

Minutes*

Senate Committee on Finance and Planning
Tuesday, January 22, 2008
2:00 – 3:45
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Judith Martin (chair), Jon Binks, Rose Blixt, V. V. Chari, Lincoln Kallsen, Thomas Klein, Joseph Konstan, Kathleen O'Brien, Kathryn Olson, Michael Rollefson, Gwen Rudney, Warren Warwick, Aks Zaheer

Absent: David Chapman, Adam Faitek, Steve Fitzgerald, Russell Luepker, Mikael Moseley, Richard Pfitzenreuter, Justin Revenaugh, Terry Roe, Thomas Stinson, Michael Volna, Candace Wagner, George Wilcox

Guests: Bob Baker (Parking and Transportation Services), James Dudley (Facilities Management), Leslie Krueger (Office of the Vice President for University Services), Robert Kvavik (Office of Planning), Orlyn Miller (Capital Planning and Project Management), Andrew Phelan (Environmental Health and Safety)

[In these minutes: (1) sustainability: (2) light-rail transit (the Central Corridor); (3) capital plan and retrospective]

1. Sustainability

Professor Martin convened the meeting at 2:05 and welcomed Vice President O'Brien and her colleagues to discuss several timely matters: sustainability, light-rail, and the capital request (current and retrospective) and six-year capital plan.

Vice President O'Brien distributed a handout and noted that President Bruininks send a message to the University community over the break highlighting sustainability. The President will appoint two committees, one will be ongoing to monitor and advance the University's sustainability program; one will be short-term to draft University goals consistent with the Regents' policy on sustainability. She said that University community members, faculty, students, and staff have provided leadership since the first Earth Day and the birthing of MPIRG to advance University environmental stewardship. Although the effort has continued, it has been informal. These two committees represent an effort to organize in order to reach the University's goals.

The Board of Regents' policy on sustainability, developed by a faculty-staff committee, contains three sections, on commitment, guiding principles, and implementation. The commitment is to "environmental, social and economic goals through design, planning and operational organization," includes the entire University community, and calls for a "balanced use of resources, within budgetary constraints." The last clause was included by the Board in recognition of the fact that there may not always be enough resources to do everything so priorities may need to be set. The policy also calls for sustainability to be incorporated in teaching, research, and outreach and operations.

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

The Guiding Principles include a call for the University to strive to be a world leader, modeling sustainability, for operational improvements and energy efficiency, and to promote research to inform campus operations and collaboration between research and operations. Implementation includes development of administrative policies and procedures, development of campus-specific objectives for development, operations, transportation, etc., accountability and identification of performance measures, and reporting to the Board on progress. Some units have made remarkable progress already, Vice President O'Brien said, and she alluded to the Morris campus as one example.

In terms of leadership, Vice President O'Brien pointed to the Institute on the Environment, the Center for Sustainable Building Research, the Initiative for Renewable Energy and the Environment, and the Chicago Climate Exchange Membership. The last is a voluntary and legally-binding pilot program to reduce and trade greenhouse gas emissions in the US, Canada, and Mexico; the University was one of the early members and the group includes such corporations as Dow Corning, DuPont, Ford Motor Co., and IBM. The members commit to reducing emissions by 1% per year below the 1998-2001 baseline by 2006; the University achieved a 38.6% reduction below the baseline.

Vice President O'Brien next reviewed a number of development and operations steps being taken, such as seeking LEED certification on new buildings, a solar-driven hydrogen fuel cell demonstration project, use of biomass as an alternative fuel in the Twin Cities steam plant, and gains made in energy conservation. On the last, both total BTU energy use and energy use per-square-foot on the Twin Cities campus have declined markedly since 1988, even though the total square footage of space on the campus has increased. Professor Martin asked if they have a target in mind for usage; Vice President O'Brien said they are benchmarking with other institutions to see what a legitimate goal might be. The University is certainly holding its own in comparison with other institutions and is doing better in a number of instances.

Other steps being taken include mechanical rather than chemical de-icing, campus composting, elimination of delivery trucks, a focus on green products in custodial services, and recycled goods such as paper towels and toilet paper. The University is serving as a test site for a number of products. University Dining Services is in partnership with the Midwest Food Alliance and uses Minnesota products, uses organic products, cage-free eggs, and fair-trade coffee. The dining rooms are also becoming greener by using recycled materials and biodegradable packaging. Similar steps are being taken in residence halls to achieve water conservation, reduction in the use of harmful chemicals, and use of recycled materials. In transportation, the University has been a model in promotion and use of the U Pass and Metro Pass as well as in reduction of fleet production of smog-forming pollutants. Both the DOT and EPA have designated the University as one of the best commuter workplaces. The University also purchases energy-efficient appliances and captures 90% of targeted recyclables. Finally, the University recycles 10% of electronic waste and ensures responsible recycling of the rest.

The next steps include continued advances in research and operations, continued focus on sustainable operations, integration of the campus master-planning process in sustainability, focus on implantation of the Regents' policy through objectives, policies and procedures, and performance measures, and continued focus on collaboration and support with academic and operational partners. They will establish a Sustainability Goals and Outcomes Committee with faculty, staff, and student representation and reconstitute the Waste Abatement Committee to a standing Sustainability Committee.

Mr. Phelan commented that the quad system for recycling, which virtually everyone on the campus is familiar with, has been very successful. The responsibility rests with individuals but a study of the project shows the University captures 90% of the target materials, which is remarkable. With nearly 800,000 pounds of old electronics per year, the University re-sells about 10% and is ahead of the curve

with recycling the remainder: recyclers are not always responsible but the University requires they not export the waste. That position cost a little more at the beginning but now the market has come back to the University's position.

Professor Martin asked if composting takes place anywhere besides the residence halls. Vice President O'Brien said composting is part of the RFP for food and beverages.

Professor Martin asked if the Committee had questions. Professor Chari asked how they will track progress. Can they measure water usage after installing reduced-use showerheads and toilets, for example? Vice President O'Brien said tracking is easier in some areas than in others. They look at efficiency measures at the operational level while at the institutional level they hope to see the efficacy of the changes. There are instances where they discover that what they thought was a solution turns out not to be, and they are prepared to recognize that possibility. Mr. Phelan pointed out that all buildings are metered so it is possible to do experiments to see what works. Professor Chari said he was interested in broader issues, such as saving money through the use of oat hulls in the steam plant. That information will be presented to the Committee when the report on utilities is made, Ms. O'Brien said. Mr. Klein said it would be helpful to have some representative buildings with statistics from before and after changes. Such examples help people understand when there are requests for increased capital project funds. Mr. Phelan reported that they did study three new buildings that were recommissioned and learned that they saved about \$2 million because of increased efficiency.

Professor Konstan inquired what decision-making process is involved when sustainability does not save money. Energy-saving changes are easy; when the University buys fair-trade coffee, the purchasers pay the difference. But other sustainability projects may cost the University more than they save. Are they looking at those instances or is that in the future? Vice President O'Brien said the University has had a revolving fund since 1992 to fund energy-efficient projects; they look at the payback period and fund those that pay back costs in five years or less. Items such as green roofs take longer to pay back and the University must decide how to fund them.

The information about sustainability and what the University is doing is not widely known, Professor Zaheer commented. They have done a good job and the work should be communicated; it will encourage people to do even better. Professor Martin agreed and said she would speak to Vice President Himle about the subject. Vice President O'Brien agreed that the University needs to feature this excellent work by many people across the campus.

Professor Martin thanked Vice President O'Brien and her colleagues for the report.

2. Light-Rail Transit

Professor Martin turned back to Vice President O'Brien, joined by Mr. Baker from Parking and Transportation Services, to lead a discussion of light rail and the Central Corridor. Vice President O'Brien distributed another handout and said the purpose of the discussion was to provide the Committee a comprehensive overview of the University's efforts to plan for light rail on the Twin Cities campus.

Vice President O'Brien recalled that the street cars in Minneapolis came off line in 1954 and there was discussion beginning in the 1960s about light rail in the Twin Cities. The discussion was more robust in the 1970s and 80s and 90s, and with a successful Hiawatha light-rail line, there is renewed interest. There are a number of cities with population density similar to the Twin Cities moving to light rail—and

many of which are doing so faster. In the meantime, the University is in the middle of the discussions about the Central Corridor, which will connect the two downtown areas.

The Central Corridor is part of the Metropolitan Council's 2030 transportation plan. The management structure includes a number of committees on which the University has representatives, but the Met Council has the final decision-making authority. The project timeline calls for a final decision in 2009 by the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) on funding, construction during 2010 to 2013, and service opening in 2014. At present the draft EIS statement and the proposal to the FTA includes a tunnel through the Minneapolis campus, but other options are being considered because of the cost of the tunnel.

Vice President O'Brien reviewed the design principles the University adopted about four years ago. They declare that optimal operation of the Central Corridor is important to the regional transportation system, safety is fundamental, the Corridor should increase economic development while having a positive impact on the urban environment, and functionality and aesthetics of the campus must be enhanced. She noted several statistics that bear on the discussion: 80,000 people come to the University daily; it is the third-largest trip-generator in the state; half a million people visit the University's hospitals and clinics annually; 68% of daily commuters walk, bike, bus, or carpool; over 20,000 students use U-Pass, about 2000 faculty and staff use Metropass, and one-third of the projected daily riders on the Central Corridor will be generated by the University.

Vice President O'Brien reviewed briefly the currently-proposed location of the three University stations, one on the West Bank, one on the East Bank, and one in Stadium Village and explained the implications of each.

The tunnel under Washington Avenue has been discussed since the 1930s. Since that time there have been various actions taken by the Board of Regents with respect to the Washington Avenue Bridge and a tunnel, and in 1991 it supported light rail in a tunnel, narrowing Washington Avenue, and extending the Mall. The development in 1996 of the first campus master plan included robust discussion about whether the University remove traffic from the campus or keep traffic in an age of new urbanization and street life. The latter approach prevailed and included bus lanes and transit, but the 1996 proposal for Washington Avenue (including buses, rail transit, autos, and pedestrians) required that it be several feet wider than there is space between the buildings that border it. So Washington Avenue cannot handle everything that might be proposed for it. There was also a proposal to remove the top of the Washington Avenue Bridge and add broad pedestrian walks on each side of the traffic lanes, but they have since learned that the cover is a structural element of the bridge that cannot be removed. That proposal also came from people who never had to walk across the bridge in the winter, Professor Martin observed.

In April of 2001 the Board rescinded the 1991 statement supporting light rail in the tunnel and narrowing of Washington Avenue and directed planners to consider alternatives. Later in the same year the Board concluded that the 1996 master plan, which called for at-grade light-rail transit, was no longer appropriate given changes in Washington Avenue. The Board of Regents' policy recommended (1) putting the light-rail on Bridge #9 (the railroad bridge just north of the Washington Avenue bridge); or (2) modified bus rapid transit on Washington Avenue; or (3) If Washington Avenue is to be routed for light-rail transit, then the University requires a tunnel.

The Central Corridor project staff has made cost estimates for the project. At present it stands at \$990 million. The federal cost-efficiency index requires that the cost not exceed \$840 million. Very preliminary engineering estimates indicate a realigned tunnel would cost an additional \$110 – 130 million while the at-grade alternative would reduce the project cost by an estimated \$128-148 million. Various

other elements could increase or decrease the project costs as well (e.g., reinforcing the Washington Avenue bridge is estimated to cost \$25 million (which may be more than what it would cost to replace the existing railroad bridge to accommodate a northern alignment), extending the line in downtown St. Paul would cost \$57.8 million, and so on).

At this point the Corridor Management team with the University is analyzing three options for the East Bank: a tunnel under Washington Avenue, at-grade transit on Washington, and a northern alignment that would take the trains around the other side of the new football stadium and near Dinkytown to the 10th Avenue Bridge (or, alternatively, the existing railroad bridge).

Building the tunnel would require 6-9 months to move utilities and another two years of construction, which would be disruptive for the campus. Mr. Baker then reviewed with the Committee the detailed impact of an at-grade light-rail train on Washington Avenue. The train would run down the middle of the street and there would be traffic lanes on either side; there would be left turns only at certain intersections, and there would be no on-street parking or any bike lanes. On a block-by-block basis, the street would be considerably wider, there would be only two traffic lanes (one each direction), and the landscaping would either be substantially reduced or completely eliminated (e.g., in front of Amundsen, MCB, Weaver-Densford, the Radisson, and so on).

The congestion on Washington Avenue requires a solution and there are three issues to be addressed: safety, emergency access, and reliability/functionality. Washington is the main thoroughfare through the campus, heavily used by pedestrians and bikers (there are 10 rush hours per day—each time classes get out), and 10,000 pedestrians cross it several times a day. But it provides critical emergency access to the hospitals and campus (there were over 43,000 emergency room visits in 2006)—and many of the drivers for emergency room visits are anxious and not always sure where to go. In terms of reliability and functionality, 25,000 vehicles per day go between the West Bank and University Avenue, there are 1500 buses daily, and congestion leads to line disruption.

The Chair of the Metropolitan Council has asked the University what principles it would require to put the light rail at grade. The University reiterated its position that there should be a tunnel but did respond to his request and set forth a number of principles. Mr. Baker reviewed them and also explained to the Committee the implications for the East and West Banks and the area around the stadium if the light rail is built at grade. He also reviewed the northern alignment. He concluded by noting that the various depictions and numbers he had recited are only ideas—there has been no design work. The University's position is that if traffic is to be taken off Washington Avenue—which it must be if the light rail is at grade—then there must be work in the surrounding areas to absorb the traffic.

Vice President O'Brien said these ideas are being presented to various groups, including the local businesses and neighborhoods. The University is pointing out that Washington Avenue is already congested and there can be a tunnel, the light rail can be at grade and traffic moved elsewhere, or the light rail can be put elsewhere (the northern alignment). The University does not want the City, County, or University to be in the position of needing to fix things after the light rail has already been built. President Bruininks has asked that the northern alignment be studied again; Chair Bell said he would approve if the University pays for it. The President concluded this is too big an issue to not study appropriately so agreed to fund the study.

Vice President O'Brien reviewed the next steps, which include the study of the northern alignment (expected to take 3-5 months). The difficulty is that the Metropolitan Council is scheduled to act on February 27 about the scope of the project in order to maintain the required timeline. It is the

University's view that the staff team may not have done sufficient analysis of the options and not designed the mitigations so the Council may not be able to make as informed a decision.

Professor Martin said the northern alignment seems to work better for several reasons--but will it be cost-effective when it effectively loses the Academic Health Center? The biggest challenge is ridership, Vice President O'Brien agreed. They have looked at other alternatives, such as a shuttle to the Academic Health Center, because they believe the remainder of the East Bank and the West Bank would be well-served. She also observed that the area around the new stadium will be a vibrant research area that the light rail will also serve.

Professor Martin said she also liked the way that a northern alignment could potentially serve the regional transit system by linking to the other proposed rail systems. The Washington Avenue route would not be able to accomplish that linkage directly.

Ms. Olson observed that there are a lot of classrooms in Ford Hall and Amundsen Hall and that there are noise problems even with the current setbacks. Those problems would become worse if the setbacks are reduced or eliminated. Mr. Baker agreed and said they are concerned about noise and vibration and are talking with the affected units about vibration tolerance and static interruption.

Professor Konstan wondered if it would be necessary to have two tracks on the railroad bridge for the northern alignment (there is now only one); could not routing and timing be arranged so that only one train need be on the bridge at one time? The issue is events, Mr. Baker said: they add trains and the frequency of trips when there are major events, and there is also the problem of a train breaking down on the bridge.

All the analysis is on the cost side, Professor Konstan said, and the formulae are based on the number of riders and the time saved. If it would be possible to increase campus ridership and increase efficiency, the project should be worth more money. Vice President O'Brien said that the Central Corridor staff acknowledges that the tunnel would increase the number of riders and cut the travel time but says the cost may be too great. Many metropolitan areas have more cost-effective standards because they have dedicated transit funds, can negotiate with the federal government to increase the local contribution, and make more rational decisions. The Academic Health Center is also studying a possible loss of business; Senior Vice President Cerra has informed her that if they lose 10% of the hospital and clinic business, that would cost \$130 million per year.

Can the Metropolitan Council implement an at-grade light rail system without the University's consent, Professor Chari asked? Vice President O'Brien said the University is studying that question, and the plan would require a right-of-way from the University, but she emphasized that the University wants to negotiate an agreement—and that the University supports a strong transit system. Given the safety issues involved, Professor Chari commented, it is difficult to believe the federal government would approve an at-grade option. Vice President O'Brien recalled that during her tenure at the University, there have been times Washington Avenue has had to be closed because of chemical spills, lab explosions, bomb threats, etc.; the University does not want to be hysterical, but the truth is the street has to be closed on occasion.

Professor Martin said she was glad the northern alignment was back in the picture because it makes more sense.

Professor Konstan asked if there had been any lessons from the Hiawatha light-rail route in traffic management. Mr. Baker said the problems have reached the point that federal authorities have stepped in and are now reviewing the problems.

Professor Martin thanked Vice President O'Brien and Mr. Baker for the presentation.

3. Capital Plan and Retrospective

Professor Martin turned once more to Vice President O'Brien, and this time also to Associate Vice President Robert Kvavik and to Mr. Orlyn Miller, Director of Planning and Architecture, to discuss the capital plan. Vice President O'Brien explained that the six-year capital plan will not go to the Regents in February but they did have a working group discussion—and wanted to have a discussion with this Committee as well.

Mr. Miller distributed a number of handouts and reviewed them with the Committee. To start, he outlined the principles for the 2008 six-year capital plan:

1. Advance the academic excellence of the University of Minnesota by aligning capital projects with the established strategic positioning goals of:
 - Recruiting and educating outstanding students
 - Recruiting and supporting innovative, energetic world-class faculty and staff
 - Being responsible stewards of resources
 - Inspiring innovation, exploration, and discovery
2. Address service unit priorities that support the academic priorities.
3. Commit sufficient investments to ensure that existing facilities and infrastructure contribute to the safety renewal, preservation, and restoration objectives and are aligned with the priorities of the University's academic plan and master plan.
4. Give preference to projects that create flexible space, improve space utilization, and reduce operational costs.
5. Capitalize on unique opportunities that are aligned with academic priorities.
6. Protect the University's financial position by keeping capital expenditures within projected debt capacity limits.
7. Advance the guiding principles of the master plan and the Regents sustainability policies.

He then reviewed some of the items in the 2008 and 2009 capital request/capital plan, including the renovation of Heller Hall for CLA (University-funded for \$2.6 million), the ambulatory-care clinic infrastructure (\$20 million from the state), and social-sciences remodeling for CLA (also University-funded, \$2.7 million). Projected University-funded projects for 2010 include Northrop Auditorium (\$70 million), Recreation Center expansion (\$45 million), and residence halls system replacement (\$11 million). This document, the 2008 six-year capital plan, is something his office is working on now. The current (Regentally-approved) six-year capital plan includes the request currently before the legislature (for \$212 million in state funding). The infrastructure work for the new primary-care clinic is an

important issue for the Academic Health Center and it includes large tails for the University in terms of the renovation of Phillips-Wangensteen when the clinics move out. Vice President O'Brien observed that the \$20 million for infrastructure will provide utility support for future growth. It is the University's contribution to the project, Mr. Miller added.

Professor Konstan asked if there is a reason that Northrop Auditorium and the Recreational Sports Center expansion are not in the request to the state. Vice President O'Brien said the Northrop project was brought to the state in 2000 and was not funded. Even if it is more academic than some projects, the President believes there is a financial plan that works and that would take Northrop out of competition with other academic projects. There is also a revenue stream for the Recreational Sports Center so it also need not be put in competition with academic projects.

Mr. Miller went on to comment that the 2012 capital plan is difficult to predict without knowing what will happen in 2008 and 2010. 2012 does, for now, include renovation of Physics and of Pillsbury, and they are trying to accelerate Pillsbury. He also highlighted projects that are important to the University but which are not at a stage where they can be put in the capital plan; these include Burton Hall remodeling, the Diehl Learning Commons, Hasselmo Hall remodeling, Nolte Hall renovation, a Rochester campus building, and others. No funds have been identified for these projects and they are still in planning and development; some will move into the six-year plan, some could displace other projects and some might be added.

Professor Konstan observed, apropos the Rochester building, that earlier conversations in the University indicated the University would not take money away from the existing campuses to support Rochester and that it would only go ahead if the state provided additional funding. Rochester now appears on the same spreadsheet, he pointed out. That was the idea, Mr. Miller agreed, and one can worry that it will be lost. Professor Martin commented that the memory of the Committee is very long.

Mr. Miller then noted a list of projects that will extend beyond the 6-year horizon that have been identified in a number of ways—from units, from the compact discussions, etc. They are sorting through which ones might move to the six-year capital plan and which will not. Mr. Rollefson asked about one item on the list, a new administration building. Mr. Miller responded that building new administrative buildings is difficult because they do not compete well with academic units. Either the University must convert academic buildings to administrative use or it must move administrative units to more efficient space not in the center of campus and free up space in central buildings which can then be renovated or demolished and replaced. Vice President O'Brien added that in the Facilities Condition Assessment, Morrill Hall has the worst score, but how does the University justify putting money into it? Perhaps it can be justified if it were converted to an academic building. Dr. Kvavik said that the President's and Provost's offices are of lower quality compared to offices of other Big Ten presidents and provosts; he also said that a lot of back-office services are increasingly provided on the web and the University should consider moving them to better off-campus space thereby opening up more central space for academic programs.

Professor Konstan asked about the absence of coordinate-campus buildings on the long-range list. Is there no backlog there? Has there been overinvestment? Under-planning? Vice President O'Brien said that the list is long for the Twin Cities campus because the campus is larger and its buildings are older. There has been attention to other campuses and will continue to be. In some cases, when coordinate

campuses have not a major project in the capital request, they have received an increased HEAPR allocation to address specific improvements, Mr. Miller said.

The Twin Cities campus master plan will be done by the end of 2008 and may have capital plan implications, Professor Martin said, but there are no provisions for it on the list. Vice President O'Brien said the list must be redone each year and it would need to be revised to take into account the campus master plan.

The Committee turned next to a table of data titled "State Capital Request History 1996 to 2006." The table identified the University's requests as well as what was funded, what was not, and what was dropped from the request. With the exception of 2002, when the Governor used a line-item veto for a number of capital projects, and the 2004 session (when there was no state bonding bill), the University has typically received funding for a high percentage of the projects for which it requested support over the last decade. However, the HEAPR appropriation has typically been significantly reduced from requested amount. Dr. Kvavik said that the University used to go to the legislature with a long list of projects and the legislature would all too often pick the ones it liked. The success rate has increased because the University now goes with a much shorter and focused list with clear priorities.

Has the University gone too far in the other direction, Professor Chari asked? If it is batting nearly 100%, perhaps it is not asking for enough support. Dr. Kvavik observed that the state's bonding bill is usually about \$1 billion, of which higher education receives 15-17%. If the University were to add items to its capital request, it is unlikely they would be funded. The legislature also balances its appropriation between the University and MNSCU, Professor Martin pointed out.

Vice President O'Brien said that the requests to the legislature require a tremendous mobilization of effort by people in the units. These outcomes are very good compared to the University's Big Ten peers; the legislature has done well for the University, she said. She also drew the attention of Committee members to a list of factors that affect the six-year capital plan that Dr. Kvavik had prepared for the Committee.

1. Success and failure at the legislature. Failure pushes projects to the next budget cycle and often creates significant readjustment of priorities. Or, the legislature or Governor adds an unranked project for political purposes.
2. Failure of the legislature to pass a bonding bill.
3. Change in the presidency and/or deans who have different programmatic priorities. And concomitantly facility priorities.
4. Project cost surprises. The cost of a project is too expensive as programmed or because of unanticipated infrastructure or regulatory requirements.
5. Dominos. Sequencing of projects necessary to achieve desired outcomes in a manner that is least disruptive to faculty, students, and instructional and research activities.
6. Failure to raise required private funds. Concomitantly, the availability of private funds that can be leveraged with public funds.
7. Unexpected funding opportunities. Receipt of grants or private donation that alter capital priorities.
8. Successful internal or external lobbying for projects not on the capital list. Or a reordering of priorities to satisfy regional interests.

Mr. Rollefson asked if the Governor's plan differs from that of the University. Vice President O'Brien said the Governor's recommendation includes 12.5% of the capital budget for the University, lower than usual, but he supported everything on the University's list except the new Bell Museum (and he recommended less HEAPR money). The President has said he appreciates the support but has expressed concern about using the bonding bill for transportation; if there were a separate transportation bill, there would be less pressure on the bonding bill.

Another reason the University has been successful, Mr. Miller said, is because of the tremendous work of Associate Vice President Donna Peterson and her team.

Professor Martin thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting at 4:05.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota