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TO: Members of the Duluth Planning Advisory Committee

Gentlemen:

Submitted herewith is the preliminary draft of the Planning Directives for the UMD Long Range Development Plan. The "Directives" set the course for planning at UMD by establishing criteria for future development and strategies for reaching planning goals.

Included as part of this document are the "issue analysis sheets" that have been submitted to date. A separate file for issues is being kept and they are included here for reference only.

This document was to include enrollment projections and space need data. However, due to problems in arriving at agreed upon data, this information is not included and will be sent out later as an addendum to this report.

This preliminary report is for your review and comment. Please feel free to comment on any of the information in the report at the next Duluth Planning Advisory Committee Meeting to be held on November 2, 1972 at 2:00.

Sincerely,

Kenneth P. Stebbins
Consultant Planner - UMD

KRS: rvo

Kenneth R. Stebbins
Planning Consultant

6335 Barrie Road    Edina, Minnesota    55435
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participatory planning
Prior to the development of a master plan for UMD, it is essential that the goals and strategies for achieving that plan are established; i.e., Planning Directives. The following text outlines those goals that the planners see as the basis for the development of the planning framework, and the strategies or methods for achieving those goals.

The text will be broken down into five general areas: 1.) issue analysis and participatory planning, 2.) programming needs, 3.) planning criteria, 4.) planning strategies, and 5.) site analysis. Each area contributes significantly to the master planning framework which will be developed later.

As was stated in the Tactical Report/Report 1, participatory planning plays a very crucial role in the Planning Process. If planning decisions are not founded on input from those who will be most affected by planning decisions, then the plans have no validity and become "ivory tower solutions".

To achieve participatory planning, the planners distributed issue analysis sheets to students, faculty, and staff to solicit their comments on what the planning at UMD should consider. In addition, meetings were held with individuals, committees, organizations, city government officials, and other interest groups to identify additional areas of concern.

The issues that have been generated by the issue sheets and meetings, have been catalogued according to the general planning areas outlined in the Planning Base Inventory/Report 2; (natural systems; program relationships; housing, social, recreation and commercial facilities; services and utilities; and transportation). Copies of these issues are found in the Appendix of this report.

The following drawings of the Campus illustrate some of the more significant issues that have been brought forth by issue analysis and interest group meetings. They indicate the wide range of concerns that issue analysis has uncovered. Issue Map-A illustrates those issues that relate the Campus to the Community. Issue
Map-B indicates those issues which are more specifically related to the Campus itself. Issue Man-C illustrates those issues which deal directly with transportation problems.

on-going planning

The planning at UMD is to be an on-going process. The Master Plan, is to be reviewed, revised, and updated regularly so that it all remains current. All background information related to the master plan must also be kept up to date.

As part of the on-going process, it is imperative that UMD establish a means of having continuous user input into the planning process. It is, therefore, recommended that issues analysis sheets be available to anyone who wishes to identify a specific issue and that an open file of planning issues be kept at the Office of Physical Planning in Minneapolis and at UMD.

Issue Analysis sheets should be obtained from either the Office of Business Affairs or the Office of Student Affairs at UMD. Completed forms should be returned to either office or sent directly to the Office of Physical Planning, 503 Morrill Hall, Minneapolis Campus. Completed forms will then be filed under a general heading or area of concern. An additional record will be kept stating the action that has taken place on each issue.
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As has been stated previously, the major product of the planning process is to be a Master Planning Framework for UMD. Prior to the development of the "framework plan", a concerted effort must be made to develop fundamental predictions in the areas of: future enrollment, related space needs, capacities for future physical development and sources of financial aid. The task of providing these basic predictions rests with the administration of UMD, because too often this responsibility has been handed over to the physical planner resulting in assumptions that portray the future of the institution in a manner that does not accurately reflect the true needs and desires of the institution.

To prevent false assumptions from being made, UMD was directed to supply the planners with information related to enrollment projections, space needs and space utilization. To be useful in developing the "planning framework" the information is related to the three planning development stages stated in the Tactical Report/Report 1, Issue 9. Specifically, these stages are:

a) Short Range Planning (2 to 4 years) - Predictions must reflect a high degree of accuracy because this type of planning typically involves physical facilities that are in the programming stage or building request stage. Projections for such projects must indicate numbers of people using the facility, related space requirements, teaching methods, functional relationships and operational needs.

b) Mid-Range Planning (up to 10 years) - Projections should indicate basic societal, educational and cultural trends that effect enrollment, programs, teaching methods, and space needs. This information allows the planners to locate facilities and functions within the "planning framework" in general terms.

c) Long Range Planning - (beyond 10 years) - For this planning stage the "framework" functions as a statement of the ultimate physical goals of the institution. To identify these goals the institution must define enrollment ceilings, educational goals, and basic trends.

The physical planners task then is to translate the academic programming data generated by the institution into a workable "physical planning framework."
enrollment projections

The information and data for this section is currently being prepared and will be sent out as an addendum for review and comment as soon as it becomes available.
space need projections

The information and data for this section is currently being prepared and will be sent out as an addendum for review and comment as soon as it becomes available.
planning criteria
Planning Criteria are the set of goals that planning at UMD should strive for. The criteria establish the character and systems required to make the Campus a viable part of the University system and the City of Duluth while providing an exciting environment within which to live and learn.

The planning criteria are to be used as a method of evaluating the progress of planning implementation and physical growth at UMD. As projects are proposed for UMD, they should be evaluated against the criteria to insure that when the projects are implemented they will be compatible and successful additions to the Campus. The organization of the criteria follows the general outline of the planning areas as defined by the Planning Base Inventory Report/Report 2. (or see Issues and Participatory Planning of this Text).

natural systems criteria

The following criteria outline the guidelines for the development of the physical character of the Campus. The criteria were generated from an analysis of the existing physical character as well as from related issues that have been identified during the early planning phases at UMD.

1. General Criteria

   a) The unique and inherent topographic features of the Campus shall be preserved.

   b) The natural environment shall be upgraded or improved by two means. (1) preservation of existing amenities, and (2) adding desired qualities to existing amenities.

   c) Plant materials used shall be native to the Duluth region except in specific cases where non-native materials are required for special effect or teaching purposes.

   d) All ecological and geological systems shall be regarded as having high priority and the unique features of these systems should be regarded as a valuable resource.

   e) Views towards Lake Superior shall be preserved whenever possible.
f) The feasibility of using the natural surface drainage ways and streams on Campus should be studied as a means of linking together areas of the Campus and of linking the Campus to the community.

g) The character of the Rock Hill area should be used as the unifying and major characteristic of the Campus.

h) Earth excavated from current construction projects should be utilized whenever possible for use in landscaping projects on Campus.

i) The Campus shall present an overall image of quality and continuity.

2. Land Use

a) When sites are considered for new construction, the potential for the site to take alternative uses shall be thoroughly investigated prior to any final decision.

b) If animal holding areas are required for specific academic programs they shall be of two classifications: (1) large animal holding areas and breeding colonies shall be located off the Campus proper, (2) short term animal holding areas shall be located within the academic complex in areas where they can be easily serviced and will be unoffensive to the activities of adjacent areas.

c) The Campus built-up area shall be kept as compact as possible so that all parts of the academic complex are within convenient walking distance and quickly accessible between class breaks.

d) High density development shall occur on carefully selected sites where it will add visual interest to the architectural character of the Campus without destroying views of the lake from the Campus or surrounding neighborhoods.

e) Land use at the periphery of the Campus shall respect the uses imposed by the city on property adjacent to the Campus.

3. Open Space

a) Open space shall be preserved whenever possible and should be related to open space planning policies established by the city.

b) A variety of open spaces should be developed to provide a wider range of spacial experiences for the Campus population.
c) The courtyard system already established should be expanded to provide passive outdoor open space immediately adjacent to academic and housing facilities.

d) Formal recreation space (tennis courts, ball fields, etc.) should be located as close to student housing areas as possible.

4. Built Form

a) Buildings that have high historic or aesthetic value (i.e. Lower Campus) should be preserved and up-graded to the same standards and quality as the rest of the Campus.

b) Planting areas near buildings shall be developed so that the visual impact of large bare walls are reduced to a more pleasing and human scale.

c) Landscaping and built form shall protect against severe climatic conditions and enhance beneficial ones by:

1.) Linking the academic complex, parking areas, and transit stops with climate controlled pedestrian routes.

2.) Preserving and creating both warm, sunny sheltered areas and highly shaded areas.

3.) Protecting against severe winter winds and taking advantage of cool summer breezes.

4.) Prevention of detrimental snow drifting.

5.) Creating weather protected external circulation routes.

d) A concerted effort shall be made to unify the Campus by simplifying the palette of materials used on future buildings, relating them to the major materials previously used on Campus and by using a consistant set of native landscaping materials for site work.

e) New facilities constructed on Campus should contribute to the existing Campus beyond those needs of the departments involved, in the following ways:

- internal circulation linkages with the existing campus should be part of building programs whenever feasible.

- provide easy access to and integration with existing facilities.

- access for the handicapped shall be provided in all new facilities.
- provide common spaces, both exterior and interior for students, staff, and faculty
- common outdoor circulation should be provided and considered part of the program.

program relationships criteria

To the same extent that planning at UMD must be based on a sound planning process, so must the programming for new curriculums and facilities. It is essential then that UMD establish a standard programming process that is carefully coordinated with the programming processes of other units of the University system.

By utilizing a standard process, UMD can effectively utilize information and personnel from other units of the University system in developing programs that accurately reflect the campuses needs and aspirations. Thoughtful programming will result in physical facilities which easily fit into the master planning framework while successfully meeting the needs of the Campus.

1. General
   a) Complete and accurate data concerning enrollment projections, staff, and faculty needs, space needs, time and facility scheduling should be continuously available from UMD so that the implementation of the master plan will be carried out in a rational manner.
   b) Curriculum scheduling and teaching loads should be continuously monitored so that the highest efficiency of teacher-student contact can be achieved.
   c) All programming data should be kept in a standard format so that it can be readily utilized by anyone involved in the development of new programs and facilities.

2. Programming
   a) Extension programs should be expanded so that academic facilities are utilized for a greater share of the day.
   b) Future expansion of the Campus should be based on rational functional relationships and accurate space needs.
c) Academic space shall be broadly categorized according to type and intensity of service, (i.e., general or specific and highly or lightly serviced) so that they may be appropriately located within the planning framework.

d) Space shall be utilized to its highest potential through efficient class scheduling.

e) Interrelated activities shall be located adjacent to each other.

f) Programs and facilities serving the Campus as a whole shall be located where they have the best accessibility and exposure.

3. Physical Facilities

a) New and innovative teaching methods should be explored whenever possible and therefore new academic structures should be adaptable to these new methods.

b) New facilities should allow for three scales of flexibility:

- changeability of furnishings and services within a single space

- changeability of entire floor layouts

- conversion of an entire facility to house a different function.

c) Research facilities shall be easily accessible at all times so that research space is used to its highest potential.

d) Large lecture halls and library facilities shall be located where they are easily accessible by large numbers of students.

e) All facilities and spaces within facilities shall be accessible to the handicapped student and provisions shall be made to conveniently meet their daily needs.

f) Existing and future facilities should be available for public functions whenever possible so that the Campus becomes a more viable part of the community.
At the present time, it appears that a key to future growth at UMD will be the amount of housing provided by; the University itself, private developers, or the surrounding community. To reach anticipated enrollment goals, a variety of methods will have to be employed to encourage students to come to UMD. Offering a variety of high quality, non-academic amenities will be one method of accomplishing this goal. Of these amenities, the offering of a variety of housing types plays an important role.

Past history at UMD indicates that a marked increase in enrollment occurs each time new housing facilities are opened. At the same time there is no increase in the number of vacancies of rental units in the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Therefore, it seems justifiable that to attract students to the UMD Campus, the University must adopt a strong policy towards providing additional student housing at UMD.

Although no official University housing policy exists, the following criteria are stated as a guide for whatever future housing is constructed at UMD.

1. Housing
   a) Complete records should be kept as to where students live and what kinds of facilities they prefer so that future projections for housing needs can be fairly realistic.
   b) A variety of housing types shall be provided so that students are presented with a choice of living styles.
   c) Student, staff, and faculty lounge spaces shall be provided within housing areas where they will be easily accessible by all concerned.

2. Social, Recreation, and Commercial Facilities Criteria
   a) Convenient access should be provided to non-academic activities located on and off Campus.
   b) The feasibility of providing commercial facilities on campus should be studied.
   c) A variety of indoor and outdoor recreational facilities shall be provided to fulfill the non-academic needs of students.
   d) Housing, social, recreation, and commercial facilities shall encourage and support year round as well as day and evening usage.
1. General

a) Services and utilities to new facilities should be an extension of a coordinated utility and service system for the entire Campus.

b) Service and delivery points shall be kept to a minimum and be well integrated with the architecture of the Campus so as to be as unobtrusive as possible. All servicing and delivery shall be treated as a single system.

As enrollment increases at UMD so will problems related to traffic circulation, pedestrian movement, servicing and vehicular storage. The following transportation criteria have been developed from information obtained during the survey taken on November 3, 1971 (see Appendix, Planning Base Inventory/Report 2). The criteria provide guidelines for the solving of existing problems and for the prevention of future transportation problems on the UMD Campus.

1. General

a) All methods of transportation to and within the Campus and parking on the Campus shall be treated as a system. With this system approach the relationships between each element of the system may be determined, and the tradeoffs resulting from a change in one element of the system may be assessed.

b) The transportation system shall serve as a tool towards implementing overall Campus objectives, such as regarding Campus size class schedules, housing, and the establishment of a Campus identity.

c) The transportation system shall operate effectively during all time periods (peak hours, as well as late night hours and weekends).

d) The transportation system shall be coordinated with the transportation system in the City and region.

e) Development of transportation facilities shall be sensitive to community concerns, including social and environmental quality, property values, open spaces, recreational areas, and cultural and historic facilities.
f) Use of transit for access to Campus and intercampus movement shall be maximized.

g) The elements of the transportation system shall be coordinated so that all Campus users, including visitors can reach their building destinations directly and without confusion.

2. Travel to Campus

a) The campus shall be directly accessible via the regional arterial street system, with travel on local streets discouraged.

b) Each parking facility on Campus shall be directly accessible from each major direction of approach to the Campus.

c) A distinctive signing system shall be implemented on the approaches to the Campus to direct motorists to their appropriate destinations.

d) Access to the Campus shall be coordinated with other transportation planning studies in the Duluth area.

e) The Campus bus service shall serve travel between the Upper Campus and the Lower Campus and the major off-campus student residential areas. It shall be coordinated with City bus routes and shall be coordinated with class schedules.

f) City bus routes shall continue to link the Campus with downtown Duluth and other areas not served by the intercampus bus routes.

3. Intra-Campus Circulation

a) Campus buildings shall be linked both by a system of enclosed pedestrian walkways and by an outdoor sidewalk system.

b) Each long term parking facility shall be conveniently accessible to both pedestrian systems.

c) Provisions shall be made for bicycle movements and parking.

d) Pedestrian routes shall accommodate handicapped persons.

4. Parking On Campus

a) Long-term and short-term parking needs shall be satisfied through separate facilities.
b) Short-term parking spaces shall be provided where needed near buildings for the exclusive use of visitors and drop-off/pick-up purposes.

c) Long-term parking facilities shall be planned to meet future parking demands on campus. On street parking along adjacent residential streets shall be discouraged.

d) Both short and long-term parking facilities shall provide an adequate number of spaces to serve handicapped drivers.
1. Planning Implementation

The major goal of the UMD Long Range Development Plan is to establish a set of guidelines for future development of the Campus. In the past, planning in general has been too restrictive in directing physical growth by not providing flexibility for adapting to future changes. It is nearly impossible to predict what the future holds for educational institutions because so many variables can come into play. However, a master plan should be able to respond to these variables as they occur.

The Long Range Development Plan should be related to a set of planning stages, each stage being able to stand alone yet function as a part of the ultimate plan whenever the plan reaches completion. The plan should be able to adapt to unanticipated changes in education yet still function in the context of the plan's overall concepts. New additions to the Campus framework should not restrict the growth of adjacent areas and functions or prevent the implementation of future options as they present themselves.

The overall planning framework should define the broad objectives of the institution while allowing flexibility and change as the institution works toward those objectives.

2. Natural Systems

2a. Preservation of Natural Resources, the Environment and Campus Character

With the development of a comprehensive long range plan, elements other than physical facilities take on increased importance. The final plan must consider the total environment and character of the institution, as well as the addition of new facilities.

The UMD Campus possesses unique characteristics in both its landscape and architecture. The naturalness of the Campus should be considered a valuable resource and should be preserved and/or improved as the Campus grows. There should be a variety of areas on Campus that are not devoted to physical facilities. Planning should therefore take advantage of the natural resources on the Campus by creating a policy of conservation and preservation rather than casually expanding physical facilities into any open areas on Campus that appear convenient.
The general architectural character of the Campus is one that relates well to the pedestrian scale. The system of total internal circulation and the system of intimate exterior courtyards adjacent to academic buildings provide unique qualities that many Campuses do not have. These, too, should be considered valuable resources which should be preserved, improved, and expanded as the Campus grows.

2b. Landscape

The beauty of the natural landscape at UMD provides an unusually impressive backdrop for the academic complex. There are many open spaces on Campus of extremely high quality which should be preserved at all cost. These areas provide not only aesthetic relief but also provide habitat areas for a variety of wildlife species.

As physical facilities expand, the natural areas should be made readily accessible from the academic core through an organized pedestrian circulation system and should combine to form an overall system of open space. Open spaces should provide a pleasant variety of spacial experiences to the Campus population.

The upgrading of open space should be accomplished primarily through the use of native plant materials. Campus open space should relate to and be compatible with established or planned open space systems for the City of Duluth.

To prevent having undeveloped spaces between and around new facilities, building programs should include adjacent areas as part of the project contracts.

2c. Landuse

Expansion of physical facilities at UMD should occur only on those sites where such development is easily tolerated. Individual sites possess unique qualities, and, therefore, prior to any final decisions as to location of new facilities, all possible building sites should be considered so that new facilities will be built where they are most appropriate as viable additions to the existing complex.
Development at the periphery of the Campus should respect the landuses of the properties adjoining UMD to avoid major use conflicts between University and residential property.

Landuse shall be categorized into four major types: 1.) Academic or Building Sites; 2.) Open Space Sites; 3.) Parking Sites; 4.) and Housing Sites. (See Section 5 - Site Suitability Study.) Major sites are identified as to their primary landuse and may be used for alternative functions only after carefully considering the consequences of implications of other kinds of development.

2d. Recreation and Open Space

Open space and recreation areas involve a wide range of intensities of use. Areas and uses can vary from highly active organized forms of recreation, to passive activities such as sitting and sunning, to areas that are basically for visual effect. A variety of open space should be preserved and dispersed throughout the Campus. Organized recreational areas should be directly accessible from student housing areas.

3. Housing, Social, Recreational & Commercial Facilities

3a. Housing

The subject of student housing is a sensitive issue and one that appears to play an important role in the future development of the Duluth Campus. The present policy of the University has put a hold on student housing funded by the University. This policy may severely restrict the growth of UMD. It seems inevitable that any major increase in enrollment at UMD will be through students coming from other areas of the state or five state region. These students will require housing if they choose to stay at UMD. The total lack of married student housing or faculty housing places yet another burden on the quantity of housing needed.

Future planning for UMD must anticipate the possibility of providing more student housing. Housing should be offered in a variety of types so that the students have a wide range of living styles to choose from. Housing should be located where it is convenient to outdoor recreation areas and located near the periphery of the Campus. In addition, housing should be linked to the academic complex by climate protected linkages whenever possible.
3b. Campus Communal Facilities

To make the Campus a total living-learning experience, the feasibility of developing more commercial, recreation and social facilities on Campus should be studied. Although the immediate community supplies a part of these non-academic types of facilities, there is great potential in making the UMD Campus a total living-learning center by providing more of these facilities on Campus.

The main center for communal facilities should remain at Kirby Center/Food Service Center while smaller, sub-centers or activity nodes should be located at either end of the academic complex. The facilities should be an integral part of the pedestrian circulation system and related to the exterior court system.

Campus communal facilities important for the non-academic part of the students' college life. With the addition of these functions the viability of the Campus would be increased; creating an environment that is active for a greater share of the day and encouraging longer usage of all facilities year round.

3c. Integration of Common Facilities and Functions

As the Campus develops toward its ultimate goals, an intense investigation should be made of methods of combining and consolidating common use facilities and specific functions within single facilities so that departmental territories can be avoided. General purpose space should not be isolated but consolidated into areas where they are highly accessible to large numbers of students.

New facilities should incorporate as part of their building programs, extensions of the pedestrian circulation network and linkages to common exterior open space.

3d. Academic Space

New academic space should be provided only after careful analysis of departmental needs. New facilities should possess a high degree of flexibility so that they may readily accommodate new teaching methods and alternative uses. The feasibility of developing shared facilities, rather than departmental territories should be studied so that a high degree of space utilization may be achieved and duplication of facilities avoided.
3e. Physical Facilities Expansion

There are four methods of achieving building expansion; utilization, renovation, infill, and expansion. When new physical facilities are requested there should be an analysis of the appropriate method to use in providing the required space. The first method includes expansion through better utilization of existing facilities. The second method involves the renovation of existing facilities to better use existing space for new functions.

Due to the newness of most buildings on Campus, these situations are not typical. However, the opportunity to fulfill space needs of departments through these techniques should not be overlooked. If neither of these techniques are appropriate, then the possibility of infill construction between existing facilities either above or below grade should be studied.

The courtyard spaces at UMD provide an unique opportunity to construct extensive below grade space immediately adjacent to existing facilities. By using this method, the Campus would maintain a high degree of compactness and not infringe on existing open space. In addition, it would encourage the development of the exterior court spaces which are now very underdeveloped.

The fourth technique involves the construction of new facilities in areas adjacent to the existing complex where presently no facilities exist. This type of development requires careful analysis of those sites selected for future buildings so that the site suitabilities of the particular homogeneous sites involved are respected.

4. Services and Utilities

4a. Facility Servicing and Deliveries

A system for servicing individual buildings and the handling of pick-up and deliveries should be incorporated into the short term parking and intra-campus vehicular circulation system. Pick-up and deliveries should be restricted to as few locations as possible with the majority of servicing occurring at the central loading dock and service tunnel under the new Food Service Center. Service docks should be carefully integrated with the physical facilities.
4b. Utilities

In the past no orderly system of utilities had ever been developed at UMD. When money has become available old sections of the system have been updated to current standards. However, some sections of the existing system are still below standard.

Recently constructed facilities have started to consolidate and extend the present utility system into internal utility tunnels thus preventing the interruption of utilities service when new facilities are constructed.

It should be of the highest priority to establish a first class utility framework by consolidating all the major utilities into a highly organized utility system.

5. Transportation

5a. Auto Circulation

The interruption of Oakland Avenue by the construction of the new Food Service Center has changed the traffic flow through and around the campus considerably. As the Campus continues to grow, the impact of UMD as a traffic generator will become even greater. UMD should keep the impact of traffic volumes on adjacent neighborhoods at a minimum.

All vehicles, other than service, visitor, drop-off, or pick-up should be prohibited from the built-up campus area. To satisfy those high turnover needs, a minimum number of short-term parking spaces should be provided adjacent to academic buildings.

5b. Transit Use

Transit use at UMD involves two levels of service. The first is the city-wide system of public bus service that brings students to or near the Campus. The second system is the inter-campus bus system, which shuttles between the Upper and Lower Campuses and runs into the neighborhood adjacent to the Lower Campus where a large number of UMD students live.
The interface between the two systems should be improved so as to encourage greater transit travel to Campus by students living in areas some distance from the Campus. Increased transit use would inevitably lower the demand for on-Campus parking.

The possibility of expanding the inter-campus route to include St. Scholastica should not be discarded until further relationships between the two schools can be established. The expansion of the transit system should service future student housing areas built by the University.

5c. Parking Systems

As the Campus expands in both enrollment and physical facilities, changes will have to occur in the existing system of parking on Campus. There are two types of parking that must be satisfied now and in the future; long-term, low turnover parking and short-term, high turnover parking.

Because of the distinct differences in character and need between the two parking situations, there should be a clear separation between the two functions. Long-term parking should occur at the edges of the Campus in landscaped, surface lots or in parking structures. These parking facilities should be linked to the academic complex by pedestrian corridors which are either climate controlled or protected from adverse weather.

Short-term parking should be located in a limited number of strategically placed lots immediately adjacent to academic buildings. The control and use of these facilities should be strictly enforced so that the system functions properly and in the manner for which it was intended.

The parking facilities should clearly relate to an established vehicular circulation system for the entire Campus.

Changes should also be made in the current system of fees paid for parking. If parking is to become a permanent facility while being self supporting (a current University policy), then students, faculty, staff, and visitors will have to pay more than they do now. Increased fees for parking would also have a side affect by encouraging more people to car pool or rely on public transit thus reducing the demand for on-Campus parking spaces.
5d. Pedestrian Circulation

A unique quality of the UMD Campus is its internal, environmentally controlled, pedestrian circulation system. This system, which is well integrated with physical facilities, should establish the basis for an expanded pedestrian circulation system for the entire Campus development.

The system should be extended to all new academic facilities on Campus and should connect with long-term parking areas whenever possible.

By further developing the internal system of circulation, a greater cross use of facilities by various departments can be achieved. This will eliminate departmental boundaries on space and increase facilities utilization. Total internal circulation will also provide a high degree of accessibility for handicapped students.

In addition to the internal pedestrian circulation system, there should also be a related external pedestrian system which takes advantage of the natural areas on Campus linking together isolated facilities on Campus with the academic complex.

The external pedestrian circulation system should relate to the City's open space system. Bicycle circulation should also be incorporated with the Campus pedestrian circulation system and relate to bicycle routes, established by the City.
site analysis

The future growth of the University of Minnesota - Duluth Campus is not only dependent upon the number of students, their needs and desires, but also upon the amount and potential of available land to support such growth. While there appears to be sufficient land area for anticipated expansion, the characteristics of different areas vary greatly in their ability to support certain types of functions and intensities of use. Some areas have soils which will readily support major structures while soil conditions at another area would make construction economically infeasible. Areas have varying topographies, vegetation, microclimates, and visual appeal.

homogeneous sites

Planning the future use of the available land must be based on thorough investigation and analysis of the numerous sites. To aid in establishing the best use of the land, the entire Campus was divided into sites which are considered to be homogeneous in their characteristics and which can be treated as units for future use and/or development. All land currently under university ownership and land programmed for future acquisition was analyzed (however, this does not include the newly acquired Northeast Experiment Station property).

In defining homogeneous sites, three basic factors were considered: Ecological/physical land characteristics; current land usage; and visual characteristics. Homogeneous sites were established through visual inspection. The boundaries of some sites are well defined by existing development while others are defined only by a change in topography, vegetation, or variations in natural habitat. (See figure 4.)

the matrices

Following the establishment of the homogeneous sites, each unit was analyzed by testing it through a series of matrices. The initial matrix, "Homogeneous Site Components" (figure 5) defines the major characteristics of each site relative to the three basic factors mentioned in the previous paragraph. The second matrix, "Site Suitability Components" (figure 6) rates the characteristics of each site against specific requirements of various land uses. This matrix generates an evaluation of the ability of a site to support certain functions: recreation, housing, academic buildings, outdoor biological education, maintenance, and parking facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>site number</th>
<th>ecological/land characteristics</th>
<th>land use characteristics</th>
<th>visual characteristics</th>
<th>site relationships</th>
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</tr>
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*figure 5*
### Site Suitability Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Casual Recreation</th>
<th>Organized Recreation</th>
<th>Academic/Outdoor Buildings</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Single family homes**
- **Single family homes**
- **Student housing**
- **Rock hill**
- **Pond**
- **Theater**
- **Single family homes**
- **Single family homes**
- **Service area**
- **Market, large storage**
- **Single family homes**
- **Service area**
- **Baseball fields**
- **Central campus**
- **Service area**
- **Parking lot 'B'**
- **Peninsula**
- **Parking lot 'A'**
- **Bus route across Oakland Ave. South**
- **Field**
- **Field**
- **Parking lot**
- **Service area**
- **Parking lot**
- **Service area**
- **Bus route Maryl Drive**
- **Under construction**
- **Griggs field**
- **Service parking area**
- **Service parking area**
- **Hill terrace, under construction**
- **Parking lot 'A'**
- **Service parking area**
- **Parking lot 'B'**
- **Service area**
- **Bus route through parking area**
- **Student center court**
- **Bus route through service area**
- **Service area**
- **Service area**
- **Library center**
- **Service area**
- **Service area**
- **Parking lot**
- **Service area**

- **High contributing factor**
- **Low contributing factor**
Each site was evaluated against specific requirements for each land use category. If a certain element does not apply to the site in question, it was not rated. If an element had a minor effect upon the future use of the site, an open circle was noted on the matrix. Only those elements which exert a major influence upon the character and potential of a site were noted by solid circles. The intent was to determine the primary factors that dictate the potential use of each site. Not all factors rated are of equal importance. It is possible that a site might possess several attributes that would appear to make it suitable to a certain use, yet it might be deficient in a single element which is essential to that use. The result is that such use would not be considered the best use of that site. This evaluation of all sites, indicated that certain sites are suitable for many uses, while others have very limited potentials.

To determine the future land use of each homogeneous site, a third matrix, "Land Use Components" (figure 7) was utilized. While the first two matrices represent a more scientific evaluation of characteristics and suitability, the third was intended to combine the information generated from the first two with visual observations and intuitive input. In summary, the first matrix deals strictly with the characteristics of specific use requirements; and the third, giving strong consideration to the existing use and potentials of adjacent sites, identifies the proposed future land use options for each site. Uses noted with solid circles are primary uses and will be illustrated on a Land Use Plan. Those uses noted with open circles are logical alternatives.

It should be emphasized that the Land Use Components indicate the general use of each site. For instance, organized recreation components identify only sites that could be utilized for ballfields, tennis courts, and other common facilities. Special uses, such as ski slopes, would not be appropriate in all sites identified for organized recreation. Only detailed analysis of each site will determine the suitability of a specific development proposal.

don't build sites

Certain homogeneous sites have been identified as "Don't Build" areas. The current condition or use of areas so marked are considered to be of sufficient value to the Campus environment that replacement would be impossible. Therefore, these areas must be completely preserved. Homogeneous sites that have been noted with an open circle in the "Don't Build column can tolerate only a limited amount of encroachment of future development. The portions of such sights that must be preserved
casual recreation
organized recreation
outdoor biol. ed.

housing

outdoor biol. ed.
parking

housing

academic buildings
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note: this plan is based on preliminary site evaluations and is subject to change during the development of the planning framework.
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are indicated on the Land Use Plan. (figure 8)

While the evaluation process is complex and is subject to inaccuracies in the information it generates, it must be emphasized that the function of the components matrix is the provision of a guide and reference for the planner/designer in making critical decisions concerning future university development. It is an organized method of sorting and evaluating information relating to characteristics and potentials of all remaining sites on campus. It will continue to be useful to designers as they prepare detailed development plans.

The following paragraphs briefly describe the primary elements which were considered in evaluating site suitability.

CASUAL RECREATION

Sites to be used for casual recreation should offer a pleasant retreat from highly developed areas of the Campus. Since casual recreation requires virtually no alteration or development of the land other than the possible creation of trails or sitting areas, such use can be accommodated on land that is marginal for more intensive use. Casual recreation uses can occur without destroying the natural landscape or interfering with wildlife habitats.

A variety of spaces for passive recreation is essential - spaces should be usable in different seasons and for varying moods of the user. Sites may vary from a rocky, densely wooded hillside to a surfaced public plaza; from a woodland marsh to a manicured lawn area adjacent to a building. Sites with scenic features, high quality vegetation, and good views are very desirable for casual recreational use.

ORGANIZED RECREATION

Organized recreational facilities - ballfields, tennis courts, etc. - require relatively spacious sites. Since major vegetation and other natural features are not only unimportant, but may actually be detrimental to such uses, flat, open areas are most suitable. Soils must provide good drainage and support adequate ground cover. Accessibility from residential areas and from physical education buildings is of primary importance.

HOUSING

Sites for residential use must, of course, be serviceable and capable of supporting structures, but they should
also provide a desirable living environment. Quality vegetation, good views from dwellings, and protection from harsh climatic elements are desirable. Of primary importance for student housing is proximity to the university academic complex and accessibility to recreational areas - both active and passive.

ACADEMIC BUILDINGS

Sites for future academic buildings must be capable of servicing and supporting major structures. While views and vegetation are of limited value to a site to be used for the expansion of the academic complex, proximity to the existing academic buildings is of utmost importance to allow for interior pedestrian linkage to the existing complex.

OUTDOOR BIOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Areas for outdoor biological study should provide unique plant and animal life. Native vegetation, wetlands, and natural habitats for a wide variety of animal types are essential. Sites should be of adequate size to protect the natural characteristics of such areas and insure their continued existence. Areas of high quality, ornamental (not native) vegetation which could be used for specimen study also have potential for biological education use.

MAINTENANCE

Maintenance functions require areas that are relatively flat and well drained to provide for the necessary garage structures and outdoor storage yards. Good vehicular access to the entire campus is essential. However, since the character of maintenance facilities are not considered compatible with residential, recreational, or academic uses, location of these facilities out of view from the rest of the Campus is extremely important.

PARKING

Although parking may be considered as an interim use on any site programmed for future development, it is and will remain a permanent element of the campus. Sites for major surface parking facilities should be flat and well drained. Since parking lots by nature are open and unobstructed, sites void of vegetation and unique natural features are preferable. Good vehicular access and proximity to the buildings it serves are of major importance.

definitions

To aid in the understanding of the "Site Suitability Components" matrix, several terms deserve definition. They are as follows:
UNIQUE NATURAL FEATURES - natural topographic or geological formations which may present severe limitations for development or have inherent scenic value which should not be destroyed. (Rock outcroppings, swamps, natural forests.)

GOOD VIEWS - expansive overviews of the Campus, the city, the lake, or a scenic area.

SCENIC FEATURES - features that are of great value for viewing in their natural state and cannot be replaced if destroyed. (Rock outcroppings, native forest.)

EASY ACCESS - can be reached with minimum delay and/or obstruction; not necessarily related to distance.

MAJOR VEGETATION - dense, mature trees and other vegetation of high replacement value; primarily, but not exclusively, relating to native vegetation.

MAJOR SOIL LIMITATIONS - obvious limitations to building construction or other development based on available research information; more extensive soil exploration and testing would be required for construction on any site.

PROXIMITY TO SERVICE/COMMERCIAL - close physical relationship to existing commercial and service facilities.

UTILITY RESTRICTIONS - geological, topographic, or soil characteristics that would cause construction of utility lines to be economically infeasible or otherwise undesirable.

PROXIMITY TO EXISTING BUILDINGS/LINK - adjacent to or located sufficiently close to the existing buildings to facilitate the uninterrupted extension of the interior pedestrian circulation system.
1. natural systems
2. program relationships
3. housing, social, recreation, and commercial facilities
4. services and utilities
5. transportation

issues
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university

Date: 5/23/72

Issue:

Access to buildings.

Source of information:

Eric Clarke - Plant Services

Current assumption/policy/situation:

In most cases entrance into existing facilities requires the negotiation of stairs. With the concept of the totally interconnected Campus, stairs defeat the concept and hinder the ability of handicapped students to get around.

Comments:

Ramps are needed at major entry points to allow handicapped access. Ramps also reduce maintenance by making it easier to remove snow.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ staff
doctorate ☐ non-university

Date: 5/23/72

Issue:
Easier maintenance at entries to buildings.

Source of information:
Eric Clarke - Plant Services

Current assumption/policy/situation:
Snow builds up in front of entries creating a hazardous situation and increased maintenance.

Comments:
Dead air space below entry slabs and connected to basement areas of buildings would melt snow and reduce the maintenance required.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university
Date: --

Issue:

Storage of snow once it's removed from parking lots and sidewalks.

Source of information:

Norm Rick - Plant Services

Current assumption/policy/situation:

With the large amount of snowfall each year, the storage of removed snow becomes a critical problem. Areas must be designated and provided for the storage of snow. An alternative system of snow removal might be studied or needed.

Comments:

Landscape architect must be aware of this problem so that appropriate steps can be taken to accommodate this problem or alleviate it with proper landscape planning and treatment.
Third concourse connecting Administration and Physical Education complex.

Source of information:
Long Range Planning Committee

Current assumption/policy/situation:
It has been assumed that a third concourse should be constructed between Administration and Physical Education to create another Terrace and pedestrian link. Could be used to create a central or main entry into Campus.

Comments:
Is this link necessary? Could it ever be extended? Would it receive a large enough volume of traffic to justify its construction?
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ student ☑ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university

Date: 3/1/72

Issue:

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:

Outdoor mini-park areas for lunching, conversation and general communing.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ faculty ☐ staff ☐ student ☐ non-university

Date: --

Issue:

Presentation of the Rock Hill nature area.

Source of information:

Based on personal observation

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Snowmobiles negate a lot of effort by Plant Services to make this a fine sanctuary.

Comments:

Some policy for this area is needed.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ faculty ☐ staff ☐ student ☐ non-university

Date: 2/2/72

Issue:

View of Lake Superior

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:

Originally it was the policy here that no new buildings would block the view of the lake from any existing structures. The new Administration Building has broken with this tradition, and this is to be regretted. In planning for the future, it is to be hoped that the former policy will be adhered to.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ faculty ☐ staff ☐ non-university

Date: 2/22/72

Issue:

General architectural appearance and the approachability to the Campus.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

This is more of a gripe than anything else. Having seen the campus building program grow over the years following the establishment of an overall campus plan, I feel we have ended up with a disappointing "smorgasborad" of brick and mortar. This is particularly true as one looks down the center mall toward the lake.

I see little hope that master planning at this stage of the game can do much to improve the appearance of the Campus. But then, I guess it is what is inside that counts--the convenience of all buildings interconnected--no need to go outside in winter--compactness.

Even with a "something to be desired" appearance, we have lacked a frontal approach road both for access and for viewing the Campus "from below Kirby".

Comments:
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student □ staff
☒ faculty □ non-university

Date: 2/22/72

Issue:

Landscaping

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

The UMD Campus looks like it's been dropped in the center of a big field. There are very few trees, bushes and hedges which break up the bleakness and monotony of that schoolbrick red which seems to predominate in the greater part of Campus. Walking across the big field, coming from Woodland or College Street, one gets the impression that UMD is a big barren factory, with little or no concern given to the aesthetic quality of the buildings or grounds.

Comments:

Make this Campus a little greener with ivy-covered walls wherever possible; thousands of trees, hedges, bushes, all of which help cut down on erosion, break those chilly winter breezes and break the monotony of some very regrettable architectural planning.
Issue:

Feeling at home, a high school or a college, general sterility of atmosphere.

Source of information:

Observation, Sensation

Current assumption/policy/situation:

I assume the present atmosphere of discomfort is not policy but happenstance. Ordean Circle is a meeting place necessarily because this is largely a commuters school. There should be chairs there, at least benches with backs, end tables and possibly even lamps. Many students stand there or sit on the floor for many halves of hours waiting for rides. The way it is now it looks sterile and feels transient.

Bells for classes should be eliminated. Even progressive high schools are getting rid of bells. More classes should be available P-N. P should be A, B, C. N should be D, F. There is a very immature over-emphasis on grades to such an extent that students still come in and ask for their "report cards."

Trees should be planted outside Kirby Lounge at least, and benches of a permanent nature put outside (all-weather benches, heavy wood or something that could be taken in during the very cold months but left outside most of the year). If possible, summer school should offer more classes - the feasibility of this could be at least partially determined by a general survey as to what students actually do during the summer. Given the nature of the area - i.e. economically depressed non-growing city and surrounding payroll and company towns - if anything, such job oriented majors as HE and IE should be expanded. Work-study programs might be instituted (such as at Antioch and others).
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ faculty  ☐ staff  ☐ student  ☐ non-university

Date: --

Issue:
1. Lack of adequate planning.
2. Increasing enrollments.

Source of information:
Sixteen years observation of campus growth.

Current assumption/policy/situation:
1. X number of dollars are appropriated for a building; departments then squeeze in as best they can.
2. Only solution seems to be larger classrooms.

Comments:
1. Buildings take priority over educational programs.
2. The trend towards larger and larger classes represents a backward step. Enrollments may have to be controlled.
Issue:

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:

Better public relations and more involvement of Campus with community. Tweed should be open evenings and public programs - lectures, etc. promoted in this area.

Professional copy writer on Campus to enhance the departmental writing and stories for press.

UMD must become a strong entity within itself, not a weak branch of Main Campus. Strong representation to fight for UMD.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ faculty ☐ staff ☐ student ☐ non-university
Date: 2/22/72

Issue:
Seminar Rooms and Rooms conducive to conversational practice for foreign languages.

Source of information:
Actual classroom situation; faculty conversation during seminars on Improvement of Teaching.

Current assumption/policy/situation:
I would like to see two rooms available which would allow circular seating behind a table. One for 5-10 persons, another for 10-20. These rooms could be use for foreign language conversation courses and seminar and literature courses where class participation is an important aspect. It is important that there be a table present because too much exposure impedes conversational flow. One blackboard, either portable or stationery should be provided, and a hanger for maps.

Comments:
I have heard support for this sort of classroom from other departments. I assume that they would be in great demand for graduate courses.

There must be eye-contact among participants.

Lighting is important. It should be softer or less glaring than in the regular classroom.
Issue:

I feel more emphasis should be placed on using present classroom space rather than on more buildings. Classes could be scheduled later in the day and more of them on Tuesday and Thursdays, when a lot of them are empty. Some classes could even be held on Saturday if necessary. More sections are needed in many areas for freshmen and sophomores. No student should be denied taking a class because it is closed out--more instructors should be hired.

Source of information:

Own opinion after several years of observation.

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:
Issue:

Incidental Fees

Source of information:

Personal experience

Current assumption/policy/situation:

That all students actively participate in the extra curricular activities.

Comments:

I have attended UMD for one year; during that time, I have not found the opportunity to attend these activities. My reasons for not attending are not due to a lack of interest, however, the problem is primarily due to economics. Being married, and carrying a maximum credit load forces me to also work full time. Therefore, it irks me to realize that already I have "donated" approximately $140.00 to a benefit I cannot afford.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☐ student ☐ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university

Date: 2/18/72

Issue:
Registration

Source of information:
Experience

Current assumption/policy/situation:
Registration is a mess. Too crowded and too slow. The main problem is the lack of space in courses which are popular and/or required. Closed classes are the most frustrating drawback at registration.

Comments:
There must be a way to have pre-registration, as many larger colleges have. Although UMD is comparatively small, the problem of not being able to enroll in desired and required courses is terrible. Have pre-registration during the previous quarter by mail reserving a place in class for each person, and then arranging the number of sections according to the number of enrolled students.

Then when registration rolls around, spots for each student would be open, and registration would be much faster and less frustrating.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

Issue:
School closing due to inclement weather.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:
The policy is one where the University has no formal policy.

Comments:
I feel that absolute criteria should be established for closing the school in bad weather. As a possibility, if the temperature is below -20°F and more than 6 inches of snow has fallen in the past 18-24 hours - close the school. I recommend this on the grounds that student and faculty safety is at stake during such weather, that the time and cost of getting to school on such days is prohibitive. The California Junior College system has a "floating holiday schedule" which seems to be what is really needed here in the sense that if the University is so opposed to closing the school due to bad weather, they could just declare a "holiday" that coincides with the few really lousy days we have here.
Issue:

Poor planning for registration and way too much paper to hang onto and fill out.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ student ☐ staff ☐ faculty ☑ non-university

Date: 2/18/72

Issue:
Food Budget
Incidental Fee

Source of information:
Food Budget - pamphlets
Incidental Fee - personal experience

Current assumption/policy/situation:
Food Budget - too much spent.
Incidental Fee - poorly taken care of.

Comments:
It seems to me that the Food Budget at UMD is too large. I realize I know little
about the economics of food planning but I do think that less money could be given
to this budget, this would allow more money for more important budgets.

The Incidental Fee, I feel, is really unfair. Many students pay for activities
and/or services that they are not interested in or able to attend. A better method
of paying for student activities and services would be to pay on attendance or use
of services.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student   □ staff   □ faculty   □ non-university
Date: 2/13/72

Issue:

No relationship with administration.
Poor quality instructors.
Too high of tuition in relation to services...(recent figures show Marvelous Moos as exceeding his expense account by $18,000; my old man doesn't even make that much.)

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:
Issue:

Facilities for Continuing Education and Extension, and Summer Session Administration.

Source of information:

Jim Kafka, Director

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Adult education activities at UMD for persons in Northeastern Minnesota are administered through channels which differ from those used at UMD. Concurrently, most activities are coordinated with UMD programs through Vice Provosts and higher administrators. I believe most persons involved in these coordination procedures value the proximity of our offices and the freedom associated with our joint program development efforts. Allocation of fourth floor UMD Administration Building facilities to these offices is contingent upon alternative uses of these facilities.

Comments:

I believe the current situation is nearly ideal. Efforts to make Summer Session, Continuing Education and Extension, and UMD administrative efforts appear joint ventures are commendable. Every possible effort appears appropriate for continuation of the Duluth Center level of autonomy and recognition we are now achieving, and proximity of these offices with UMD administrators.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student □ staff □ faculty □ non-university

Date: 2/18/72

Issue:

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:

Spend less on arts and sports and more on education! Quit cutting the budget for teachers and use the classrooms that stand empty.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☐ student ☐ staff ☐*drop out from University ☐ faculty ☐ non-university Date: 2/13/72

Issue:

Broad range of students at UMD.

Many classes catering to the "normal" student, but there are not many classes for the "liberal" or otherwise different student looking for an education to fulfill them as human beings.....

Source of information:

I use to be a student here.

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:

Courses on Eastern Religion and Philosophy, Yoga, Farming, Organic Cooking, Meditation, classes for the living not for the dead and for those people interested in living an alternate life style.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ faculty
☐ student ☐ staff ☐ non-university

Date: 2/18/72

Issue:

Vocational-Technical-Industrial Education

Source of information:

Current trends, need of business and industry, United States office of education.

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Vocational, technical and industrial education needs to be expanded to facilitate the growing need and interest in these areas.

Comments:
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☐ student ☐ staff
☒ faculty ☐ non-university

Date: 2/19/72

Issue:
The past and continuing priority given to buildings over program.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:
The current policy seems to be one of adding buildings while the on-going program lacks for leadership and support. A Performing Arts Building is under construction while no one seems to quite know why it was built and for what real purpose, especially when a Performing Arts Building is part of the Arena-Auditorium complex. A Physics Building is to be constructed when the number of Physics majors had declined to next to nothing and our society has become disenchanted with the hard scientists and their disciplines and is crying out for more study of the humanities. A Field House is to be built to provide space for baseball and track. Are these the same priorities that are going to dominate the Master Plan?

Comments:
Perhaps if more attention had been payed to programs in the past and present, higher education would not be in big trouble today. Will we "blow" the future too? Education is not buildings, it's people.
### Issue Analysis

**Issue:**

Cut red tape involved in planning and securing approval for summer courses and in-service programs.

**Source of information:**

Experience

**Current assumption/policy/situation:**

**Comments:**
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ student ☑ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university

Date: 2/22/72

Issue:

UMD Library

Source of information:

Personal Experience

Current assumption/policy/situation:

The UMD library is one of the poorest libraries I have ever been in when one considers study atmosphere. There are no signs indicating that the library should be QUIET, nor do any of the people working there make an effort to keep it so. It's disgraceful that our library doesn't provide some semblance of what a library stands for - A QUIET.

Comments:

PLACE TO STUDY AND DO RESEARCH

I would suggest that our librarians take a field trip to the libraries at the main University and some of the surrounding schools to see what a "controlled" atmosphere is like. They will not find groups of people laughing and talking and disturbing others as they will in the UMD library. I hope the UMD master plan will succeed in its effort to create a "functional environment within which to learn....."
Issue:
Evaluation of students as a contribution to his (or her) own education.

Source of information:
There is none

Current assumption/policy/situation:
The grade a student gets reflects what he did for his or her own education. We assume that students put a great emphasis on studies. Can we rightly complain about poor teaching if they do not put some of their own effort into the process. Likewise, can we as teachers take credit for good performance of the student.

Comments:
We have an embryonic teacher evaluation but we have no student evaluation. No where do we know or can find student effort into the learning process. We don't know how many hours the student actually studies. We know that very few use the library and books specifically reserved for certain classes but no numerical data. We have no correlation between grades and books bought. No information on extra hours spent in the lab or independent study for a course. If there is going to be teacher evaluation there ought to be student evaluation.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student □ staff □ faculty □ non-university
Date: 2/22/72

Issue:
Need for School of Business Administration on the Duluth Campus.

Need for a Master's Degree graduate program in business.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:
A substantial portion of the graduates of UMD over the past twenty-five years have been in the departments of business and economics, business administration, and economics. UMD has grown to the point where education for business needs to be allowed to develop within the constraints of its own administrative unit. I think it is correct to say that of all the colleges in Wisconsin and Minnesota tracing their history back to teachers college status now have separate schools of business. Certainly this is true of the colleges with major programs in business including Superior, Oshkosh, Eau Claire, Stevens Point, and Whitewater in Wisconsin and St. Cloud, Mankato, Bemidji, and Moorhead in Minnesota.

Comments:
A separate educational unit for business and economics enables it better to serve its students and the business community of its region.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ student ☐ staff
☐ faculty ☐ non-university
Date: 2/18/72

Issue:
Instructor Tenure. I feel that too many incompetent teachers are being foisted upon the paying student body. There must be some way to challenge the right of merely mediocre educators to waste our time. With the tremendous output of people with teaching degrees these days, it seems there should be some way to use the good ones and eliminate the bad ones. Teaching is a profession, as are law, medicine, music, or art fields; if one cannot make the grade, then he doesn't deserve the stature of privileges of the position. There should be some sort of review board, including students, which would evaluate the worth of some of our insultingly unimaginative educators. Certainly, this prospect would imply that some teachers would lose their jobs, but after all, to whom is the University most responsible? The students, of course.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:
Issue:
Procedures concerning orientation and registration. I am pointing out the fact that the present system of orientation and registration is not only degrading and insulting to we the students, but also a pain in the neck to those who punch, rip, file and collect the "red tape" that is so "necessary" when one wishes to attend school.

Source of information:
Personal experience and hourly discussions with fellow students as we stood in a registration line.

Current assumption/policy/situation:
Orientation - As a transfer student, I was required in the month of August to attend a mass orientation and registration day. I reported to the assigned room at 8:30 A.M. and all 3 or 4 transfer students were greeted by the epitome of Mr. Fraternity who insisted on assuming a fatherly role. I was back in second grade at age 20. The day did not improve. We followed "Daddy" around all day as he bellowed to us through a megaphone. Registration that day was, needless to say, as hectic as it was the following quarter, and the following quarter, etc..

Registration - The day we all dread, employees, volunteers, and students as well. An underclassman or woman, with some luck will be able to finish registering within 3-4 hours. The employees and volunteers by 2 o'clock are short tempered, tired, some hungry and a few have removed shoes and ties. And what about the students? After some have been inevitably rejected from filled courses, must they, plus the other hundreds of students be forced to stand in long lines for the rest of the day? When a student has finally reached the front of a line the student is then referred to the end of another. I am convinced that registering does not have to be the marathon of patience that it is now.

I hope that my suggestion for solving these problems is not overly simplified, but some kind of an answer did appear to me to be rather obvious. As for the orientation, I suggest that someone with less desire for "herding cattle" be chosen for the "great honor." It would make orientation much more successful and bearable.

Concerning registration, I would think that having more people help with the registering, more space, and more time. Why not extend registration until 10 o'clock P.M. or have it spread over a period of two days? Must we all be processed within one morning and afternoon?

I certainly hope that these problems and solutions will be acted upon, so that registration will be a more pleasant and efficient experience.
Source of information:
From: E. Ruth van Appledorn

Current assumption/policy/situation:
Situation: I believe that a faculty "generation-gap" exists and for those who have served this school faithfully over a number of years, who have given it their best in terms of effort, this "gap" can be a painful one. Being dubbed "the old guard", hearing about how an administrator wishes Mr. "X" were back to swing the vote this or that way, and other changes, is a demoralizing experience. If the older members of the campus community have no more to offer from their experiences, then they should be given the gracious way out, and not spend their years in being snubbed and ignored.

How is the morale of the older faculty member? Has anyone tried to do a study of this? Were it not for the work of the "old guard", there would be no jobs here for these new people.

Comments:
This is my 26th year of teaching at UMD (began in 1946 under State Teachers' College); there has been no sabbatical leave due to shortage of staff in the department. Are steps being taken to bring down the retirement age? After 30 years of hard work can a faculty member elect to retire? My teaching load this quarter, for example, is 24 hours; an additional 4 to 5 hours is spent every week giving help to students; paper grading and course planning is done nights and weekends. I do not begrudge this time and effort with these freshmen students - they need all the help that I can give. I DO, however, resent the attitudes of the younger staff who do not want to be bothered with teaching at this level. (The students are stupid; they don't know anything; it takes too much time to grade papers, etc.) Also, the past doesn't count; there are no lessons to be learned. Their ideas are not new or innovative, they are transplants. Two issues must be faced: 1) Graduate Schools must give attention to the preparation of college teachers; 2) Schools must come to grips with the meaning of undergraduate education itself.

Weigh: Is not our supply in great excess of demand?
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: [ ] student [ ] staff
[ ] faculty [ ] non-university

Date: 2/22/72

Issue:
1. Amount of work required in one course as compared to another varies considerably; varying from almost nothing to too much.

2. Courses for major are determined by course number, not content. I had to take Driver Education I, which has no relation to my area, simply because it had a SEED number. This is stupidity.

Source of information:
Actual experience as a graduate student at UMD.

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:
1. Why not have a little quality control? Perhaps department chairman could assume responsibility to assure each instructor within the department at least understand how his requirements compare to those of other instructors within the department.

2. Why can't students include courses within their major which are of potential benefit to them if agreeable with their advisors? Why must courses he taken only from SEED, EDUC, or EIED for an education M.A.? Why not include EDAD? At present a student with a B.S. major of Business can only select courses from SEED or EDUC as ELED does not offer anything for him. Combine this restriction with the major graduate course offered, and a graduate student ends up taking Driver Education I as a course in his major.
Issue:
Special purpose needs of some departments.

Source of information:
Lyda Belthuis, Geography Department

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:
I believe that for several departments in science, such fields as music, business administration; the needs of a central grouping 7 classrooms and laboratories is essential as otherwise it is just too difficult to do a good job. I understand that the new plans for the building for Business Administration and Geography, the offices and classrooms are to be scattered through several buildings which will make it next to impossible to do a good job. One may need a projector, slides, pointer, plus several maps in any one given period, to carry this distances through crowded halls may be impossible.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student  □ staff  □ faculty  □ non-university

Date: 2/23/72

Issue:
Planning for future space increases.

Source of information:
Lyda Belthuis, Geography Department

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:
I understand that Geography facilities in the building into which we will move about 1975 are to be only slightly larger than the present ones, obtained in 1959 with rooms and offices added later and that the new ones are to be scattered. This, it seems to me, is poor planning. One should plan both for enlargement in the future and also for efficiency and convenience.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☐ student ☐ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university

Date: 2/19/72

Issue:
1. Starting and ending dates of the University school year.
2. Registration.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:
1. The fall quarter starts in late September and Spring quarter does not end until late June.
2. The enormous crowd and the endless lines resemble a stockyard more than a registration process at a University. The number of student manhours wasted is ridiculous. No group of humans should be treated as such an insignificant herd. This really burns me!

Comments:
1. My main complaint is that it is very difficult to find a job so late in the spring. Jobs are not overly plentiful and getting a late start is no advantage. I think the University should follow the general schedule of high schools and other colleges rather than continually be two weeks behind them.
2. I feel that the registration should be done in two days rather than in just one. In this way, the same system could be used only doubling the time space between each group. Then only half the people would be in the gym at a given time.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☐ student ☐ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university
Date: 2/23/72

Issue:

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Reserve room library is open until approximately 4:30 pm.

Comments:

I think the Reserve room should be open for checking out books for a few hours every night as I know many people who haven't the time during the day to read them.

I also think there should be a fine for keeping a book out past your 2 hours.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student □ staff □ faculty □ non-university

Date: 2/22/72

Issue:
The administration's responsibility to the people who rent the Village Apartments.

Source of information:
Village residents

Current assumption/policy/situation:
The rent charged for the apartments is at least twice the market price in the Duluth area. In return for their high rent payments the residents are forced to live in conditions that would cause any other renters to move out, a situation prevented at the village by the policy of collecting the rent at the start of the quarter.

Comments:
Because student housing is difficult, if not impossible to find, and because most of that which is available is a good distance from the campus; it seems that the administration feels that it can grossly overcharge the students who find it necessary or desirable to live in the village. Any good businessman would realize that this practice, besides being unethical, only creates tension, bad feelings, and eventually, boycott.

Added to the high rent is the refusal of the university to accept its responsibility as a landlord. Life in the village is characterized by icecold floors, frozen drains, cold furnaces, and cold drafts. When problems arise and help is requested, that help probably won't come until sometime during the regular work day. Very often, the only response to a call for help is an instruction to call back sometime the next day. That is not much satisfaction when it is cold outside and your furnace won't work.

(continued)
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

| From: | □ student | □ staff | □ faculty | □ non-university | Date: |

Issue:

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:  (continued)

It's time the administration took a look at this situation from the student's view, and asked themselves if they would live under these conditions. And when they decide that they wouldn't, they had better do something about it. If they don't, it's probable that the students will.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ student ☐ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university

Date: 2/18/72

Issue:

Housing

Source of information:

Housing - personal experience.

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Housing - not enough single rooms.

Comments:

I feel as though Housing should make more single rooms available to students. Living quarters play an important role in a student's life at school and some students are much happier and can perform much better if allowed to live alone. This choice should be available to a greater extent.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student □ staff □ faculty □ non-university A member of the Cooperative Extension Service housed on Old Campus
Date: 2/23/72

Issue:

Housing of University staff not administratively connected with UMD.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

The area staff of the Agricultural Extension Service are housed in Old Main - in an excellent office arrangement. However, the building is old and has problems of heating, air circulation, and maintenance. It is neglected at times.

Comments:

In planning space for offices, other units of the University as well as non-University units that are an educational or research unit should be included in this planning.

An office building for Continuing Education is needed. General Extension and Cooperative Extension need adequate office space. There are other non-University units that can enhance UMD's offering to people as well as the contribution UMD can make to these units.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ student ☑ staff ☑ faculty ☑ non-university Date: 2/18/72

Issue:
Lowering the drinking age to 18.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:
As it exists now a college age person must travel to Superior, Wisconsin to dance to live band in a cabaret situation in a place of business that is frequented by college-age people. Having a bar in the Student Center would promote a closer knit student body in that it would draw the commuter students back to campus in the evening and make for greater contact among students and more school spirit. Plus the entertainment revenues are being lost to the State of Wisconsin.

Comments:
Issue Analysis

From: [ ] student [ ] staff
[ ] faculty [ ] non-university

Date: 2/20/72

Issue:
1. On-campus 3.2 beer-house.
2. Major addition to Kirby Student Center.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:
1. Students old enough to drink would not have to leave campus to drink, thus providing a great convenience and safety benefit for students. This is presently being done in Wisconsin.

2. Even with the new addition to Kirby's basement there still will be a lack of space and unmet needs in our student center. One only needs to tour student centers of schools our size and the lack of facilities at our institution is evident. The most noticeable fact is the inadequate size of our present Ballroom.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: [ ] student [ ] staff [ ] faculty [ ] non-university

Date: 2/18/72

Issue:

Dictionary

Source of information:

Experience

Current assumption/policy/situation:

We need a new dictionary in the late hour study room!

Comments:

We need a dictionary in the late hour study room. The one in there now has many pages missing and it is very difficult to look up a word. The copyright of the dictionary in here now is 1925. It should be put in a museum!
Issue:
Whereas a new cafeteria is under construction, it seems especially feasible to use older facilities for an alternative food service. One that would serve natural, organic food similar to the programs at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis Campus and St. Olaf for a healthier and happier student body.

Source of information:
Experience

Current assumption/policy/situation:
That hamburgers and hotdogs are good for people.

Comments:
Even if it would be a little more expensive and only experimental, it would give student complaints an alternative and maybe give them an outlet in helping prepare more wholesome food in a volunteer capacity.

The whole food co-op at 1306 East Second Street has been in operation for over a year and could perform a large role in supplying raw (food) materials and leadership for a student run facility.

"YOU ARE WHAT YOU EAT."
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ student ☐ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university  
Date: 2/18/72

Issue:
Where should Grub Dances be held? They should be in the Gym.

Source of information:
Experience (personal)

Current assumption/policy/situation:
Because the last Grub dance held in the gym was said to be "destructive" in nature the following grub dances were held in the Ballroom and Kirby Lounge. This really ruined the concept of Grub dances because not only are the two areas combined not as much space but just doesn't permit the group unity that could be achieved in the gym. The "Destructiveness" could be prevented by having less policemen than were needed for the present sites of the dance.

Comments:
The reason there was so much destruction at the last gym Grub dance was because there were student "chaperones" at the doors and not policemen.
Issue:
Study Rooms - more late hour study rooms should be provided. When the library closes at 10:00, the late hour becomes overcrowded with far too much noise to study. This lasts for about an hour, and begins to taper off at eleven. If another room were provided, it would be less crowded and less noisy. Maybe two rooms could be used until 11:30 or 12:00 and then only one room.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:
Issue:
Poor information on activities of the University as well as services. Also poor expenditures of convocation money. Whatever happened to shows of entertainment value, like rock concerts. In general, just too much money being spent for such unsatisfying activities.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☒ student ☐ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university
Date: 2/16/72

Issue:

Not enough informal studying space where people could take a nap, play cards, study or look out the window.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☐ student ☐ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university

Date: 2/13/72

Issue:
No planning or direction offered from counseling in the way of future occupations. Whatever happened to qualitative study of needy areas in the economy (for college grads)? Fire those bums.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student  □ staff  □ faculty  □ non-university
Date: 2/21/72

Issue:
Drinking on campus.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:
I would like to recommend the drinking be permitted on the campus. Master plan calls for more apartment style living units which lends itself to adult environment—age of 18 to vote establishes a certain maturity that would permit students to be more responsible in University housing!

Comments:
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ student ☑ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university

Date: 2/19/72

Issue:
Limited and restricted membership in the Campus Club.

Source of information:
Minutes of a recent Campus Club Committee meeting.

Current assumption/policy/situation:
Teaching Assistants are not allowed to become members of the Campus Club although they may eat there as guests of members.

Comments:
Civil Service personnel, faculty and staff members may become members and there is a movement afoot to allow some student membership. The issue of possible membership for teaching assistants was questioned and forbidden again at a recent meeting of the Campus Club Committee.

Teaching Assistants are candidates for the MA degree and the PhD and are a vital part of the Campus. In a growing, progressive University Center of the future, their welfare and status should be considered as important as a secretary's and a professor's welfare and status. What is a valid reason for this current restriction?
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student  □ staff  □ faculty  □ non-university

Issue:

Married student housing.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

There should be worked into the Master Plan, apartments for our married students that would be less expensive then what is commercially available at present in the Duluth area.

Comments:
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: [ ] student [ ] staff [ ] faculty [ ] non-university  Date: 1/21/72

Issue:
The school is closed off on weekends and in the evening, especially Sunday night.

Source of information:
Personal experience

Current assumption/policy/situation:
I feel the school is very difficult to enter especially when walking to the school from the tundra. All major back entrances have been locked. This causes waste of time and strength to walk all around the school at -30°. This is no joke.

Comments:
I think you would find fewer broken doors if you left some open.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☒ faculty  ☐ staff  ☐ student  ☐ non-university

Date: 2/21/72

Issue:

Faculty apartments on campus or near the campus.

Source of information:

Personal

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Alworth apartments are not sufficient and are perhaps too small for a married couple.

Comments:
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ faculty ☐ student ☐ staff ☐ non-university

Date: 2/22/72

Issue:

Commons areas or lounges for staff (secretaries) and graduate students (especially Teaching Assistants).

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

In many areas such as the current Humanities Building and Social Science Building, there is no place for staff members and graduate students to congregate or meet.

Comments:

In the shift to new modes of individualized and less structured education, the need for gathering/study/relaxation areas will increase.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student □ staff
☑ faculty □ non-university

Date: 2/21/72

Issue:
Faculty and graduate student housing.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:
Currently there are only limited facilities available for new staff members in the Alworth Apartments.

Comments:
As this campus shifts toward more professional and graduate training, there will be a genuine need for inexpensive housing for older students. Adequate rental housing is very difficult to find in Duluth. New staff members, single as well as young married couples, almost despair times of finding housing if they are not in a position to buy a home as soon as they move to Duluth.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☐ student ☑ faculty ☐ staff ☐ non-university

Date: 2/18/72

Issue:

We need a Late-Hour (up to 2 AM) Social Center. Let's keep vending, socializing, etc. out of library and study areas by providing a place for such activities.

We need a study/commons area in each department. There should be some A/V hardware associated with it, learning resources, etc. Neither the library, nor one Learning Resources Center, can fill this need. Each department should have such an area.

We need more ccat rooms, and more public bulletin boards. We need places to park bicycles.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Let's plan for social nooks at various points on campus. We can't departmentalize this, restrict it to Kirby. The library can't serve this purpose, and still be a place for study. There should be several social centers.

Comments:

We don't need any subsidies for parking of private cars. This merely invites more noise, congestion, pollution to campus. Let's plan for public transportation only. Our police are needed to protect university property, not to regulate private parking. We need a policy to discourage the private automobile on campus.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ faculty ☐ staff ☐ student ☐ non-university

Date: 2/21/72

Issue:
Campus weekend activities.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:
Open only those buildings and activity centers necessary to accommodate dorm residents.

Comments:
The campus should be an open area seven days a week. Special activities should be planned to keep the students, on campus with something to do. At the very least, they should be able to get a cup of coffee at the Bulpub or the Rafters which is not possible at the present time.

In general, the Campus should mean more to the students than just a place to attend classes and then leave for the evenings and weekends.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ faculty ☐ staff ☐ student ☐ non-university

Date: 2/21/72

Issue:
University Health Service

Source of information:
Personal observation and comparison with main campus organization.

Current assumption/policy/situation:
Because of the relative remoteness and heavy scheduling of our local clinics and physician offices, much time is lost by both faculty and staff in obtaining outpatient care.

Comments:
I suggest that the long range plans include an expanded University Health Service. Adequately staffed, this would allow an optional, self-supporting, outpatient service plan to the staff and faculty.
From: □ student  □ staff  □ faculty  □ non-university

Date: 2/17/72

Issue:

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:

I would like to see better facilities for the staff as far as a regular lounge area and more variety in the lunch menu - such as french fries, fishwiches, etc.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university

Date: 2/18/72

Issue:

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:

Lounge for staff and also kitchen facilities completed in the Venden in Administration building so there could be a better menu for lunches.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student □ staff □ faculty □ non-university  Date: 2/18/72

Issue:
Bookstore orders for textbooks and manuals - cutting orders results in students being unable to take required courses where a manual is needed from the first day.

Source of information:
Personal experience

Current assumption/policy/situation:
The bookstore has on several occasions refused or neglected to order as many texts and manuals as we estimated need for in courses. When text books arrive on re-order after 5 or 6 weeks, it is true some students never do buy one and they have to be returned. In some courses a new lab manual is required and must be available from the start.

Comments:
When our enrollment is limited and our sections are full, (the limiting factor being staff and space,) we shouldn't have to have available spaces sacrificed because the students couldn't buy a required book anywhere in Duluth.
### U.M.D. Master Planning Issue Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Non-university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>2/27/72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issue:**

The building of the so called "cultural center" at UMD

**Source of information:**

The student association, and programs presented to the various groups planning on using the structure.

**Current assumption/policy/situation:**

The majority of the students at UMD have their own culture. This culture might be related to Bach, Shakespeare and Picasso, but how does one relate, for instance, the music of Bach, etc... to the music of the Moody Blues, etc... or Jesus Christ Superstar. The culture of Bach etc... and Shakespeare were popular in their day, but are they popular today?

**Comments:**

I realize that the 3.2 million dollars was mostly donated, but this money could have been spent better elsewhere, for instance, at already existing facilities that need the money, i.e. the Duluth Arena Auditorium, that has adequate facilities, that perhaps, could have been improved.
Issue:

Common room for staff. One close enough to office, or one centrally located.

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:

What staff is this person part of administrative or department?
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ faculty ☐ staff ☐ non-university

Date: 3/6/72

Issue:
Faculty/married graduate student housing

Source of information:
Myself

Current assumption/policy/situation:
The present situation: Limited nearby housing for new faculty and married graduate students.

Comments:
The development of this Campus into a "University Center" with the resulting increase in graduate programs is going to pose a real housing problem.
The problem for new staff is nothing new!
Issue:

Bookstore

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:

This Campus needs a much enlarged bookstore which would handle many times the paperbacks, records, and other educational materials. I have no complaints about the management. The need is space in which to shelve and display books and materials of all kinds. I would like to see a "mini" version of the Michigan State Bookstore.
Issue:

Program and cafeteria planning

Source of information:

Personal opinion

Current assumption/policy/situation:

I wish that somehow in the near future it might be a little easier to get programs approved. I may not have any idea what has to go on to get one approved, but it seems to me that there is so much red tape involved. In planning for Indian Week I found that in order to get a speaker approved to come to UMD it had to go through convocations committee, be approved by UMD committee and then be able to have him come. The program for the year may be too rigid to squeeze in anything else without going through 10 different committees.

Comments:

I also feel that cafeteria planning is poorly organized. Food is being prepared that very few people eat. I don't know how to go about finding general opinion about food desired but maybe if what is offered was more appealing people would want it more. Food no where is fed to anyone with scum on top of the soup, or crust on the hash; just to name two incidents.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ faculty ☐ staff ☐ non-university
Date: 5/9/72

Issue:

Servicing greenhouse and science facilities.

Source of Information:

Medical Education Advisory Committee and Duluth Long Range Planning Committee

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Now these facilities are serviced from the east side of the complex.

Comments:

The greenhouse will have to continue to be serviced as it is, from the outside. Likewise the Chemistry building will have a solvent storage room at the south end of the building and this room should be serviced from the outside.
Issue:
A consolidated or organized system of service roads must be identified.

Source of information:
Medical Education Advisory Committee

Current assumption/policy/situation:
No well organized system of servicing buildings

Comments:
With all the new construction underway at UMD, a well defined and coordinated system of servicing buildings is needed. The system should not conflict with other systems of movement on the Campus.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ student ☐ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university
Date: 2/18/72

Issue:
The heating situation

Source of information:
Personal experience

Current assumption/policy/situation:
Not enough heat in concourse humanities, library, education and Kirby student center are all extremely cold.

Comments:
The science buildings are all too hot and when a person goes from there to the Humanities building or the concourse you get frozen. It hinders studying, at school. Thank you.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student □ staff □ faculty □ non-university

Date: 2/23/72

Issue:

Campus police force

Source of information:

Observation, conversations with Student Campus Police on other campuses, discussions with Regents.

Current assumption/policy/situation:

All non-student force

Comments:

A force with some, or even all, students would be an interesting experiment. This type of program has worked out very successfully at many campuses around the country. The report between the students and police is improved fantastically. Also, a student on the force is much more aware of the needs of students than the people we presently have. Their ways of handling problems of alcohol and other drugs would be more rational, and their knowledge of these problems is much greater. This has been shown the major attribute to the program at many schools, such as Beloit in Wisconsin, Colorado University, etc...
Issue:

School parking and busing.

Source of information:

My head.

Current assumption/policy/situation:

I assume plans are continuing to increase parking space and that a general transportation problem will always exist relative to the UMD Campus.

Comments:

The existing Campus bus is a good thing. Could this be expanded (while parking space is kept at a minimum) to encourage more bus riders and fewer one car/one driver incidents?

This would serve in various ways:

1. Encourage riders from Duluth (who don't live so far away) to leave their cars at home - thus helping the parking problem.

2. Begin to educate people towards the idea of mass transit (which definitively is gaining a place in our society due to increased traffic congestion depletion of natural resources, growing car junk piles, etc.)

3. Money saver for those who would rather leave their car at home, but can't because of campus busline inaccessibility.

4. Help the winter hitchhikers who can't find the curb to stand on (which they are supposed to do).
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☐ student  ☐ staff  ☐ faculty  ☐ non-university
Date: 2/20/72

Issue:
On-Campus Parking

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:

On-campus parking should be eliminated and an increase of bus service to replace transportation needs. Any new buildings should be built in the now parking lot areas in order to preserve the open spaces that now exist on the UMD Campus.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student □ staff □ faculty □ non-university

Issue:
1. Parking
2. Elimination of cross campus road

Source of information:
16 years observation of campus growth

Current assumption/policy/situation:
1. Parking has always been inadequate to the demand.
2. A mistaken theory that Minneapolis knows best.

Comments:
1. In the foreseeable future, Duluth will be largely a commuter college. Your comment concerning the elimination of Campus parking represents the typical Minneapolis ignorance of our situation.
2. Instead of having an easy cross campus route, the student must travel on crowded Woodlawn Avenue. Since there is presently 2 traffic lights on either side of College and Woodlawn, this intersection will never have a stop light and will always be hazardous to the student.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ faculty ☐ staff ☐ non-university

Date: 7/25/72

Issue:
Easy access to campus

Source of information:
John Greene (Chairman UMD Parking and Transportation Committee)

Current assumption/policy/situation:
With the cutting off of Oakland Avenue and the deterioration of Buffaloe and Ste. Marie, access to the Campus has been one difficult at times.

Comments:
Four directional access to the Campus is extremely important and should be considered in the planning for the Campus. Accessibility from streets to parking should be relatively easy.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: ☑ student ☑ staff ☐ faculty ☐ non-university

Date: 7/25/72

Issue:

Access from Pentom Housing units to Rock Hill.

Source of information:

Norm Rick - UMD Plant Services

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Presently, Buffalo Avenue has deteriorated to the point where little traffic uses it. With this minimal traffic Rock Hill essentially becomes a part of the housing area. Very little conflict occurs between vehicles and pedestrians.

Comments:

Increased traffic on Buffalo might not be desirable. Would separate Rock Hill from the rest of the Campus. A new inner campus ring road using the Junction Avenue right-of-way and Buffalo to Ste. Marie would serve as a barrier between housing and Rock Hill. The impact of any ring road should be considered.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student  □ staff  □ faculty  □ non-university

Date: ----

Issue:
Parking on Campus

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:
I usually take the intercampus bus and like it very much so I wouldn't want to see any changes in that, but If I were to miss the bus as I occasionally do, I wouldn't want to have to walk 2 miles to school - there is not enough residential area for parking - the school is located in the middle of a big field and if you park off campus you have to walk at least 3 blocks to get to school - don't change the parking rules.

Comments:
Issue:
Access route across Campus

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:
"You can't get there from here."

Comments:
Ever since Oakland Avenue was closed it has become apparent that vehicle traffic around campus has become difficult. There is no way a person can walk from one end of the Campus to the other when buildings are locked on weekends. Several times as a pedestrian, I have been bewildered as to how to get to my office and the building for which I have a key. Others must have found themselves in similar situations.
Issue:

Access to the Campus

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Present access roads from College and Ste. Marie are inadequate for a Campus of 5,000 + students. A central entrance from Woodland Avenue is needed. Such an entrance would also provide identity for the Campus.

Comments:

I am convinced that this is one of the most important things needed on the UMD Campus.
Issue: Parking

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Parking lots all over the place, "look like a factory". Expensive maintenance and snow removal. Hard to find anyplace to park after 10:00 am.

Comments:

Build 3 or 4 story parking ramp. Very little snow removal required. Cars wouldn't get stuck in snowy lots. Coin operated electrical outlets for tank heaters in winter cold. Ramps would make the place look more organized. An enclosed walk to building would keep the students from freezing temperatures.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student □ staff □ faculty □ non-university

Issue:
No through street.
Closing of Oakland Avenue.

Source of information:
W. L. Gum

Current assumption/policy/situation:
Currently there is no access to UMD from the front of the Campus. Closing of
Oakland Avenue was made by whom? Whose decision?

Comments:
Our Campus seems dictatorized arbitrarily. In time, as the Campus expands
the lack of a through street will become serious. Even now during bad weather or
heavy traffic hours, one is forced to use Woodland or Arrowhead Streets to get
to one or the other side of the Campus.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student  □ staff  □ faculty  □ non-university

Date:

Issue:

Source of information:

Current assumption/policy/situation:

Comments:

I want Oakland Avenue back in use!

I want staff parking in reserve lanes.
U.M.D. Master Planning
Issue Analysis

From: □ student  □ staff
□ faculty  □ non-university

Date: 2/20/72

Issue:

Campus road system. A road through the center of the Campus from Ste. Marie Street to College Avenue is needed.

Source of information:

Many students, including myself, as well as people living in the area feel a road should be incorporated into the campus layout.

Current assumption/policy/situation:

No road. The shortest alternate routes are Brainard Avenue and Woodland Avenue.

Comments:
Issue:
There is no through route for "across campus" traffic. It is essential that it be provided.

Source of information:
Personal Observation

Current assumption/policy/situation:
It has been stated that after the completion of the new cafeteria there will not be a re-opening of that road to handle the through campus traffic.

Comments:
1. There is a terrific inconvenience in having to drive completely around (several large city blocks or a square mile), the University in order to reach a major artery of city traffic.

2. It is extremely difficult to direct visitors to an area of destination which is of some distance from their arrival point.
The following lists of comments were generated through discussions with various interest groups affected by planning at UMD. Although some of the comments do not pertain to transportation problems at UMD, the majority do and it is for this reason that they are included in this section.

INTEREST GROUP ISSUE DISCUSSION

DATE: May 19, 1972

GROUP: City Government Officials
Don Wiski, City of Duluth
John Sweeny, DTA
Norm Schmidt, MHD
Dick Isle, HOTLCOG
Denny Johnson
Dick Cihoski, HOTLCOG
Ken Stebbins
Dick Wolsfeld

1. A functional road classification system is being developed for the City of Duluth. How does the planning work we are doing and our reports relate to that classification system?

2. The Minnesota Highway Department is irritated by the process used by architects when they design buildings for UMD. First, the building is designed then access to the building has to be developed. It usually results in a poor solution.

3. Is there enough land to support projected student populations?

4. Does the University of Minnesota have the money to fund street improvements? (Note: Only those that occur within University property).

5. What is the future of the Old Campus?

6. Where are community activities and public events (art gallery, athletic events, etc) going to occur in the future?

7. Can University hours be changed to get University traffic out of peak rush hour periods?

8. Future University Policies must consider the impact they will have on City policies.

9. Could a peripheral route go around on Kenwood rather than through the Campus?

10. Can existing parking policies be changed?

11. Future Housing policies . . . . Will there be on or off/campus housing? Is UMD going to build more or are private developers going to be encouraged to build? What are the students attitudes toward housing? Can private developers build on Campus?
12. Access to future housing and to the Campus will be a major problem.
13. Bus routes should be changed to pick up more students per trip.
14. The City bus lines cannot compete economically with 10 cents per day for student parking. With the $9.40 per hour the city charges UMD for the Campus bus line, they just break even.
15. If the campus bus line is expanded many problems could be resolved.
16. A better transfer system is needed to connect the campus bus line with the city bus routes coming in from the East and West Ends.
17. Legislative funds should be appropriated to up-grade public streets within University property.
18. Adequate access to campus should be a community responsibility.
19. What impact will future enrollment increases at St. Scholastica have on transit routes and traffic movement between UMD and St. Scholastica?
20. The hospital bus loop that exists at the present time should be extended to include St. Scholastica and UMD.
21. What will be the relationship of existing UMD land use to city land use at the periphery?
22. What will be the landscaping treatment at the edges of the campus?
23. Are bikeways and pedestrian paths going to be developed, and if so, will they be coordinated with city planning proposals?
24. What will the future of Skyline Drive as it circumvents the UMD Campus?
25. Can the existing commercial areas of Kenwood and Mount Royal be expanded to cater to student needs?
26. UMD planning should consider link up to and improvement of city utilities and strict pollution controls should be established.
27. Should commercial facilities be located on or off campus?
28. What will be the future of off campus UMD oriented activities such as sailing?
29. What are the future relationships between St. Scholastica and UMD going to be?
INTEREST GROUP ISSUE DISCUSSION

DATE: May 18, 1972

GROUP: Student Representatives

1. Why doesn't the consultant planner live in Duluth?

2. Why so many different building materials and architectural styles on this campus?

3. The closing of Oakland has created many circulation problems. Why was this done?

4. Parking during the winter, many spaces are lost due to snow accumulation so more space is needed.

5. Parking rates should be increased and the number of parking spaces should be decreased to encourage more car-pooling.

6. Commuting students often work in the P.M. and therefore don't car-pool.

7. Bus service charges must be cheaper than eventual parking rates to encourage rider patronage.

8. Why can't old houses purchased by the University be used to house students in apartment situations?

9. Dormitory housing isn't really wanted by students anymore. Trend is toward apartment type units.

10. Policies should be changed concerning keeping alcohol on campus.

11. Carpeting for the halls in dormitories is not wanted by students.

12. Creek systems should be brought back to the surface and developed.

13. Can housing be located off campus with a transit system that would bring students to and from the housing and the academic complex?

14. The open space and recreation areas on Campus are fast disappearing so the remainder should be preserved.

15. More bicycle and walking trails should be developed on and near the campus.
INTEREST GROUP ISSUE DISCUSSION

DATE: May 18, 1972

GROUP: Faculty Representatives

1. With the number of students and cars increasing each year how can enough parking spaces ever be provided to meet the need?

2. Making left turns off of Woodland onto College at rush hour during the winter, is a very major problem.

3. A new approach to campus is needed to alleviate traffic congestion during rush hour periods.

4. The parking lot north of the Physical Education Building has three entrances but should have another near the middle of the lot off of Midway Drive.

5. Pedestrian-auto conflicts on College Avenue are a major problem.

6. If ramp parking is provided, then the cost factor to the user would become the major point of contention.

7. If ramps are built they should be protected from snow drifting and should have headbolt heater plug-ins for use during the winter months.

8. Faculty members wouldn't mind walking a block or two from a parking ramp to the academic complex. (This point of view comes from a limited number of faculty).

9. More visitor parking is needed and must be better identified and easy to find.

10. More bicycle parking is needed.

11. More motorcycle parking is needed.

12. Bus route expansion would be favored by a large number of faculty members. Better bus service would reduce the number of cars on campus.

13. Upper concourse is way over capacity. What can be done to alleviate this congestion?

14. Many areas exist on campus that are difficult to negotiate for handicapped students (i.e. Chemistry Building and Campus Club area).

15. More effort should be made to provide access for handicapped students.

16. Distances between facilities at each end of the campus are nearing the limit in terms of convenient walking time. Does this mean that future expansion occurs more towards the center of the campus?

17. Is vertical development the solution to future physical expansion of UMD?

18. How and where will existing buildings expand?
19. Large lecture halls are needed near the center of the campus.

20. A better system of graphics is needed to direct people to and within the UMD Campus.
INTEREST GROUP ISSUE DISCUSSION

DATE: October 5, 1972

GROUP: Residents of Adjoining Neighborhoods

1. An alternative road is needed to relieve traffic problems on Brainard Avenue.

2. City planned five years ago to reopen Junction Avenue; why hasn't this ever been done?

3. Can Niagra Street and Buffaloe Avenue ever be closed off to prevent student traffic from getting onto Brainard Avenue?

4. What is the possibility of reopening Oakland Avenue?

5. What is the possibility of making Brainard Avenue a one-way street?

6. A sidewalk is needed on the north side of College Street.

7. Drainage of area East of Brainard and South of Niagra needs to be improved.

8. Snow plowing on Brainard Avenue is a big problem.

9. Parking on Brainard and Niagra is a problem especially during the winter months.
INTEREST GROUP ISSUE DISCUSSION

DATE: April 26, 1972

GROUP: UMD Parking and Transportation Committee

1. There will be an immediate need to replace parking lost to new construction that will be underway this spring and fall.

2. What will the long range plan offer in terms of new parking policies?

3. Why was Oakland closed and how will traffic be moved across campus now that it is closed? What are the alternatives?

4. How much land is UMD willing to sacrifice in order to continue present parking policies?

5. Will public transit be increased to the campus and if so who will pay for it; the city, UMD, or the students?

6. Is the current parking system the best? Should there be one fee/quarter or a daily fee? How much should the fee be?

7. Should we continue to have surface parking or are parking structures better?

8. Existing lots should be upgraded only if they are to be made permanent.

9. If service lots are kept, how should they be treated?

10. How do we handle parking for public on campus events? Should the public be made to pay for the privilege of parking on campus to attend an event?

11. Should visitors, local residents, and extension students be made to pay for parking on campus?

12. What do visitors do during the day? No designated spots other than a few meters.

13. Should there be only one class of parking or are certain types of parking needed for different situations?

14. A central entrance is needed to give direction and orientation to visitors?

15. Should the site along Brainard and south of East University Circle be used for parking 1000 cars?

16. What should be the limit of traffic that is diverted through student housing areas?

17. The amount of traffic on Brainard has reached a critical point and something must be done as soon as possible to alleviate this situation?
18. Presently most resident on-campus students are freshman and sophomores who usually have fewer cars. As more apartment type housing is built a greater number of upper classmen will probably be living on campus. Upper classmen tend to have more cars so more dorm or housing parking will have to be provided.

19. Ordeen Court area is a high activity area and now with new construction, parking adjacent to this high activity area will be lost?

20. Are there certain central areas that should have relatively close parking?

21. Should there be a greater use of across campus parking? Example: A person parks in lots A or B to attend an activity in Tweed Gallery.

22. Some policies are needed for non-daily use of parking lots.

23. Parking policies must be related to serviceability and accessibility from the city street system. In addition, city planning policies must be considered.

24. Can fill from new construction be used for developing new lots, etc.?

25. Existing grades and topography must be considered in new decisions on roads and parking lots.

26. Bus service must be improved.

27. If parking is expanded, what will it cost and who will pay.

28. If a new student center is built on the west end of the new food service center, added access problems to student activity areas will occur.