

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well  
**University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well**

---

Campus Resources and Planning Committee  
(Inactive)

Campus Governance

---

2-18-2009

# Campus Resources and Planning minutes 02/18/ 2009

Campus Resources and Planning Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/crpc>

---

## Recommended Citation

Campus Resources and Planning Committee, "Campus Resources and Planning minutes 02/18/2009" (2009). *Campus Resources and Planning Committee (Inactive)*. 20.  
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/crpc/20>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Campus Resources and Planning Committee (Inactive) by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

## **Campus Resources and Planning Committee**

February 18, 2009

Present: Dave Swenson, Sara Haugen, Jennifer Rothchild, Ray Schultz, Lowell Rasmussen, Heather Peters, LeAnn Dean, Maddy Maxeiner, Kathy Julik-Heine, Shannon Juhnke, Pete Wyckoff, Zak Forde, Jacquie Johnson, Bryan Herrmann

Guests: Judy Kuechle

**Minutes from 12/11/08 and 2/24/09 approved as presented.**

### **Master Plan**

Lowell reported that the Board of Regents has asked all campuses to keep their Master Plans updated. This plan is the second edition for UMM. The first and only other Master Plan was done in 1995. About a year ago, we issued an RFP and ultimately hired Oslund and Associates. What you have in front of you is a compilation of their interpretation of what they heard and what they think UMM should look like. As an interesting comparison, the first plan was very much a narrative, academic, honoring our history kind of approach. Basically a book on why Morris is special. This plan is absolutely not that. It's a technical and numbers oriented approach to describing our campus and focused on very specific outcomes. After CRPC reviews, the plan goes to the Chancellor. If she accepts the plan, it is forwarded to Vice President Kathleen O'Brien who will put it on the Regents agenda for their approval sometime this spring. Oslund & Associates have reminded us that is a fluid plan that will never be static. He cautioned the perfectionists among this group that it may never be right for everyone but we have to have a plan that in concept we can believe in.

Pete said he made a list of things he agreed with and would be proud to defend. There are also things in the plan that he would not have a good answer for. For example, one easily defended suggestion would be the Hwy 59 entrance to the campus. The extreme opposite would be moving second street. Sara thought the committee and the consultants never agreed on how important it is to be part of the community. Jacquie said we will need to hear from the community before it goes before the Regents because it's important to hear what they have to say. We will schedule a meeting that would include members of the community. She added that phases and priorities could change depending on available funding.

Pete asked Lowell if they addressed what we asked for. For example, the storm water problem isn't addressed anywhere in the report. Zak added that there wasn't very much data or rationale for why they suggested something. Ray asked Lowell if the list is adequate. Lowell said that if there are things in here the committee cannot live with then he will get back to them. He asked committee members to remember that is only a template and guide, not a building document. Kathy asked if is possible that we could construct a building without it being in the master plan. Lowell responded that yes we could. He looks at the master plan as a starting place.

Pete feels that endorsing this place could mean two things: because we have to have a master plan, we sought a professional opinion and here it is. If what we're saying is here is the plan CRPC is pushing, then I'm not ready to endorse because Oslund never responded to the concerns of the committee. He feels that it is still their vision, not ours.

Jacquie thought we may be overstating just a little bit that Oslund didn't listen to anything. There were some heated conversations as well as directives as the process evolved. For her, one of the hopeful elements was the technology piece and she believes we may have disappointed them because we weren't ready. Lowell said what we will say to the Regents is that this is our view of what the campus might look like. This is simply a guideline for us to use. The committee could approve or endorse in principle, not page by page.

CRPC will continue the discussion at the meeting next week.

### **Stimulus bill**

Lowell reported that we were asked to submit a prioritized list of projects that could be started or done in the next three to four

months. He apologized for not submitting the list to CRPC because of a very quick turnaround.