

February 6, 2008

Attendees: Laura Hazlett, Matt Merriman, Danny Shearer, Jim O'Fallon, Whitney Wagoner, Neal Zoumboukos, Paul van Donkelaar, Nathan Tublitz, Gary Gray, Dave Peterson, Anita Weiss, Dev Sinha, Richard Sundt, Kari Herincky, Jim Isenberg, Melinda Grier, Renee Baumgartner

Notes:

- I. Anita apologized for the schedule conflict. She mentioned the need for agenda items for March meeting, and noted that Dev will chair the 2/20 meeting on baseball.
- II. Danny updated that site selection for baseball was announced. For reasons like financial and parking, the baseball stadium will be near Autzen Stadium. He mentioned that the decision was well thought out, and that there may need to be some realignment in parking (we will know more in Feb about the parking issue). The sub-committee is working well and will meet one more time before the 2/20 meeting.
- III. Discussion of changing wording regarding IAC charge – Gordon Sayer suggested it may not need changing. Sundt brought up role of executive committee; Anita reminded the group that we agreed to wording changes and sent IAC suggestions to Gordon, who indicated wording is sufficient to give chair ability to appoint sub-committee. Sundt mentioned that we needed a clear procedure for appointing an executive committee especially relating to “sensitive, timely issues” (the hope is for 4 members, including the chair of the IAC, the FAR and 2 other members – as opposed to specifically including 1 student). Nathan and Paul will revisit this issue with Gordon. Whitney and Dev have volunteered to be the other two members.
- IV. The rest of the time was spent on the arena. Moffitt and Rowe were unable to attend but had sent emails to Anita.
Suggestion was to vote on resolutions/motions presented in Jan 23 Senate meeting. Some mentioned that IAC is a sub-committee of the Senate so what is the point to vote on issues that have already been voted on by the Senate. Others felt that IAC vote should be on the record and that IAC should take a stance on the senate resolution.

Dev mentioned that IACE is an independent group-like a board of directors with an academic presence, to advise the athletic department. IAC is also an interface to campus and faculty appreciates IAC “summary”. Whitney mentioned we issue a simple statement of support (or lack of) for the Senate and Senate Budget Committee Subcommittee (SBC-SC) Report. IAC may bring forward more motions – but another reminder that IAC is advisory and that Senate is parent to this sub-committee. Still, the IAC may be better versed than are other Senate members about how athletic department is run.

Paul reminded us that Senate endorses SBC-SC report and the worst case scenario (50% or

projected revenues) has to happen for 15 years straight before the legacy fund runs out. Nathan felt the SBC-Sc report is the best he's read. Paul reminded us that Dennis Howard and John Chalmers will continue to follow project for 2 years. Nathan volunteered to be part of the SBC-SC in recent years. There is a proposal that "The IAC, in endorsing the SBC-SC recommendations, wants a member of the IAC to be a standing member of the SBC-SC" and will forward this request to the Senate.

Discussion of 6 recommendations in SBC-SC report plus parking: Transparency, containing risk (note investments are made by Foundations and only suggestions can be made), budget allocations in adverse situations (note that University President claimed that there would be no use of academic funds to buy back bonds), remediation/demo costs of Mac Court (administrative issues), construction fees to reduce debt, revenue sharing (still being considered), and parking (still being evaluated). Note that parking was subsequently added (not in the SBC-SC charge). This is an important issue to campus, and waiting for more information. Report during Senate was that we would need 2700 additional spots (\$55M), but IAC was reminded that this is the requirement for a free, stand-alone building and that roughly 400-500 incremental spots would be needed.

Reminder that Athletic Department members are not allowed to vote.

Vote: The IAC endorses SBC-SC report (2 abstentions, 0 opposed, 10 yes (includes George Rowe, who was absent))

Sundt explained his abstentions – doesn't like how arena was introduced over summer ("from gift to bonding") and that there is "enough money to build two arenas between Knight and Kilkenny without paying interest". We could build other academic buildings.

Anita reported that Moffitt enthusiastically supports arena project – and that the cost of NOT building the arena has been ignored for too long (via email).

There was a suggestion to vote on other Senate resolutions and to include additional statements from IAC. Others opposed this idea – a waste of time to introduce new resolutions and we should voice opinion on revenue sharing which will be voted on at next Senate meeting. There was another suggestion to issue a statement from the IAC on whether this project "makes financial sense" and a statement about risk – perhaps that it does not seem to be the case that there is significant risk. With appropriate safeguards implemented, the projected costs/revenues are likely to pay for themselves – the possibility

of using academic funds is extremely remote.

Another reminder was that the charge of the IAC is to help interpret large donations.

Suggestions to vote on Revenue Sharing resolution – apparently it has been changed “watered down”. Once concern was raised that we do not want to put any revenues agreed to into academic budget and that athletic money should not be a core source of support. Perhaps a better idea is that excess athletic department money comes back to the University to spend as deemed necessary.

This is a goal of the Athletic Department, but is a **long-term** opportunity to spread the wealth – currently the Athletic Department has a \$45M budget with no reserves.

Suggested to vote on **correct, updated wording** of revenue sharing resolution. **Dev has an additional proposal – will work on wording, will circulate and will vote on during March meeting.**

March meeting: Dev’s proposal, role of FAR.