, Wisconsin
 20 Iowa — at Iowa City, Iowa
 27 Open
 March 4-6 Big Ten Championships — at Columbus, Ohio
 25-27 NCAA Championships — at Ames, Iowa
 April 9-11 National AAU Short Course
 Championships and Pan-Am Trials — at Pullman, Wash.

INDOOR TRACK, 1971

January 30 North Dakota
 February 6 Iowa — at Iowa City, Iowa
 13 Michigan State Relay — at East Lansing, Michigan
 19-20 Northwest Open
 27 Northwestern
 March 6-7 Big Ten — at Madison, Wisconsin

OUTDOOR TRACK, 1971

March 21 Louisiana State, Northern Illinois, Houston, Pennsylvania,
 State, Tennessee
 27 Louisiana State University Invitational
 April 2-3 Texas Relays — at Austin, Texas
 10 Nebraska — at Lincoln, Nebraska
 17 Indiana — at Bloomington, Indiana
 23-24 Drake — at Des Moines, Iowa
 May 1 Illinois
 8 Wisconsin — at Madison, Wisconsin
 15 Wisconsin, Iowa
 22 Open
 28-29 Big Ten — (to be determined)

WRESTLING, 1970-71

November	28	U.S. Wrestling Federation Open Invitational Tournament
December	4	North Dakota
	5	North Dakota State
	19	Navy, Missouri, South Dakota State — at Brookings, S.D.
	29	Midlands Tournament — at La Grange, Illinois
	30	USWE Open Tournament — at La Grange, Illinois
January	2	Northwestern
	4	Purdue
	9	Nebraska
	16	Indiana, Wisconsin, (and other team)
	23	Superior State of Wisconsin
	30	Kansas State
February	6	Illinois
	13	Iowa, Ohio State, Wisconsin — at Madison, Wisconsin
	19	Northern Iowa — at Cedar Falls, Iowa
	20	Iowa — at Iowa City, Iowa
	26	Michigan State — at East Lansing, Michigan
	27	Michigan — at Ann Arbor, Michigan
March	5-6	Big Ten Conference — at Lafayette, Indiana
	12-13	NCAA Districts — at Northern, Illinois
	25-27	NCAA Final Championships — at Auburn, Alabama

Approved Revised Schedules

FOOTBALL, 1971

September	11	Indiana
	18	Nebraska — at Lincoln, Nebraska
	25	Washington State
October	2	Kansas
	9	Purdue — at Lafayette, Indiana
	16	Iowa — at Iowa City, Iowa
	23	Michigan
	30	Ohio State
November	6	Northwestern — at Evanston, Illinois
	13	Michigan State — at East Lansing, Michigan
	20	Wisconsin

FOOTBALL, 1972

September	16	Indiana — at Bloomington, Indiana
	23	Colorado
	30	Nebraska — at Lincoln, Nebraska
October	7	Kansas
	14	Purdue
	21	Iowa
	28	Michigan — at Ann Arbor, Michigan
November	4	Ohio State — at Columbus, Ohio
	11	Northwestern
	18	Michigan State
	25	Wisconsin — at Madison, Wisconsin

FRESHMAN FOOTBALL, 1970

October	23	Bemidji State Junior Varsity
	30	Iowa Freshmen
November	6	Wisconsin Freshmen — at Madison, Wisconsin

JEROME MOSS, JR.
Chairman

Accepted

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

IX. NEW BUSINESS

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly adjourned.

W. DONALD BEATTY
Clerk

**The next regular
meeting of the Assembly
is scheduled for
February 4, 1971.
Docket materials
are due January 22.**

Appendix

ABSTRACT OF DISCUSSION

Minutes of the last meeting were approved.

1970-71 Assembly Officers

The President named Donald Beatty, clerk; David Cooperman, abstractor; and Ralph Miller, parliamentarian.

Assembly and Campus Committees

Memberships on the committees were approved.

Special Nominating Committee

Approval by the faculty members of the Assembly was granted to the slate of nominees for a committee to select candidates to fill the 1971-72 faculty vacancies on the Assembly Steering Committee.

Parking

Warren Ibele, associate dean of the Graduate School and chairman of the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning, opened the discussion of parking and its related problems. He cited first some conclusions reached by the ad hoc Committee on Parking and Circulation in September 1967, including recognition of the importance of encouraging an effective metropolitan mass transit system; immediate development of parking structures with an appropriate adjustment of parking charges; cooperation in the development of highways to and through the University community; improvement of intracampus bus service; and policies to reduce vehicular traffic within the campus. He emphasized that the committee agreed that the latter point was an important planning principle, that the present Minneapolis Campus boundaries should remain fixed (with two possible exceptions), and that the University should support the development of a metropolitan public transportation system. He said the principles indicated that parking facilities should be constructed on the periphery of the campus and that the Twin Cities bus system should be encouraged to arrange facilities to attract the widest possible acceptance of its service. The committee endorsed the proposed facilities and recognized that a substantial increase in parking revenue was needed, and it was currently reviewing the relation of the proposed increases to the schedule of construction and the financing of the construction, he said. To assist in resolving such issues as equity among users, parking in the surrounding community, and parking income allocation, he said the committee proposed establishment of an advisory committee on parking, which would have representation from the surrounding community, as well as all other affected campus groups.

Scott Maynes, professor of economics and chairman of the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, presented a paper drawn up by his committee. It, too, contained a review of the issues and a statement of the principles upon which the committee's recommendations were based. The committee, he said, approved the exclusion of nonparking police expenses from the parking budget, the inclusion of charges for parking-related buses, the inclusion of costs of land acquired for parking purposes only, and it recommended that the Accounting and Economics De-

partments designate auditors to review procedures and report to his committee. The committee further recommended that every faculty member have access to contract parking, and that persons absent for one term or more not be required to pay a fee in order to preserve their parking rights. Mr. Maynes reported that his committee had met with Vice President Champion, and would present recommendations on rates at the next Assembly meeting. In the meantime it recommended no change in parking rates before January. Mr. Maynes went on to outline certain principles related to the pricing of parking which the committee had considered. They included the income effect, the faculty recruiting effect, a social productivity argument, and a statement of the committee's arguments on price and resource allocation. Another section of the report dealt with comparisons of University parking arrangements with those of other organizations and with parking as a fringe benefit.

Interspersed during Mr. Maynes' discussion were various questions of clarification. A spokesman for Local 1164, AFL-CIO, spoke briefly against the proposed increase.

Hale Champion, vice president for finance, planning and operations, reviewed the cost factors which had given rise to the proposed increase. He reported that there had been no administrative conclusion on when the proposed rates would be effective, and that there had been and continued to be consultation with as many groups as possible. He indicated that the parking operation must be solvent, that a 30 percent revenue increase was needed to meet current requirements by January 1971, and that the required additional 40 percent increase could be delayed until July 1. He recognized that the cost-of-living and income effects were important factors, that University salaries were failing to keep pace with the rising cost-of-living, and that resources would be sought at the 1971 session of the legislature. He said that no parking revenues would be used for other purposes. On the fringe benefit question, he reminded the Assembly that the University's forthcoming request to the legislature would be \$17 million over the \$75 million for the current year, and that any additional request would be competitive with other requests to the legislature. He pointed out that not all people at the University would benefit from any funds allocated to subsidize parking. He further reported his fear of increasing pollution and lack of concern for aesthetic considerations.

John Wertz, professor of physical chemistry, emphasized that proposed construction would require a significant sum of money. He observed that higher rates would merely drive more cars into the already crowded neighboring area, and that parking space lost when Bierman Field was established was not replaced by a facility in that area. He further noted that July might not bring salary increases for many employees, and that the proposed rates would put the University at a disadvantage in recruiting. He questioned the feasibility of financing five ramps in 5 years from charges levied on people in the under \$10,000 salary range, and suggested adoption of a scale of charges graded by rank, title, or something similar. In conclusion, he voiced a hope that the University could continue to provide a stimulating climate for learning and productivity.

(At this point President Moos turned the meeting over to Eli Rosenfield, vice chairman of the Assembly.)

David Feigal, student assemblyman, observed that an increase in rates would drive more cars to off-campus parking in the community. He noted that tuition would also be increasing, and that in spite of higher charges it would still be cheaper to drive to the campus than use public transportation, so there would be no easing in pollution.

Russell S. Adams, associate professor of soil science, distributed the results of a questionnaire submitted to the St. Paul staff, which related to salaries, driving

habits, and preferences. He said the results were based on a return of 475 responses, and substantiated his premise that the proposed fees would be discriminatory, that there was widespread use of personal cars by academic personnel in the course of their work, and that in most cases there was no other way to travel without taking extra time. He suggested that the University work closely with the surrounding community and that extensive use of minibuses be considered. He noted that pollution might be increased rather than decreased because of additional trips to the campus required where people preferred to leave their cars at home and to be driven to the campus.

Tom Mortenson, member of the Resources and Planning Committee, touched on certain statistics which he had compiled pertaining to projected parking needs by 1977. He said that 50 percent of University students commute by car, that there were over 10,000 cars daily on the campus, and a shortage of 5,000 to 6,000 spaces. He indicated that students had subsidized contract parking for about 7 years and called for a rate which would be self-supporting after consultation with residents of the adjacent communities and the civil service staff of the University.

Business and Rules Committee

Roger Page, associate dean of liberal arts, presented a number of recommendations concerning Assembly procedures. They included proposals to make motions to table debatable, that a committee quorum would be a majority of its members, that committees could determine who might be present at meetings and could make their own rules of procedure, that the Assembly meeting room bear clear identification of the area reserved for assemblymen and explicit permission from the chair required before access to the floor would be given, that chairmen of Assembly committees or their designees could have the privileges of the Assembly floor, and that recognition of assemblymen over nonassemblymen would ordinarily be granted. His motion for approval of these procedural proposals was seconded and approved.

Dates for future meeting of the Assembly and the Senate and their respective docket deadlines were presented for information.

Intercollegiate Athletics Committee

Presented for information was a report on a change in the football schedule in 1971 and notice of approval by the Big Ten Conference of an amendment to permit members to use athletic facilities by professional sport teams or organizations under certain conditions. There was also a report which indicated that participation in competition by freshmen on varsity teams other than basketball and football did not prevent those students from attaining satisfactory grade point averages. Also presented for information were the approved schedules for basketball, cross country, gymnastics, hockey, swimming, indoor and outdoor track, wrestling, and football.

Old Business

Samuel Krislov, chairman of political science, requested that the *Daily* identify on its front page those issues containing subjects for the Senate or Assembly dockets.

Parking (continued)

Rick Macpherson, president of MSA, asked what the next step would be in the parking rate controversy. Mr. Ibele responded that his committee's report

contained several recommendations and included plans to report to the Assembly on its study of construction scheduling, financing, and their relationship to the proposed increases. He further pointed to the committee proposal for an advisory committee with broad representation. Mr. Wertz suggested a motion for a new committee consisting of faculty members, students, civil service personnel, administrators, and representatives of the community, which would be asked to make a report at the next Assembly meeting. At this point the Chair ruled there was not a quorum.

Donald Smith, vice president for administration, emphasized that the University must keep going and solvent and that Mr. Champion would be bringing to the vice presidents a proposal for a January 1 30 percent increase and that an administrative decision on that proposal would be announced thereafter. He said consultation would continue with all concerned committees on the remaining suggested increase. When asked about what power the Assembly held, he replied that that body set policy guidelines through its deliberations and those of its committees.

DAVID COOPERMAN
Abstractor