

August 2004

Minutes August 3, 2004

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/bot_agendas

Recommended Citation

"Minutes August 3, 2004" (2004). *Agendas and Minutes*. 27.
http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/bot_agendas/27

**MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT**

AGENDA

University of Connecticut
Rome Commons Ballroom
South Campus Complex
Storrs, Connecticut

August 3, 2004

OPEN SESSION

The meeting was called to order at 12:05 p.m. by Chairman John Rowe. Trustees present were: Philip Barry, Bruce Gresczyk, Andrea Dennis-LaVigne, Stephen Kuchta, Michael Martinez, and Michael Nichols.

Trustees who participated by telephone were: James Abromaitis, Louise Bailey, Michael Cicchetti, Linda Gatling, Thomas Ritter, David O'Leary, Richard Treibick, and Brenda Sisco, who represents the Governor's Office.

Trustees William Berkley, Lenworth Jacobs, Denis Nayden, and Betty Sternberg were absent from the meeting.

University staff present were: President Austin, Interim Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Maryanski, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Aronson, Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Flaherty-Goldsmith, Vice President for Operations Dreyfuss, Interim Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Makowsky, Vice President for Student Affairs Saddlemire, Associate Provost for Enrollment Management Evanovich, Athletic Director Hathaway, Dr. Schurin, Special Assistant to the President Callahan, and Ms. Locke. Faculty Senate Representative Kent Holsinger was also present.

All actions taken were by unanimous vote of the Trustees present.

1. Public Participation

The following members of the public addressed the Board on the topic noted:

- Helen Koehn, Chair, Environmental Impact Evaluation
Citizens for Responsible Growth

Ms. Koehn identified herself as the chairperson of a local environmental advocacy group known as Citizens for Responsible Growth (CFRG). She stated that they mailed to the Board last week a letter and some materials because their members care about their town and their community. Ms. Koehn referenced the Environmental Impact Evaluation for the Burton Family Football Complex that was to be voted on by the Board of Trustees. She acknowledged that the University is committed to sustainable building practices for this project and they applaud that decision. However, concerns have been raised about follow through on this commitment. The members asked the Board to consider LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certification for the Football Complex and all UConn 21st Century Projects. LEED certification consists of ratings for a building's compliance with a long list of environmentally sustainable practices. LEED certification can be obtained at different levels from basic, silver, gold, and platinum. For example, buildings earn points for reducing water and energy consumption and using renewable energy resources. She stated that the University conducted an audit of four buildings that were built with UCONN 2000

August 3, 2004

bonding. Three of the four buildings scored one point for energy efficiency out of a possible five points. None of the buildings would have obtained basic LEED certification.

Ms. Koehn emphasized that a commitment to LEED certification stops the rhetoric and ensures that the good intentions of the University for sustainable design will be implemented. The University's sustainable guidelines for building design and construction developed by the SmithGroup, Mr. Richard Miller, Director of Environmental Policy at UConn, and others employed by the University are based on LEED standards, but these are general recommendations that do not require an external monitor to rate the level of compliance. These guidelines also hedge by citing various reasons for ignoring the "green" guidelines. She stated that the University seems reluctant to pay the extra up front capital costs for LEED certification, which is somewhat understandable. Ms. Koehn referenced the information provided to the Board in which there is evidence that certifies that there are long-term energy savings if LEED certification is granted.

She noted that the Connecticut League of Conservation Voters conducted a survey several years ago that showed Connecticut residents are very concerned about the environment and they are willing to pay more in order to have environmentally sustainable design. The University is also asking taxpayers for increases in its operating budget to hire needed additional faculty. Below personal costs, the next item on the operating budget in terms of size are energy costs. By joining other major universities, such as the University of California at Santa Barbara, UConn would position itself as a national leader in sustainable design. Ms. Koehn asked for clarification about whether the University had changed its decision to obtain LEED certification for the Football Complex. She stated that Mr. Miller indicated that the University would consider pursuing LEED certification as long as it the costs were not excessive. She asked for clarification about what "pursue" meant in terms of whether the University will seek more information about LEED certification or that the University will work to LEED certify the Football Complex.

Chairman Rowe stated that the perception of "lack of clarity" on what the University plans to do with respect to this item reflects the fact that the decision has not yet been made by the Board.

Ms. Koehn quoted the following from the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), which is a committee of the State that provides environmental watchdog services:

...We recommend formal certification of the major buildings as "green" or efficient buildings. The EIE indicates several efficiency measures that have been designed into the building, but does not indicate how the building will perform overall and what its overall efficiency might be. Applying efficiency to athletic facilities at the State's flagship university with its many environmental programs will give a very high profile to the concept of green construction that would be observed by both private and government sectors. The Council acknowledges that cost associated with certification, but any extra efficiency measures required for certification should save the University additional money over the long term.

Ms. Koehn concluded that CFRG agrees with CEQ's recommendations and urged the Board to obtain LEED certification for the Football Complex and all future 21st Century buildings.

August 3, 2004

conservation measures were considered, such as re-glazing windows, but this action did not amount to much as his office still has leaky steel framed, single-paned, casement windows as it did when he arrived in 1970. He supposed that the barrier was cost, but retrofitting costs are usually considerably more than doing right the first time.

The consensus among energy analysts is that world oil and gas production is approaching its peak and will be declining by the end of the decade. At the same time demand for oil and gas is increasing particularly in China and India. Accordingly, we can expect the price of energy to rise substantially from its current levels over the lifetime of UConn buildings.

Mr. Lehmann raised concerns regarding oversight. The University has said that it will design buildings with due regard for energy conservation and environmental impact, but it is not clear that it will be enforced without a Board of Trustees' policy to which administrators can be held accountable. A Board of Trustees policy for designing for LEED certification would not constitute that kind of club, but it would significantly improve on a voluntary standard. He urged the Board to adopt such a policy.

- Robin Weiner, member, Citizens for Responsible Growth Responsible Planning

Ms. Weiner read the following letter that she recently wrote to *The Hartford Courant*:

With a series of building projects, including the new Football Complex, about to begin at the University of Connecticut, it is time to think how to plan for the best possible results. Richard Miller, UConn's Director of Environmental Policy, has recently shown a commendable willingness to pursue environmental certification. Universities across the country, including our own ECSU are adopting the LEED certification program for responsible building standards, leadership in energy and environmental design. Following their carefully thought out criteria for designing construction will ensure that the new building projects will not disappoint, but rather do what they are designed to do efficiently, last as long as they are supposed to last, and fit into the existing campus without doing harm. Having suggested guidelines or standards for building practices is not enough. We need LEED certification from design and planning through construction. We must make sure that high standards of construction are followed with monitoring from impartial, outside sources. Now is the time to contact our elected officials in Hartford. Sound construction may cost a bit more at the outset, but will be an excellent investment for the future with major savings over the years in maintenance, energy, remediation, and replacement costs. We deserve to have our tax money used wisely.

Ms. Weiner asked the Board to consider these recommendations and not rush ahead with construction, even though the LEED certification process may slow down progress on the Football Complex. She said that it would be a great credit to the administration and the Board.

- Edmund J. Smith, Mansfield resident Citizens for Responsible Growth
Chairman Rowe read the following letter on behalf of Mr. Smith, who could not be present at the meeting:

August 3, 2004

“Citizens for Responsible Growth (CFRG) is once again out to mislead the public, now accusing the University of Connecticut of “shortsightedness.” A July 30 *Chronicle* article carried the headline “Group wants a ‘greener’ UConn” and called CFRG ‘A Mansfield resident organization.

“What kind of an organization is CFRG? Their website has not been updated for almost 2 years. They do not post minutes. They do not publicly announce meetings. They do not allow the general public to attend their meetings and in fact have canceled meetings when members of the general public have shown up. They do not provide a membership list.

“They have failed to remove blatant anti-UConn misrepresentations from their website and have submitted outright anti-UConn lies to the *Chronicle* for publication. They have shown themselves bankrupt of honesty and openness by engaging in a defamatory letter writing campaign to my employer. They appear to self select Mansfield residents with anti-UConn biases – based on the fact that they refused my membership to UConn’s Chancellor as well as me, an environmental educator and 10-year past member of the Windham Water Commission.

“I challenge CFRG to publicly deny anything I have here said. I challenge them to begin to act like a Mansfield resident organization and allow any interested citizen membership, make their meetings public and allow for open discussion. Until then they are not fit to be portrayed as a citizen’s organization.

Edmund J. Smith
166 Storrs Road
Mansfield Center, Connecticut”

- Elizabeth Paterson, Mayor, Town of Mansfield Mansfield Downtown Partnership

Mayor Paterson spoke in support of the Mansfield downtown development and provided a brief background on its progress. The project began as a vision in the 1960s by President Homer Babbidge, who envisioned a commercial center well fitted to the University community. While the concept never realized its full potential, the vision remained and has continued until today. Former Mayor of Mansfield Michael Schor, Mayor Paterson’s predecessor, was an active member of the National League of Cities (NLC) and also on the University community sub-committee of the national board. He kept the vision alive for a college town that would be equal or better to those towns that he visited as a member of the NLC. When he left the council in 1999, he encouraged her to expand upon the vision.

Mayor Paterson took this opportunity to thank many individuals who were instrumental in the success of this project. She first acknowledged Mr. Doyle Hyatt and Ms. Dolores Palma for their first report that confirmed it was viable to consider building a downtown area in Mansfield. She thanked her fellow members of the Mansfield Downtown Partnership who brought the idea to fruition encompassing both University and townspeople who came together bringing extraordinary talent, camaraderie, and vision. Mayor Paterson commended consultants Milone & MacBroom, Inc. for expanding on the vision. Mayor Paterson was grateful for the work that the original planning committee conducting in creating the guidelines and the draft of the Partnership. She personally thanked those who donated

August 3, 2004

countless hours of their time and support, including President Philip Austin, Special Assistant to the President Thomas Callahan, former Provost John Petersen, Ms. Elizabeth Treiber, Mr. Martin Berliner, Mr. Greg Padick, Mr. James Stallard, Vice President Dale Dreyfuss, Mr. Matthew Hart, and Trustee Philip Barry, who has been involved with this project since its inception. The Mansfield Town Council and staff, Board members, subcommittees, dozens of volunteers, and the membership, which is almost 300 strong who believed in this project were also acknowledged. Mayor Paterson recognized our legislators, who have supported this endeavor and assisted in obtaining grants. Most of all, she thanked Mr. Philip Lodewick for his leadership and guidance throughout the planning stages. Mayor Paterson also commended Ms. Cynthia van Zelm, Executive Director of the Partnership, for her time and effort on this project.

After over five years in the planning stages, they seek the Board's endorsement of this project, which will result in a bustling, vibrant, college town. She thanked the Board for their consideration of this issue.

- Philip Lodewick, President
Mansfield Downtown Partnership

Mansfield Downtown Partnership

Mr. Lodewick recounted a conversation with President Austin many years ago in which he said that as important as the transformation that was taking place at the University was, then and now, the most significant project in his mind was a downtown area. They worked for some years flushing out the plans, but have successfully developed a concept master plan, improved EIA, land use studies, market studies, etc. It is evident to all that there is a viable economically, socially, and culturally vibrant center to be developed. The item before the Board today is the Land Transfer agreement that Vice President Dreyfuss has worked diligently on. He thanked the Board for their past, ongoing, and current support on this initiative.

- Allen Ward, Emeritus Professor of History
Member, Citizens for Responsible Growth

Mansfield development

Mr. Ward spoke on behalf of the efforts of the Citizens for Responsible Growth and disputed the contentions provided in Mr. Smith's letter. He stated that members of CFRG have worked hard with the Partnership. Mr. Ward concluded that they have made very positive contributions to the plan, which is going in the right direction.

2. Chairman's Report

- (a) Minutes of the meeting of June 22, 2004

On a motion by Mr. Martinez, seconded by Mr. Treibick, **THE BOARD VOTED** to approve the minutes of the meeting of June 22, 2004.

- (b) 2004-05 tentative Board meeting schedule (Attachment 1)

Chairman Rowe directed Trustee attention to a revised 2004-05 Board meeting schedule in which a change was made in the location for the April, 2005 meeting, which is to be held at the Stamford Campus. He asked that Trustees bring their concerns about the schedule to the attention of the administration.

August 3, 2004

3. President's Report

President Austin reiterated comments made by Mayor Paterson regarding Mr. Philip Lodewick. He and his wife Christine have supported the University in so many ways including his service as former President of the UConn Foundation Board and in their private philanthropy. He thanked him for his leadership in bringing the downtown project to fruition. President Austin also acknowledged the efforts and contributions of Mayor Paterson on behalf of the entire University community.

(a) Items requiring Board discussion and approval:

- (1) Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Department of Dining Services and the Union of Needle Trades, Industrial & Textile Employees, AFL-CIO, CLC (UNITE)

(Attachment 2)

President Austin asked Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Flaherty-Goldsmith to present the UNITE contract. Vice President Flaherty-Goldsmith stated that this contract covers the University's non-State food service workers. The administration presented at the June Board meeting a request that the Board approve an extension of the contract that was agreed upon in 2000 for a four-year period ending June 30, 2004. The extension covered the contract through September, which allowed time for the membership to vote on the contract. Now that the membership has voted, the contract before the Board is in effect until June 30, 2007 retroactive to July 1, 2004. It calls for salary increases of 3%, 4%, and 4% in the years 2004, 2005, and 2006, respectively. A significant change from the existing contract, which was misstated in the original materials, is for family coverage. The change stipulates that Dining Services will pay 60% of the difference in the premiums between individual and family coverage for employees who select family coverage and will pay 100% of the individual coverage. She indicated that in the original materials this change was incorrectly stated. Trustees received by fax a revised resolution that accurately reflects the contract language.

Chairman Rowe asked for clarification that the University is paying 60% of the difference between the premium for individuals and the premium for families. He stated that the University is paying the individual premium plus 60% of the delta if someone opts for family coverage and the employee pays 40% of the difference.

Vice President Flaherty-Goldsmith concurred and stated that it was not reflected accurately in the original resolution. The difference or 40% is \$244 per month or how much additional they would be paying.

Trustee Barry asked for the percentage of food service personnel who are non-union. Mr. Gerald Weller, Director of Dining Services responded that there is very small percentage of employees that are non-represented and consists of employees in the Catering Department and the Retail Department. He was not sure of the percentage, but estimated that it was approximately 40 out of 300 or so employees.

Trustee Barry stated that it would appear because of the way the union dues are structured that if you chose not to join the union, then you should pay an agency fee equivalent to the dues. He asked if there was anyone who had not joined the union based upon that practice.

August 3, 2004

Mr. Weller responded that this has not happened. UNITE represents production and food service employees and they have purposely worked with the union to keep those employees associated with the Catering and Retail Departments, who are primarily managers in those areas. It is not an elective membership.

On a motion by Mr. Martinez, seconded by Mrs. Gatling, **THE BOARD VOTED** to approve the three-year agreement, from July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2007, between UNITE, AFL-CIO, CLC representing the University's non-State food service workers and the Department of Dining Services.

President Austin acknowledged Mr. Weller and Mr. Dennis Pearce as they were prominently featured on the cover of one of their trade magazines. Even more importantly, the University's food service department received a strong rating for the quality of our services. He congratulated Mr. Weller.

President Austin updated the Board on the issue of parking fees at the regional campuses, which was raised at the June Board meeting. He noted that the administration has discussed this matter further and has decided not to implement a fee structure this fall pending further study.

- (2) Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE)
The Burton Family Football Complex and The
Mark R. Shenkman Training Center
Storrs, CT

(Attachment 3)

Mr. Richard Miller, Director of Environmental Policy provided background for the Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE). He noted that The Burton Family Football Complex and The Mark R. Shenkman Training Center was previously approved by the Board. Because of the size of these facilities, the project does require review under the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act (CEPA) and the development of the Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE). The preferred site for these facilities currently is the location of 12 tennis courts used by the Recreational Department and by the intercollegiate tennis teams. As a result, the tennis courts will need to be relocated. Thus the EIE addresses not only the football facilities, but also the proposed relocation of the tennis courts to be placed adjacent to the ice hockey area parking, which was selected as a preferred site

Mr. Miller stated that UConn officials conducted several public meetings regarding the EIE. The first meeting was held in February. Later, the Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) requested a site walk, which took place in early June and subsequently a public hearing was held on June 10 on the draft EIE. He noted that the latter public hearing was the only one that was required by the CEPA statute. UConn considered five alternative sites for the football complex, including Memorial Stadium and the Morrone Soccer Stadium. The current proposed site (tennis court area) was selected, because it was near other athletic facilities and support services and preserves existing athletic fields, which are at a premium. It is also consistent with the Master Plan, and the size and scale of nearby facilities. The site is also convenient for students and student-athletes and for visitors, because the South Parking Garage is nearby. A similar analysis was completed on the site of the proposed tennis courts relocation.

Mr. Miller referenced page 3 of the resolution in Attachment 3, which consists of a table that

August 3, 2004

summarized proposed measures to mitigate environmental impacts. He briefly outlined the major impacts and how the University responded to them. First, storm water runoff is a significant issue at the Storrs Campus and through the use of state-of-the-art treatment technologies as well as widespread use of more progressive natural methods to infiltrate rainfall on site, reduce runoff, and maintain hydrology, they expect to actually improve water runoff quality and even reduce the peak rate of runoff from these project sites. Concerns were raised about trees and buffers that would be retained as well as lighting and noise issues. The Chair and another faculty member of the UConn Arboretum Committee had reviewed the proposed sites with Mr. Miller and found no specimen trees of unique value on either site. They did, however, identify heavy growth of invasive species, such as bittersweet and multi-floral rose, which they plan to remove along Stadium Road. Some trees would need to be cut down and others trimmed in that area to allow for the view of the Shenkman Training Center, although several of the largest and healthiest trees will be preserved. We will be able to maintain substantial wooded buffers elsewhere in this project. For example, the clearing from the tennis courts at their proposed location to the nearest residence at the intersection of Separatist and South Eagleville Roads is approximately 300-400 feet. Also, there are no plans for lights at the tennis courts, and no night play is anticipated at this point. In addition, most of the lighting from the Football Complex will be internal and there will be cutoff lighting for associated exterior lights.

There were questions about the site line and whether it would be visible from neighbors who reside in the Hillside Circle and Westwood Road neighborhood. An analysis was conducted with photographs and profile drawings of the elevations showing that the topography and the distance actually screen the view from the residences. With respect to wetland areas, we do not plan to fill, excavate, or disturb any regulated wetlands with either of these sites. If this were to happen, the University would first need to obtain a DEP wetlands permit. The EIE documents that, historically, any filling on top of the wetlands soils that occurred in the project areas actually happened in the 1960s before the Connecticut Wetlands Law and the Federal Clean Water Act were adopted.

As for the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) discussion, which the Mansfield residents and members of Citizens for Responsible Growth have articulated today, the entire project has been designed to meet UConn's new sustainable design guidelines. The University has determined that it could achieve a high sustainable design rating under the U.S. Green Building Council's standards for LEED. The administration has proposed to pursue LEED certification on this project to the extent that it is economically feasible. We know that it is consistent with the environmental sustainability focus area of UConn's new Academic Plan and also our new Environmental Policy Statement, which was adopted last April. We expect LEED certification would result in a relatively small premium versus conventional design and construction costs, but will also result in operating and maintenance cost savings. Mr. Miller confirmed that the University has received proposals ranging from \$40,000 to \$80,000 to actually submit the documentation for certification. To date, they have completed 100% of the design development phase at no additional cost for incorporating LEED elements, but they will continue to monitor to ensure that the LEED certification would not become cost prohibitive. We are proud that UConn is among the first colleges and universities around the country to adopt its own sustainable design guidelines and that we are able to recommend LEED certification on this project.

August 3, 2004

Chairman Rowe asked for clarification and reiterated that the University will build the building according to LEED standards. He asked Mr. Miller if the University was committed to getting certification or it was to be considered at a later time.

Mr. Miller responded that the University is recommending that it should pursue LEED certification to the extent that it proves to be economically feasible.

Chairman Rowe stated that he was confused by Mr. Miller's last comment, which seemed to indicate that certification had been pursued. With respect to the construction, it appears that it would not be a significant added expense for the taxpayers. On the other hand, Chairman Rowe raised concerns about taxpayer expense and the loss of the equivalent of another faculty salary in order to obtain LEED certification.

Mr. Miller responded that they are still evaluating whether the LEED design and construction costs will be at a premium, and will strive to contain those costs. In terms of the actual paperwork costs, they have received proposals ranging from \$40,000 to \$80,000 to conduct an audit to verify that the system will work as designed and to submit paperwork for the certification. He noted that Chairman Rowe was correct in assuming that it would be an additional cost. In light of the proposed environmental impacts and mitigation measures that were analyzed and described in detail in the EIE, UConn is recommending that the Board approve the EIE and submit it to the State Office of Policy and Management.

On a motion by Ms. Bailey, seconded by Mrs. Gatling, **THE BOARD VOTED** to approve the Environmental Impact Evaluation for the proposed construction of The Burton Family Football Complex and The Mark R. Shenkman Training Center (formerly known as Burton Family Football Complex and Intramural, Recreational and Intercollegiate Athletic Facility).

Chairman Rowe asked that the Board review the Transfer of Downtown Development in Attachment 11 and suggested that the remaining agenda items be approved together.

(10) Transfer of Property for Downtown Development (Attachment 11)

Vice President Dreyfuss discussed the details of the transfer of property for the downtown development. He noted that an earlier version of the map of the area was brought to the Board at the December 2, 2003 meeting. LeylandAlliance of Texudo, N.Y. has been identified as the developer based upon competitive solicitation.

Vice President Dreyfuss directed Trustee attention to the attached map. The map identifies the lands that would be sold to Leyland for the purpose of constituting the downtown area. Those lands are the lands that are identified by parcels. Parcel A, the large parcel in the center of the map, is basically the University's strip mall, which extends from the northern most of the three malls currently on Storrs Road, the parking lots and vacant area behind it, and some wetlands which are delineated on the each side of that. Parcel B1 is the current location of the University Communications Department, which will be moving in the spring. Parcel B2 is the parking lot behind the Merlin D. Bishop Center. The intent of the University is not to surrender that piece of property, but to convey air rights to the developers for the purpose of building a parking garage. The University will be entitled to a fixed number of spaces as it currently had in the surface lot. Parcel C is the old Fleet Bank Building and current site of the Britta R. Nayden Physical Therapy Clinic. Parcel D is south of Route 275 (South Eagleville Road), which includes two single-family houses. Parcel E is the corner, which is currently wooded, east of the Mansfield Apartments. Parcel F is the site of the U.S. Post Office, which

August 3, 2004

is leased from the University to the U.S. Postal Service on a seventy-year lease at \$1.00 per year.

Ms. Bailey offered a motion, seconded by Mr. Martinez, to approve the sale of University real estate along Route 195 (Storrs Road) to be developed as a planned town center to serve both the campus and area residents. Trustee Abromaitis abstained on this item.

Trustee Gatling asked if University water and electricity would be utilized to run the buildings in the downtown area.

Vice President Dreyfuss responded that the University being the only supplier of water and sewer services in the area will propose separate agreements with the developer to provide water and sewer to the property line. All infrastructure costs within the property will be the responsibility of the developer. The University will not supply electricity. The Co-generation plant is being built solely for the use of the University. The developer will obtain electricity from the local utility.

Trustee Barry raised concerns about Parcel F and the lease to the U.S. Post Office. He asked how many years the lease was in effect. Vice President Dreyfuss responded that the lease is a seventy-year lease payable at \$1.00 per year and the lease has approximately 45 more years to go. At the commencement of the lease, the U.S. Postal Service paid the University the seventy dollars in full. What will happen now is that the developer will become the landlord of the U.S. Post Office. Vice President Dreyfuss explained that the reason that this was included was to give the developer an option of going back to the Postal Service and request that they move the Post Office in Mansfield to another location within the parcel, should the developer determine that it is more advantageous for the project.

THE BOARD VOTED to approve the resolution.

Chairman Rowe asked that the Board collectively approve items 3 through 9 in the agenda. On a motion by Mrs. Gatling, seconded by Ms. Bailey, **THE BOARD VOTED** to approve the following items:

- (3) 9 Westwood Road, Storrs, Connecticut – Release of Restrictions 1, 2 and 7 from a Deed Dated and Recorded on September 27, 1955, for Property of Arthur Hawkins and Ada T. Hawkins, Their Heirs and Assigns (Attachment 4)
- (4) Final Approval of Proposed Changes to the *University of Connecticut Laws and By-Laws* (Health Center Board of Directors Membership – Commissioner of Public Health) (Attachment 5)
- (5) Sale of University Property - 88 Gurleyville Road, Storrs, Connecticut (Attachment 6)
- (6) Naming Recommendation for the Pfizer Distinguished Chair in Pharmaceutical Technology (Attachment 7)
- (7) Naming Recommendation for the Carole and Ray Neag Comprehensive Cancer Center (Health Center) (Attachment 8)

August 3, 2004

- (8) Naming Recommendation for the Henry B.C. Low, M.D.
Learning Center (Health Center) (Attachment 9)
- (9) Personnel matters (Storrs-based programs) (Attachment 10)

Chairman Rowe stated that on July 23, 2004 there was a very well attended and extraordinarily productive meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee. This meeting was chaired by Vice-Chair Jacobs and was attended by a full cadre of deans, Interim Provost Maryanski and his staff. Very substantial progress was made toward the articulation of greater detail in the Academic Plan going forward. A full report would be given at the September 8, 2004 meeting. He congratulated Dr. Jacobs and Dr. Maryanski for the substantial progress being made.

Secondly, he informed the Board that in the very near future he and President Austin will be meeting with Governor Rell. They had the opportunity to meet with her Chief of Staff, who was very knowledgeable with respect to the Storrs-based programs and the Health Center and enthusiastic about learning more details about the University's activities.

4. Adjournment

Chairman Rowe noted that the next meeting of the Board is scheduled for Wednesday, September 8, 2004 in the Rome Commons Ballroom.

There being no further business, the Board meeting adjourned at 1:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Louise M. Bailey
Secretary