

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, May 15, 1972
Room 350 Modern Languages

The Faculty Senate convened in special session at 3:40 p.m. on Monday, May 15, 1972, in the Modern Languages Building auditorium (Room 350). Fifty-one members were present with President Schaefer presiding. Dr. Klonda Lynn was present as parliamentarian. Mr. David Butler was present as Assistant Secretary.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Ares, Bannister, Bartlett, Bleibtreu, Bretall, Brewer, H. Butler, Cole, Delaplane, Dewhirst, Dixon, Edwards, Eisner, Evans, S. Fahey, W. Fahey, Freeman, Gegenheimer, Gould, Grant, Green, Herber, Hetrick, Joyner, Keating, Layton, Lytle, Massengale, Mathews, Mautner, McConnell, McMillan, Munsinger, Muramoto, H. Myers, L. Myers, Nigh, Paulsen, Putt, Rhodes, Robson, Schaefer, Skinner, Sorensen, Steelink, Svob, Thompson, Tomizuka, Windsor, Wise, and Zwolinski. Student representative attending was Gene Simko.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Anthony, Barnes, Blitzer, Bok, Boyer, Christopherson, Dresher, Gaines, Goodwin, Hull, Johnson, Krebs, Lane, Mason, Murphy, Reiblich, Richard, Shields, Siegel, Varney, Voris, and Younggren. Student representatives absent were John McKinney and Paula VanNess.

The meeting had been called by President Schaefer to consider a report from the ad hoc committee appointed to study the proposed parking garage and stadium addition. Members of the committee present who are not Senate members were Mrs. Aleen Klaas, Dr. Martin Nizlek, Mr. John Zaborac, Mr. John Trimble, and Dr. Marvin Kahn, Chairman.

Immediately upon the President's calling the meeting to order, Dr. Gegenheimer rose to say that he felt the record should show that concern was expressed in the Senate chamber that the confidential report of the ad hoc committee had been leaked to the press before it had even been distributed to members of the Senate, let alone considered by this body. It makes it difficult for the Senate to do its business in the proper way when such leaks take place, Dr. Gegenheimer said. He said he wanted to be on record as objecting to the leaking of a committee report and he hoped that other members of the Senate were as troubled about what had happened in this instance as he was.

President Schaefer commented that he was sorry he was unable to be present at the Senate meeting where the ad hoc committee was requested in the first place. As a matter of fact, he felt the committee should not have been requested. He felt it was inappropriate for the Senate to concern itself with whether or not University buildings are to be constructed, where located, how financed, etc. He said he too was troubled by the fact that some committee members had seen fit to leak their supposedly confidential report to the press. It also was unfortunate that some members of the committee had contacted members of the Legislature and let them know what the majority of the committee was going to recommend. All of these actions set dangerous precedents for the future so far as the best interests of the University were concerned, he said. If, as it is understood, the leak came from student members of the committee, this undermines the concept of student involvement in University governance, President Schaefer said. Dr. Schaefer said he realized that the chairman of the committee was not responsible for the leak to the press

or to the Legislature. Nevertheless, the fact that these two leaks took place had reflected on the committee as a whole.

Dr. Steelink asked where matters lay now inasmuch as the Legislature had not passed the bill authorizing the University to issue bonds for construction of a parking garage and stadium addition. Dr. Schaefer said that obviously the University cannot now proceed in the next year to make plans to build the structure. The project is left in limbo. The Regents at their meeting on May 20 will have to decide what now should be done.

Dr. Robson asked why it was the President felt it had not been appropriate for the Faculty Senate to take the action it had in this case. President Schaefer replied that traditionally and historically the general faculty has not been concerned with plans for campus structures. The University administration should rely on the expertise of professional specialists to make evaluations of needs and the other concerns that lie behind decisions about capital plans. The administration then should be free to act on the basis of the judgment of the experts.

President Schaefer then recognized Dr. Marvin Kahn, chairman of the ad hoc committee. Dr. Kahn commented that so far as the premature releases of the committee's report were concerned, both to the press and to members of the Legislature, none of these were authorized. Obviously the committee's security arrangements were poor, he stated.

Dr. Kahn pointed out that each member of the Senate had a few days earlier received by mail a copy of the majority report of the ad hoc committee as well as a minority report. Senate members had also been furnished with extensive appendices to the reports including statements from some persons who had appeared before the committee.

Dr. Kahn said that the committee had to consider much information in a comparatively short period of time. There had been many honest differences of opinion within the committee.

The majority report of the ad hoc committee, which had the endorsement of six members, was as follows:

"The Committee met six to seven times in full session and in additional sub-committee meetings during the past five weeks. The issues to be dealt with were many and complex. It was necessary to develop considerable information in a short time in a variety of areas that bear on the topic. Among the areas of information considered were (1) review of current parking procedures, its policing and financing; (2) the projected development plans for the University and the predictions of increase with regard to buildings, students and auto traffic; (3) stadium attendance, student usage, athletic revenues, general athletic policies; (4) stadium funding methods, allocation of seats to students; (5) campus areas in terms of the amount of usage and traffic; (6) financial arrangements and options for bonding and other methods of financing parking and athletic facilities; (7) review of the pending legislation with regard to parking and the stadium; (8) the cost and other economic aspects of a multi-level structure vs. at-grade structure; (9) consideration of the site from the standpoint of convenience to faculty, staff, and students, and the traffic patterns that would be created by particular site locations.

"President Schaefer reviewed for the Committee the basis for the proposed plan and the alternatives that were considered. Mr. Trimble and Dr. Edwards presented in detail a wide variety of information developed with regard to traffic usage, construction, costs, financing, university planning, etc. Prof. Nizlek and Mr. John Zaborac presented their detailed studies with regard to traffic, construction costs and location consideration.

"The Committee also heard from Prof. Hightower with regard to his extended analysis of the plan and his recommendations for alternatives.

"Mr. Hugh Holub, a Law School student, presented to the Committee a review of user revenue financing for the proposed stadium garage.

"The Committee thus received information from a number of individuals with professional expertise in the areas considered. The various experts tended to approach the problem from somewhat different vantage points, to develop somewhat different data, and to reach, in some cases, very different conclusions. There, thus, were honest differences of expert opinion that the Committee as a whole had to consider, and some of the recommendations are a matter of majority opinion. A minority report was encouraged by the Committee as a matter of fairness, making available the fullest information to the Senate.

"During its deliberations the Committee took two administrative actions. One was a recommendation to President Schaefer that some minor word changes be made in the pending legislation on the stadium garage so that a wider variety of options would be available to the University in this matter. Secondly, the Committee recommended to President Schaefer, and it was approved, that the two Committee members who were designated as observers be given full voting membership in the Committee.

I. "Is there a parking problem on campus?

"The information developed by the Committee was clearly in the affirmative, although it appears to be more serious at certain times and places.

"The Committee adopted the following position on this question:

1. There is a general parking problem on this campus which is more acute for specific users, at specific times, in specific areas.

II. "Methods of analysis of the proposed parking facility and stadium addition:

"In approaching the question of the requirement for parking in the Southeast area of campus, the Committee first received a presentation by Mr. Trimble on the Administration's considerations and techniques utilized in developing the proposed Parking Garage and East Stadium Addition Plan. At that time, questions were raised concerning the location of the proposed garage. The Administration asserted that increased parking facilities would be needed in that location based upon building station capacities. The use of 'capacity totals' rather than 'utilization totals' was questioned. It was felt that the capacity approach gave undue weight to such facilities as the Auditorium and McKale Center, where, even though a large class might meet on a typical academic day, many thousands of seats (stations) could actually be empty.

"Dr. Nizlek offered an alternative approach based upon utilization of student stations and building addresses of campus faculty and personnel. This approach determined (as nearly as possible from presently available data) the existing, relative, disaggregated station use and personnel locations. As indicated in his report, Dr. Nizlek noted that the need for additional parking for various users is located in other than the Stadium area at the current time and that startling increases in class demand would be necessary to offset the current lack of demand. It was also noted that more than 50% of the available student parking is currently in this area.

"As it was apparent to members of the Committee that parking was not a problem throughout the day, consideration was given to the fact that the new class scheduling pattern, with a ceiling of 7% at any given time period (to be instituted in the Fall of 1972), may alleviate the problem. Dr. Nizlek's investigation concluded by reporting on the magnitude of the parking problem at the University. Utilizing predictive techniques, he illustrated that the magnitude of the proposed facility might be greatly in error with respect to total campus requirements.

"Other advice was received from Dr. Henry Hightower, Chairman of the Urban Planning Department. Dr. Hightower's presentation argued that the proposed parking garage and stadium addition were not feasible from both an economic as well as land use points of view. On an economic basis, the cost of the parking structure would be approximately twice that needed to provide the same amount of parking spaces at at-grade parking lots which had been improved to the highest level of service. Further, based solely on cost, Dr. Hightower referenced a national consultant firm's findings that multi-level parking structures are not warranted until land values exceed \$5 per square foot. The University's land acquisition costs being approximately \$2 per square foot now, the solution would clearly not be any multi-level structure.

"The Committee considered that the stadium addition aspect of the parking proposal should be viewed from the perspective that it is not the central issue nor is it invariably linked to the solution of a parking problem. Rather, it seems best to view it as a side issue which should only be considered if the two contingencies hold true. These are: (1) it turns out that the most efficacious site for a parking facility is in the near vicinity of the stadium, and (2) that the best parking facility is determined to be a multi-level garage. If these two conditions do not turn out to hold, then the stadium addition as attached to the parking problem is irrelevant.

"Assuming that the site and type of facility do turn out as stated above, then consideration of the stadium addition has merit from the standpoint of construction economics.

"Attendance figures that occurred in relationship to the previous stadium addition suggest that the increased number of seats generates increased attendance, and increased revenues. President Schaefer has tentatively indicated that the additional revenues generated by the new parking facility and the additional seats at the stadium would be used to reduce the amount of the student fee increase.

"In regard to the stadium addition the Committee concluded:

"(a) If the contingencies of the location and multi-level facility are not the most feasible, consideration of a stadium addition in connection with the parking facility be eliminated.

"(b) That should those contingencies be the most feasible, the stadium addition be included.

"(c) That revenue generated from receipts of the parking garage and stadium addition (should it be recommended) be used to reduce the student fees that might be used to finance these facilities.

"The Committee makes the following recommendations with regard to the multi-level parking garage and alternative parking methods:

2. The Committee recommends against a multiple level parking facility in the proposed area at this time.
3. The Committee recommends that future emphasis be given to construction of at-grade parking lots scattered around the campus, based on calculated need in each area of the campus.

III. "Analysis of Financing:

"Regardless of the type of facility or facilities designed and constructed to solve the parking and traffic problem on campus, financing still must be a primary consideration. Mr. Hugh Holub made a presentation that argued that financing should primarily be funded on a user basis. Mr. Holub's general argument was subsequently investigated and refined by one member of this Committee. In this proposal John Zaborac asserted that regardless of the nature of the solution utilized to solve the parking problem, the financing should first be on a user basis with blanket student fees only utilized secondarily. Applying basic figures of past revenue generated and future expenditures to be funded, the proposal illustrated the feasibility of such a financing arrangement. While not in agreement with some of the totals generated in this proposal, this Committee unanimously agreed in principle with such an arrangement for financing of the solutions to the parking problem.

"With regard to the East stadium addition portion of the plan, attendance figures indicate that the previous West stadium addition did increase attendance and therefore, more revenue was generated. Based on these figures, it appears that an East stadium addition would also increase attendance and revenue. This amount added to the user fee for parking permits should appreciably decrease the necessity for a blanket parking fee assessment to all students.

"Unlike fees for Student Union, Health Service, the Library, which all students can and are expected to use, parking fees are without service to those students who do not, or cannot have automobiles.

"Historically the University of Arizona, when considering construction of revenue generating facilities, has considered those revenues as the primary source of security for bonds. If it is found that revenue will not satisfy the bonding arrangement, then the student fee is tapped to supply this deficit.

"On page 2 of House Bill 2361, Section 4-1, is stated

'The board in connection with the issuance of the bonds or in order to secure the payment of such bonds and interest thereon, shall have power by resolution to:

Fix, maintain and collect any fees, admissions, rentals, and other charges from students, faculty members and others using or being served by, or having the right to be served by, such project.'

"With regard to financing, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

4. The Committee recommends that financial arrangements based primarily on user cost and only secondarily subsidized by student fees, should be utilized to finance all future improvements to parking facilities regardless of the type of facility or facilities designated and constructed to solve the parking and traffic problem.

- IV. "Since legislation is pending in the current legislative session with regard to the stadium addition and parking garage, the Committee recommends:
5. That if the Faculty Senate accepts these recommendations, they be communicated through proper University officials to the authorities concerned with the legislation now pending concerning parking-stadium addition.

Bill Christie
Marvin Kahn
Aleen Klaas
Betty Jane Monroe
Martin Nizlek
John Zaborac"

The minority report from two members of the ad hoc committee was as follows:

"This report will refer to only the recommendations that were not approved unanimously by the ad hoc Committee. They are as follows:

"II. The Committee recommends against a multiple-level parking facility in the proposed area at this time.

"III. The Committee recommends that future emphasis be given to construction of at-grade parking lots scattered around the campus, based on calculated need in each area of the campus.

"Two committee members disagreed definitely and strongly on recommendations II and III. In addition, one committee member abstained on recommendation III. This report will address itself to both items II and III concurrently as the subject matter of each depends on the other.

"The majority report appears to lean heavily on statistics presented by Dr. Martin Nizlek and Mr. John Zaborac. The authors of this report cannot agree with Dr. Nizlek's and Mr. Zaborac's studies as their conclusions were based on incomplete data. Their method, referred to as 'utilization total', does not take into consideration the total use of buildings and grounds. They did not include campus citizens such as dormitory residents who number approximately 4,500 and wage personnel who total approximately 4,800. It also did not include thousands of students assigned exclusively by the individual departments and colleges that have specialized courses and which do not appear on the general academic 'Room Utilization Printout' prepared by the Director of Institutional Studies Office; and finally, they did not include non-pay visitors, salesmen, and maintenance personnel which must be accommodated. All the above mentioned categories have vehicles which take up space in parking lots.

"It is the minority members' opinion that the statistics provided by the Physical Resources Division to the ad hoc Committee, based on 'building stations', are the only realistic approach to a study of the parking deficiencies. On any study such as this, a stable 'yardstick' or 'base line' has to be established so that not only present but future statistics have a common denominator. In our opinion this stable yardstick should be building capacity. Utilization such as general student stations, faculty/staff offices, and even laboratories are subject to change as the campus expands; therefore, any statistics based on current utilization are invalid. It was proven by the 'building station' method that the existing quadrants' distribution of parking space to existing building capacity is within two percent of each other. It was also proven that with the anticipated expansion in the southeast quadrant within the next five years, additional parking spaces for approximately 1,500 cars will be necessary. The only way that this additional parking can become available would be through the construction of a multi-story parking garage. If the garage were to be constructed east of the Stadium, this would displace approximately 800 cars currently parking in this area and by adding these to the 1,500 the need by 1977 would be for a structure to house 2,300 vehicles. Since the planned structure will accommodate approximately 3,100 cars, this leaves only 800 spaces in surplus. It is our opinion that these 800 spaces will be absorbed by the future curtailment of street parking around the periphery of the University campus and other quadrant 'spill over'.

"The Nizlek-Zaborac method did not take into consideration the future expansion of the University campus in the southeast quadrant and only addressed itself to the 1972 statistics. In any master plan, future projections must be considered and are an essential tool for advanced planning. We call your attention to the fact that the following buildings are anticipated to be constructed in this southeast quadrant: 1) new central library, 2) large classroom building, 3) future Physical Education facilities, and 4) other academic buildings. The above building capacities will total 12,000 additional stations. In the 'utilization total' analyses it did note that 52% of the present student parking is now in the general area of the proposed parking structure, and the combined loss in parking due to the anticipated construction will amount to about 1,800 spaces.

"It seems inconsistent to recognize that there is now a parking problem on campus; that 1,800 spaces will be lost in the immediate future, and yet recommend that no provision be made to provide some relief in a location

now accommodating 52% of the student parking.

"The new class scheduling experiment concerning the 7% maximums offering in any one period will not apply to special purpose spaces such as McKale Center, laboratories, and rooms used exclusively by a given department. Additionally, this will probably not affect Student Union and Library usage to any great extent.

"In regards to Dr. Hightower's report, he advised the Committee that surface parking lots would be much more economical to construct than the garage. There is no question regarding this single statement. Surface parking would be approximately one-half the cost of a parking structure. The minority members, however, do not agree with Dr. Hightower's categorical statement that structures are not warranted unless land values exceed \$5.00 per square foot. Obviously, convenience and total land availability must be considerations. Dr. Hightower was not able to comment when questioned on the applicability of his statement to commercial versus public buildings. To a commercial operator, 'economic feasibility' (which were Dr. Hightower's words) is based on an ability to generate revenue to pay income taxes, property taxes, and to provide an acceptable profit. None of these are required in the case of a University structure. Another aspect not given due consideration is the fact that it would take approximately six to seven city blocks to accommodate this number of vehicles on surface lots and in our opinion would not only be aesthetically unpleasant to view, but would require an additional two to three blocks walking distance more than the parking structure. It would also take approximately \$71,000 per year off the city tax rolls. Although this does not directly affect the University community, it does affect the community in which we all enjoy living.

"The parking structure as proposed would be a node protruding into the interior core of the campus. The structure would also be less expensive to maintain and operate for the next 40 years.

"Dr. Nizlek and Mr. Zaborac have approached the problem from a completely different 'bench mark', and we do not want to indicate that they are not sincere in their recommendations. It is the minority members' belief, however, that they chose the wrong 'yardstick' and by doing so, obtained erroneous results from their study.

"In the case of the recommendation concerning financing, the minority members agree that user-based financing is desirable. It should be noted, however, that other universities have suffered serious financial setbacks on this basis. It seems only prudent that a 'cushion' against such a bad experience should be generated in advance so that user-fee income could be accurately predicted and taken into account. Failure of a number of students to register their vehicles, for example, could cause bankruptcy in short order. For this reason, the minority members believe that a registration fee to all students is in order for two years. By the end of that time, usage patterns should be well established and an appropriate user-fee structure would be designed with provisions for proper adjustments each year to keep the project solvent.

"In summary, the minority members believe that the present parking problem will be intensified by the loss of 1,800 of the present parking spaces due to construction of future facilities and the need for addi-

tional 1,500 spaces to accommodate personnel housed in these new facilities. Further, a parking structure, located in an area where 52% of the parking now exists, will alleviate the problem. The parking structure and stadium addition is needed if the University of Arizona is going to keep pace in an orderly fashion with the expected expansion of this great University.

Richard M. Edwards
John B. Trimble"

NOTE: Attached to the secretary's file copy of these minutes are the appendices which accompanied the majority and minority reports.

Mr. Grant said he found himself in the unusual position of having to challenge his own statistics because of the manner in which data he had provided members of the committee had been interpreted. He referred in particular to analysis of certain data by Dr. Nizlek and a group of graduate research assistants of the Department of Civil Engineering. He explained that the number of users of certain classroom buildings had been cited to show the number of persons going to a certain campus area. Mr. Grant said that as a matter of fact the classes taught in this area included much of the instructional program of the Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, the Department of Physical Education for Women, and the Air Force and Army ROTC Departments, all of which make considerable use of outdoor facilities for their classes. This instruction is conducted in the campus area in question and yet is not reflected in the statistics of building utilization used by Dr. Nizlek in his analysis. As a matter of fact, 25,000 student credit hours are involved in the teaching programs of these three departments, a large portion of which is conducted out-of-doors. These make up 8% of the University's total student credit hour offerings. In other words students in these classes are in fact receiving instruction in the sector of the campus in question. But the fact that they are going to class in that sector of the campus is not reflected by the classroom utilization statistics used by Dr. Nizlek.

Mr. Grant also questioned certain conclusions reached by dividing the campus into quadrants and relating parking locations to the offices of faculty and staff personnel and the class meeting places of students. As a matter of fact, Mr. Grant said, two-thirds of the faculty and staff have offices located within a comfortable ten-minute walk from the proposed location for a parking garage. Half of all student credit hours taught on the campus are taught in locations within an easy ten-minute walk from the same location.

Another point that should not be overlooked, Mr. Grant said, is that to sell bonds successfully to construct the proposed garage, a sound amortization program must be possible. To amortize the bonds for the proposed parking garage, revenue must be generated from the parking of persons attending events in McKale Center and in the stadium. The parking structure, therefore, should be adjacent to these facilities.

Mr. Mautner referred to the recommendation of the majority of the committee that additional at-grade parking lots be constructed. He asked the committee where these lots would be located and where the funds were to come from to purchase the land on which they would be constructed. Dr. Nizlek said that the committee had not

seen as one of its goals the responsibility of determining where at-grade parking should be located. The committee was simply trying to determine whether parking facilities were really needed at the proposed location. Referring to Mr. Grant's comments, Dr. Nizlek said that he and his co-workers had not intended that their study was in any way an extensive or elaborate one. He said also that the point should be made that the study had not included the parking needs of most hourly workers. Most of these employees, however, work either for the Physical Resources Department or the Student Union and therefore do not work in the area most directly served by the location of the proposed garage. Referring to the "quadrant approach" to the study, he said the committee had followed the procedure used by Director Trimble in his original proposal.

Dr. Joyner said that two basic questions concerned him. One was what plans there were for appropriate and adequate ingress to and egress from the garage. The other was whether or not payment for the facility would come from user fees as distinct from a general fee paid by all students. Dr. Schaefer said that the ingress and egress matter was, of course, one calling for professional engineering expertise. He said that Campbell Avenue and East 6th Street were both to be widened during the summer of 1972, it was certainly planned to construct proper facilities for the smooth flow of traffic in and out of the garage. Problems should arise only after major events in McKale Center or the stadium. During the class day the in and out flow should be modest and manageable. There is considerable precedent for large parking garages at large universities in urban settings, Dr. Schaefer said. He said he of all people would certainly want the flow of traffic to move smoothly and efficiently. He knew that his phone would ring constantly the day after any major event where there was a large traffic tie-up.

Dr. Schaefer said he had come to the conclusion that after developing an initial funding cushion from a universal registration fee, the garage should be financed by user fees. On the other hand, we want to avoid finding ourselves in the position that the University of Minnesota has found itself where University user fees have to be so high that use has fallen off to a sharp degree. Dr. Joyner asked Dr. Schaefer if by users he meant only persons using the parking garage or all students bringing cars to the campus. Dr. Schaefer said he meant all students driving cars to the campus. Faculty and staff would be included too.

Dr. Schaefer said that it should not be overlooked that there is much to be done to existing parking facilities. Dirt lots must be paved and unlighted lots must be lighted. It is particularly urgent to add lighting, he said. Campus police statistics show, for example, that in the month of April there were nearly 400 thefts from cars in U of A parking lots. Most of these were carried out in unlighted lots during the night.

At this point Dr. Lytle said he wondered why the Senate was in session to discuss the topic being considered. If the faculty is not to be concerned about plans for campus structures, and if the Legislature killed the bill that was before it to authorize bonding for the construction of a parking building, and if the proposed building if and when authorized is not to be funded by a uniform registration fee except perhaps for one year, he wondered what there really was for the Senate to decide.

The differences of opinion he had heard were reasonable ones, but he wondered if they were concerns for a faculty body like the Senate to consider. He said in his judgment professional experts should now be asked to provide their expertise and the administration then should proceed. Dr. Schaefer said he wished members of the Senate two months ago had spoken the way Dr. Lytle had just spoken. The fact remains that the Faculty Senate did act as it did in March. That action by the Faculty Senate had contributed to a great degree to the Arizona Legislature's defeating the proposed bonding authorization bill. The Faculty Senate having helped get the University into the position that it is now in, he felt that the Faculty Senate had the obligation to take a definite position on the matter now.

Dr. Gegenheimer said in years past Director Houston had said that commercial enterprises had indicated interest in providing parking facilities for the University. Mr. Trimble said that nothing had materialized from these approaches. Dr. Schaefer said that it is not feasible for a commercial enterprise to provide campus parking. In order for such a venture to make a profit the parking cost would be prohibitive for campus users.

Dr. Steelink said that if the experience at the University of Minnesota had shown that as user charges went up, student usage went down, he wondered if there was any way of measuring how much use would be made of the proposed garage. Dr. Schaefer said that expert opinion indicates that the garage can be made to pay for itself by user fees if plans are carefully developed. He said that within the next year 1,500 parking spaces in the southeast sector of the campus will be lost because of construction. Street parking is also going to be reduced on a number of streets in the southeast section of the campus. Further, for the second straight year the State Legislature has declined to provide funds for land acquisition. Large numbers of people are going to continue to bring cars to the campus. Obviously some kind of expanded parking facilities must be provided.

Dr. Skinner said he felt that this matter appropriately did belong before the Senate. Parking is a very important issue, a critical matter to most members of the faculty and staff. He said that he agreed that experts should provide the administration input and the administration should then make its decisions. He said he believed if what is now known by most members of the University community had been known several months ago, many faculty members and students would not have acted as they did in opposing the administration's plans for the parking garage. He said he thought the Senate should go on record at this time in support of President Schaefer in his efforts to get the University additional parking facilities.

Dr. Schaefer said he would plead guilty to not having laid a sufficiently strong ground work for his proposal so far as sharing information he had with members of the faculty and staff and with students. He said he did feel he had had sufficient input for his position and he referred to a number of reports in recent years which had been provided the University administration by a number of study committees. These had recommended a high-rise structure in the location he was now recommending. He said time was against him when he suddenly was informed that the deadline for introducing bills into this Legislature was upon him. He had to act quickly and there simply was not time to share information that he had with student, faculty, and staff groups before he had to get his proposal into the legislative hopper.

Dr. Skinner commented that he did not think it was in order at this time to criticize the President further. He then moved that the Senate endorse President Schaefer's recommendation for the construction of a campus parking garage and stadium addition. Dean Myers seconded the motion. Several individuals stated that they

felt this motion was out of order in view of the fact that this meeting was called specially to consider the report from the ad hoc committee. Dr. Skinner and Dean Myers then withdrew their motion.

Dr. Thompson then moved that the Senate receive the majority and minority reports from the committee and refer them to the President to do with as he saw fit. Many seconds were heard to this motion. Dr. Schaefer commented that he was not sure this was a very satisfactory move because this simply dumped the matter into his lap.

Dr. Joyner then made a substitute motion as follows:

"I move that the Senate concur in the Administration's and Board of Regents' decision to build multiple level parking facilities and that financial arrangements based on user fees of those in the University community who possess automobiles be utilized to build said facilities."

At this point Parliamentary Lynn pointed out that a substitute motion could not be made without the assembly's permission. Dean Layton said he was unacquainted with any rule of order to such effect. No copy of Robert's Rules of Order being at hand, however, this question was not resolved.

The Senate then found itself in a bit of a muddle of motions and substitute motions. It became clear, however, that Dr. Joyner's substitute motion had not received a second. Dr. Lynn suggested that the body simply vote on a simple motion to accept the majority report or not. Dr. Dewhirst asked if he was correct in his understanding that in the Faculty Senate by tradition there has been a distinction between acceptance of a report, implying approval, and simple receipt of one. Dr. Thompson said he had intended that the report simply be received. The President then would have it available to guide him as he found appropriate.

Dr. Gegenheimer moved that Dr. Thompson's motion be amended to provide that the committee continue to study the matter and bring a further report to the Senate at an appropriate time. Dean Rhodes asked why a motion before the Senate always had to be decked out with the ornamentation of amendments, substitute motions, etc. There was no second to Dr. Gegenheimer's motion. The question was called for on Dr. Thompson's original motion, and it carried with one dissenting vote heard.

Dr. Joyner then again submitted the motion he had made earlier as follows:

"I move that the Senate concur in the Administration's and Board of Regents' decision to build multiple level parking facilities and that financial arrangements based on user fees of those in the University community who possess automobiles be utilized to build said facilities."

Several seconds were heard. Dr. Gegenheimer spoke against Dr. Joyner's motion saying he felt it would be out of order to take such action at this meeting being held for the purpose for which it was called. Dr. Bartlett moved that the meeting adjourn. Mr. McMillan seconded the motion, but the motion failed.

Dean McConnell commented that at the time the ad hoc committee was originally set up he thought the committee would have an important role to play because presumably information could be collected by the committee which would be helpful. The

committee was therefore charged to get certain facts. It seemed to him, however, that the committee in fact had now exceeded its charge and he thought this point should be brought to the Senate's attention.

Dr. Joyner said that certain facts must not be overlooked by the Senate. These include the fact that for two years now the University has not been provided any funds for land acquisition. He felt it should be assumed that this situation will not change in the next few years. On the other hand additional parking facilities must be provided. Therefore the only way parking construction can go is up. The Senate now has information before it which, coupled with common sense, should indicate the chart for the future. In other words the President is going in a sensible direction, and the Senate should provide him with moral support for his plan. He said Dr. Schaefer has admitted that he was wrong in not providing more widely to faculty, students, and staff the reasoning behind his original decision to propose the sort of parking structure he had. Dr. Joyner said he as one senator was willing to admit that his position earlier had been wrong because he did not have information which now has been made available to him.

At this point Dr. Bretall asked if the present parking lots on the campus would be maintained even if the parking garage were constructed. Dr. Schaefer said some would be and some would not. Some will have to be pulled out of service next year. On the other hand, if funding can be provided some existing lots will be paved and lighted and controlled entry installed. These steps should be taken as soon as possible, preferably during the summer of 1972.

Professor Green said that Dr. Joyner had stated that the Faculty Senate should go on record as supporting the administration in this matter. Yet the administration had said that this is not a matter for faculty action. What should the Senate's position be here? Dr. Schaefer responded by saying that the Faculty Senate had already done its damage on the matter for this year. Further he did not see how anyone could act on the report of the ad hoc committee without participating in an extensive review by experts. Such reviews take time. The President said we must recognize the fact that the question of the parking proposal is a highly emotional one. Everyone on the ad hoc committee was prejudiced in one direction or the other. Some people are so committed to the idea that automobiles should be phased out of our society that they feel nothing should be done to make it easier to park. Such philosophical points of view undoubtedly had a bearing on how some persons had approached this matter. It is hard to reach sensible decisions when people don't have a great amount of time for adequate study, he said.

Dr. Skinner said he did not feel the Senate had had adequate information at first. The fact is that more information has now been made available to the Senate members. He said if the President of the University wanted to act in an area where the Senate should in fact be acting, he would oppose that. Similarly, if the Senate was trying to act in an area which is really one in which the President should make the decision, he would oppose such Senate action. He said the latter situation prevailed in this question. He said he felt he was not qualified to make a sensible decision, though he was more informed than he was several months ago. He felt that the best possible expertise should be made available to the President and the President should then decide. He said he was speaking in support of Dr. Joyner's motion.

Dr. Schaefer said that in executive decision making there are two types of questions. In one sort of question involving subjective opinion democracy should decide and be given full play. In the other, where an absolute answer can be reached,

based on facts, a completely democratic process may not be feasible. Expertise must be the controlling factor. In University administration this expertise may come from within or without the University, but once the professional judgment has been made available then the final decision has to be made by the administration.

Dr. Dewhirst commented that the ad hoc committee's report had been received. Dr. Thompson's motion had been adopted by the Senate. He said he felt it was inappropriate for the Senate to go further and he was speaking against Dr. Joyner's motion.

The question was called for and Dr. Joyner's motion lost.

Professor Green said that he personally felt hurt that the Faculty Senate was being blamed because the Parking Garage Bill had failed before the Arizona Legislature. He said he knew that some other members of the Tucson community had objected to the planned location of the proposed structure and they on their own had taken action in their own way to encourage legislative defeat of the proposal. He did not think it was fair for the Faculty Senate to be blamed as the group solely responsible for defeat of the bill in the Legislature. Further, he said, when an individual senator's own financial welfare was at stake and he therefore spoke or acted against a matter before the Faculty Senate he did not think that senator should be scolded for having acted in a certain way.

At this point Dean Myers moved that the meeting be adjourned. Many seconds were heard and the Senate meeting adjourned at 4:37 o'clock.



David L. Windsor, Secretary