Meeting Date: December 13, 2012

Members in attendance: Barbara Albrecht, Robert Berne, John Billings, Corey Blay, Rajeev Dehejia, Mariam Ehrari, Allyson Green, Wen-Jui Han, Angela Kamer, Perri Klass, Marty Kurth, Ted Magder (chair), Laurence Maslon, Tony Saunders Rosemary Scanlon, Andrew Schotter, Matt Stanley, David Vintinner, Larry White, Diane Yu

Members unable to attend: Mary Cowman, David Engel, James Jacobs, Panos Mavromatis, Tony Movshon, Jalal Shatah

---

Note: This meeting marked the first deliberative session of the Working Group; no presentations were given. This summary is designed to capture and provide an overview of the important decisions and points of discussion.

---

The Working Group began the meeting by forming small groups and discussing specific needs for further information needed to fulfill the Group’s charge, as well as suggestions for processes and protocols for the Spring semester.

Members requested further information pertaining to the following themes:

- Faculty housing
- Student life and athletic space (as distinct from student study space)
- Development options for the northern superblock
- Neighborhood zoning constraints
- Financial modeling (including year-by-year models, and information on affordability and responsiveness to emergencies)
- Options for development outside the Core neighborhood
- Needs expressed by departments and the process by which they are vetted by the University
- Quality of life concerns (including the valuation of quality of life effects and costs, and the public health implications)
Specific follow-up requests regarding some of these questions will be made to the administration following this meeting, and information will be provided to the Working Group and posted on its Web site as it becomes available.

Members discussed the following points regarding the Working Group’s process, data gathering, and internal protocol:

- Conversation and consultation with the community, including the possibility of issuing a mid-term status update or “Frequently Asked Questions” document, considering the Working Group’s role in informing public opinion, and directing inquiries to the Web site
- Presentations and engagement with various constituencies, including visits to specific departments and inviting those with opposing views to present to the Working Group
- Distillation of departmental resolutions and public hearing records to ensure responsiveness and attention concerns expressed therein

The Group’s charge was also discussed at length, including questioning the ability of the Group to consider (with appropriate justification) no further development on the southern superblock. The group agreed to contact the University administration to seek clarification on this point.

Responding to the request for recommendations for the NYU representative to the Open Space Oversight Organization (OSOO) mandated by ULURP, the group discussed various characteristics of an ideal candidate. Members discussed the merits of selecting an administrator, a faculty member with expertise in the issue area, and a person with experience in political situations. They also emphasized the importance of this representative reporting to the University in some meaningful way.

The Group decided on the following recommendation:

“The University Space Priorities Working Group hereby recommends that the University administration select an individual who has demonstrated the following characteristics as the NYU representative to the Open Space Oversight Organization:

- Ability to represent and report to multiple NYU constituencies, and remain tempered in challenging and political environments;
- Knowledge of University policy and planning efforts, and of city planning and political processes;
- Available to attend several potential meetings, especially during the summer, and produce and review required reports.

In addition to the criteria noted above, the Working Group believes that it is essential that the appointee report back to the Working Group and, following the completion of its work, to the Public Affairs Committee of the University Senate. The University Space Priorities Working Group will revisit this recommendation in its final report.”