

**May 8, 1986**

**TO:** Keith R. Kleckner  
Senior Vice President for University Affairs and Provost,

**FROM:** Harold Zepelin  
Chair, Committee on Campus Development & Environment

**SUBJECT:** Year-end Report from Committee on Campus Development and Environment

Committee Membership

Wilma Bledsoe (Student Affairs; Ex officio)  
Kelley Dillon (Student), replaced by Carl Allen  
Paul Franklin (CIPO)  
Daniel Fullmer (Linguistics)  
Rita Gallager (Nursing)  
Barbara Hallman (Computer Services)  
R. Douglas Hunter (Biology)  
Sue Jezewski (Student)  
Bruce Johnson (Bookcenter)  
Richard Pettengill (Library)  
Geoffrey Upward (University Relations)  
Harold Zepelin (Psychology)

The Committee had five meetings, addressing the following topics:

1. Review of steps taken the previous year to meet the needs of handicapped students. No pressing problems came to the Committee's attention. Attempts to get a representative of handicapped students to serve on the Committee were unsuccessful.
2. Status of the Oakland Technology Park and its possible effects on the campus environment.
3. Complaints about the condition of Beer Lake. These turned out not to require any special attention.
4. A report by George Catton (Campus Facilities & Operations) on plans for new construction.
5. Examination of the Annual Reports of the Committee in previous years, in an attempt to gain a better understanding of the Committee's role.
6. An invited presentation by Jan Schimmelman (Art and Art History), examining the layout of the campus, relationships between buildings, visual impact of the campus, and traffic patterns between buildings. (Copy attached.)
7. Recommendations regarding the role of the Committee.

Keith R. Kleckner  
5-8-86  
Continued-Page 2

The general conclusions that emerged from this year's experience can be summarized as follows: 1) there is a need for more centralized overall planning to enhance the beauty and liveability of the campus; 2) despite the Committee's broad charge, it lacks the wherewithal truly to act as guardian of the campus environment, and 3) if the Committee is to fulfill this role, it must be guaranteed the opportunity for input into the long-range planning process.

Review of the Committee's history disclosed the absence of a central thread in its activities. Each year, it seems, the Committee struggles anew to define its role. Sometimes it latches on to a specific project; most of the time it flounders. But even as the Committee casts about for projects, new structures, parking lots, etc. appear on campus, without any consultations with the Committee, and also without any relationship to an overall plan that would protect and enhance the beauty of the campus.

It should be noted that the Committee in 1984-85 arrived at a similar conclusion.

The Committee now recommends:

1. Revision of the Committee's charge to guarantee it a role in a long-range planning process.
2. Provisions to assure that the Committee has the technical qualifications necessary to deal with environmental and esthetic issues. While the various constituencies on campus are entitled to a voice on the Committee, there should always be a nucleus of members with competence in the visual arts, architecture, etc. Ex officio membership for the head of Campus Facilities and Operations is desirable for efficient liaison with the Administration.
3. Facilitation of year-to-year continuity in the Committee's work by reducing the annual turnover in its membership.

HZ/jeg

Attachment