March 4, 2014

Dear President Sexton,

It is my pleasure to submit the Final Report of the University Space Priorities Working Group, which was convened at your request in October 2012.

As Chair of the 26-member Working Group, I have had the honor of working alongside a dedicated and thoughtful group of University citizens, resolute in their quest for facts and evidence and civil even in the midst of robust discussion.

The Working Group is confident that its recommendations—and the analyses on which they are based—are consistent with the University’s academic mission and will sustain the momentum that has transformed New York University into one of the world’s leading institutions of higher education.

The Working Group would like to acknowledge the timely and thorough responsiveness of a host of University administrators to requests for data. We owe a special debt of gratitude to Michael Patullo for his exceptional management of our affairs and his grace under all conditions.

Respectfully, and on behalf of the University Space Priorities Working Group,

Ted Magder
Chair
Executive Summary

Establishment, Charge, and Scope
The University Space Priorities Working Group was established in October 2012 to provide definitive guidance on the criteria and principles that should inform New York University’s use of space on its core campus, in and around Washington Square Park, and to provide specific recommendations on the possibility of redeveloping NYU-owned land bounded by West Houston Street to the south, Mercer Street to the east, La Guardia Place to the west, and West Third Street to the north, often described as “the Superblocks.” Given that construction on the North Block cannot begin until 2022 at the earliest, the Working Group focused its attention and analysis on the South Block.

Addressing the Needs for Space: Main Recommendation
The University should address its current needs for space by redeveloping the Coles Sports Center site to provide for the following:

- At least 80 classrooms, ranging in size from small seminar rooms to large lecture halls
- One large theater and four workshop theaters, as well as other specialized academic spaces for the performing arts
- Dedicated student study and student life spaces
- A new athletic and recreation center, which includes an assembly facility for community emergencies
- Residence halls to accommodate up to 500 freshman students
- Housing for roughly 100 NYU faculty families

Recommended Allocation of Space for Coles Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Purpose</th>
<th>Gross Square Feet (GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic Space:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General-purpose Classrooms</td>
<td>132,000–214,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Space for the Performing Arts</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Study &amp; Student Life Space</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Space Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td><strong>367,000–449,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sports Center &amp; Emergency Community Facility</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Housing</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Faculty Housing</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gross Square Footage:</strong></td>
<td><strong>817,000–899,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guiding Principles
It was evident from the start that the Working Group’s recommendations—no matter how carefully crafted—would be unable to meet the needs of every constituency or satisfy every concern within the University or the community at large.

To balance the divergence of views and steer the Working Group’s fact-finding and recommendations, the Working Group settled on four guiding principles.

1. The University has an obligation to its students to provide adequate space for their educational purposes, including their interactions with faculty and staff.
2. The University has an obligation to advance improvements on the Superblocks, which directly affect NYU residents, community residents, the neighborhood, faculty, and students.

3. Any construction project should leave the neighborhood a better place in which to live.

4. The University’s proposed Capital Spending and Financing Plan should be fiscally responsible, and the process of planning and budgeting should be transparent.

Academic Space Is the Main Priority
The Working Group identified a critical shortage of space to serve NYU’s current academic mission and to sustain the University’s momentum as a leading institution of higher education. The Full Report provides a detailed analysis showing the need for more general-purpose classrooms, student study and meeting space, and specialized space to support programs of study in the performing arts. Academic space should be the University’s highest priority and comprises close to 50% of the total use of space on the Coles Site in the Working Group’s recommendations.

The Core: A Precious and Irreplaceable Asset
The area around Washington Square, which includes the Coles Sports Center Site, is at once the heart of NYU, the closest thing to a campus for a University without a campus, and an integral piece of a dense and historically rich New York City neighborhood. The Core is where the majority of undergraduate teaching and associated student activities takes place, where most of the University’s academic departments and research laboratories are located, and where many students and faculty live.

The Working Group believes that NYU should continue to concentrate its academic activities within the Core to the greatest extent possible and that increasing the density of activities within the Core improves the academic quality of the institution. For students and faculty alike, proximity to the Core is a precious and irreplaceable asset.

Stewardship and Quality of Life: A Higher Level of Care and Attention
The use and care of the land and buildings owned by the University in and around the Core must support and enhance the neighborhood’s quality of life. The Superblocks and the neighborhood surrounding them should be better places in which to live: better in terms of their physical environment and better in terms of the relationship between NYU and the community.

Future planning and maintenance of the built and public spaces on the Superblocks should involve a new University-wide Superblock Stewardship Advisory Committee composed of representatives from all relevant University constituents, as well as representatives from the tenants associations in the NYU-owned properties on the Superblocks: Washington Square Village and Silver Towers.

Community Assembly and Environmental Sustainability
Events surrounding Superstorm Sandy reminded the Working Group that the University could serve as a place of community assembly and support during local emergencies. The Working Group recommends that the University increase its reliance on renewable energy systems and design the new Coles Sports Center to serve as an assembly point during local emergencies, providing University and community residents with access to electricity, shelter, and other basic amenities.

Fiscal Responsibility
The Working Group concluded that the University’s Capital Spending and Financing Plan is based on reasonably conservative and prudent assumptions and that the Working Group’s recommendations for construction on the Coles Site are within NYU’s current fiscal means. The University need not—and should not—adjust future tuition fees or faculty, administrative, or staff salary assumptions to cover capital costs.
The North Block and the Morton Williams Site
Before any major construction takes place on the North Block, where no construction can take place until 2022 at the earliest, or the site where the Morton Williams supermarket currently stands, the University should consult with a new advisory group similar in composition to the University Space Priorities Working Group.

Transparency and Governance
From the outset, all documents received and reviewed by the Working Group, as well as all Working Group meeting agendas and summaries, were publicly available via an open website. The Working Group is confident that its process of review, consultation, and analysis offers a potential model for University-wide deliberative and advisory bodies, a model based on transparency and broad consultation, a model that advances the University’s effort to re-imagine its mechanisms for governance.

About the Working Group: Composition and Process
The 26-member Working Group—composed primarily of faculty representatives appointed by the schools and the Faculty Senators Council, as well as representatives from the Student Senators Council, Administrative Management Council, and the University Administration—undertook extensive consultations with members of the University and community neighbors and gathered new data on all categories of space. In July 2013, the Working Group published an Interim Report to highlight its provisional conclusions and to guide its ongoing deliberations with University and community constituents.
**Recommendations**

**Main Recommendation**
The Working Group recommends that the Coles Site on the South Block should include the following uses and allocations in terms of GSF.

**Recommended Allocation of Space for Coles Site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Purpose</th>
<th>Gross Square Feet (GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic Space:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General-purpose Classrooms</td>
<td>132,000–214,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Space for the Performing Arts</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Study &amp; Student Life Space</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Space Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td><strong>367,000–449,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sports Center &amp; Emergency Community Facility</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Housing</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Faculty Housing</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gross Square Footage:</strong></td>
<td><strong>817,000–899,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I. Space**

**General-Purpose Classrooms**
Build between 132,000 and 214,000 GSF of general-purpose classrooms to accommodate a variety of pedagogical styles, ranging from large lecture halls to small seminar and group-work rooms.

**Performance Space**
1. Build a large proscenium theater, four flexible black box theaters, production workshops, storage, and specialized academic spaces for the performing arts, planned in consultation with theater architects and sound designers.
2. Design theatre and studio spaces for multiple uses and make them available across schools and to the neighboring community wherever possible.

**Student Study and Student Life Space**
1. Build 40,000 GSF to provide new space for individualized student study and student life needs.
2. Include study space as an integral component in all new construction and renovation, planned in consultation with the Division of Libraries.
3. Expand space options for student meetings and functions, and improve accessibility to Kimmel by reducing its use as classroom space and by decreasing or eliminating support fees required for students’ use of Kimmel.

**Recreational, Athletic, and Emergency Assembly Space**
1. Build a new recreational and athletic facility to serve NYU’s competitive athletic and intramural teams, fitness and training classes, and recreational patrons and designed to UAA/NCAA specifications.
2. Design the new facility with the capacity to provide emergency assembly space for NYU and community neighbors.

3. Make available appropriate replacement athletic and recreational facilities during construction on the Coles Site.

**Space for the Sciences**

The University should be alert for any opportunity to acquire a suitable site for *de novo* science lab construction somewhere in or near the Core and develop plans for a new flagship science building on such a site, to focus particularly on undergraduate science education.

**Student Housing**

1. Build 150,000 GSF of student residence halls to accommodate up to 500 freshman students, designed to provide the best possible residential college experience, including integrated University programming to address the specific needs of freshmen.

2. Continue to make studio apartments available in faculty housing for doctoral students and postdoctoral scholars, especially those whose research requires them to be in laboratories and other specialized research spaces in or near the Core.

**Faculty Housing**

1. Build 150,000 GSF of new faculty housing on the South Block, consisting primarily of larger units suitable for families.

2. Undertake an analysis of other options for faculty housing—such as mortgage assistance, rental assistance, and shared equity programs—in consultation with the faculty.

**Morton Williams Site**

Review possible plans for this site with the proposed Superblock Stewardship Committee, following the decision of the School Construction Authority, expected by the end of 2014.

**II. Stewardship and Quality of Life**

**A Stewardship Committee**

1. Establish a standing Superblock Stewardship Committee to provide the University with ongoing assessment and advice for the maintenance and improvement of quality-of-life issues concerning University properties on the Superblocks before, during, and after any construction.

   - Make all committee proceedings and related documents available for public review and ensure that the committee provides regular reports to the University.

   - Ensure that the committee is composed of faculty, including a significant number who reside on the Superblocks; a representative from each of the tenants associations; at least one student; and representatives from the University’s Division of Operations, Faculty Housing Office, and Community Relations Office. Ideally, the committee would also work closely with the Housing and Benefits Committee of the Faculty Senators Council and any other relevant Senate-level committees.

   - Create a special subcommittee to advise on construction, including the final allocation of space, architectural design, environmental sustainability, and use of public spaces.
Related to Improved Management and Stewardship of the Superblocks

2. Proceed immediately with suspended maintenance and improvement projects on both the South and North Blocks.¹

3. Clarify the chain of responsibility within the Division of Operations and communicate it to residents of the Superblocks so that, before, during, and after construction, residents and neighbors know exactly which office and/or individual is responsible for their concern.

4. Keep the La Guardia commercial strip occupied, well lit, functional, and attractive. Explore the option to utilize the space for University needs, including the possibility of new classrooms, if commercial tenants cannot be found.

5. Identify and implement the best possible window, air-conditioning, and façade improvements on the Superblocks in consultation with residents, as soon as possible, with or without construction.

6. Continue efforts to ensure that Washington Square Village is provided with a reliable source of back-up electricity in emergency situations.

7. Increase the presence of the Office of Faculty Housing on the Superblocks to improve awareness of, and response to, ongoing quality-of-life and stewardship issues. All or part of the Office of Faculty Housing could be relocated to a space on the Superblocks, for example.

8. Set up a consistent policy for usage and maintenance of the public spaces on the Superblocks.

Related to Construction on the South Block

9. Engage an independent consultant with expertise in community impacts of construction projects before any construction begins to assess whether the procedures outlined in the Restrictive Declaration are adequate and to examine any construction plans for both short-term and long-term effects on the neighboring community. This consultant should report to the Superblock Stewardship Committee to ensure transparency in the process of choosing mitigation strategies and accountability on any environmental effects of construction.²

10. Set high standards for architectural and design excellence, and meet high environmental standards of sustainability. Demonstrate leadership and innovation in terms of design and sustainability by ensuring that University buildings enhance the neighborhood.

11. Provide high-quality mitigation measures for residents on the Superblock. Reserve relocation for those NYU residents and families with exceptional health or mobility needs, and ensure that the Superblocks remain ADA-compliant throughout any construction process.

12. Establish a “work-study center” away from the construction site for faculty who currently work at home and who have no other office options.

III. Financing

1. Plan and schedule capital projects at the non-Coles Sites to scale back these projects if unforeseen or unexpected developments arise.

2. Preserve current tuition assumptions even in the event of unforeseen or unexpected financial

¹ Projects that have been allowed to lapse, such as the Coles sinkhole, the rocket ship playground, the Mercer Street dog run, the green space behind the commercial strip on La Guardia Place, the pavement throughout Washington Square Village, and the broken and redundant fencing on both blocks, should be prioritized.

² Such independent consultants are called “industrial hygienists” and can be accessed through OSHA, which routinely sets guidelines for their assessments. http://www.osha.gov/dte/library/industrial_hygiene/industrial_hygiene.pdf Although the Restrictive Declaration for the Core project calls for a consultant, that consultant is hired by the city of New York and paid for by New York University.
cial shocks. Address these shocks as much as possible by delaying capital projects and/or reducing cash reserve targets.

3. Preserve current faculty, administrative, and staff salary assumptions (including benefits) even in the event of unforeseen or unexpected financial shocks. Address these shocks as much as possible by delaying capital projects and/or reducing cash reserve targets.

4. Commit to an increase in fundraising for capital purposes, replacing the current target of $136 million with a substantially higher target.

5. Provide the University Senate with the same detailed financial information reviewed by the Working Group on a regular basis.
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NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
Introduction

NYU President John Sexton established the University Space Priorities Working Group in the fall of 2012 to examine NYU’s projected space needs and to give advice on how they can best be met. The Working Group’s charge stems most immediately from the New York City Council’s approval in July 2012 of NYU’s Core project application under the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) for new construction on what are collectively referred to as the “Superblocks,” the NYU-owned land bounded by West Houston Street to the south, Mercer Street to the east, La Guardia Place to the west, and West Third Street to the north. Bleecker Street bisects the area into a “South Block” (site of the Coles Sports Center, the Silver Towers apartment complex, and the Morton Williams supermarket) and “North Block” (site of Washington Square Village, or WSV, and the La Guardia Street commercial site).1

The Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) is the standardized procedure for public review of applications affecting land use in New York City.

While the City Council did not approve NYU’s Core project proposal in its entirety, it did grant the University permission to develop up to 1.9 million square feet (above and below grade) on the two Superblocks. The city’s approval reduced the density and height of the buildings from NYU’s original proposal, eliminated some proposed uses (such as a hotel or a temporary gym), and required compliance with expanded open space, community use, and consultation provisions. In addition, the city determined that no new construction can take place on the North Block until 2022 at the earliest.2

1 The ULURP application is one component of NYU’s original 2031 plan, which includes recommendations for space needs in the Washington Square Village Core, the neighborhood, and remote locations, including the Health Corridor, Downtown Brooklyn, and Governors Island (See www.nyu.edu/nyu2031/nyuinnyc). The final agreement between NYU and the conditions imposed by the New York City Council in connection with its approval of NYU’s ULURP application are set forth in a document referred to as the Restrictive Declaration of Large-Scale General Development for the NYU LGSD, July 24, 2012.

2 On January 7, 2014, the New York State Supreme Court issued a ruling in a lawsuit, filed by various community groups and individuals, including some NYU faculty, seeking to overturn the city’s approval for construction on the Superblocks. The court dismissed five of the six claims, including the petitioners’ challenge to the city’s approval of the NYU Core project. However, the judge did rule that the city did not have the authority to allow NYU to “substantially interfere” with the use of two strips of city-owned land that abut the North Block (the Mercer Street playground and what the court referred to as “La Guardia park”) and one strip of city-owned land that abuts the South Block (the community garden south of Bleecker Street). The court deemed these parcels of land to be “implied parkland,” and that any actions to interfere with them would require approval of the state legislature. Pending any appeals, the ruling complicates NYU’s plans for construction on the North Block and possibly at the site of the Morton Williams supermarket (at Bleecker and La Guardia Place). But, at the same time, the ruling has no bearing on the Coles Site on the South Block, which has been the focus of the Working Group’s attention. New York University and New York City have filed notices to appeal the part of the court’s ruling dealing with “implied parkland.” The petitioners have also filed an appeal.

Composition, Charge, and Scope

The Working Group represents a cross section of NYU: 18 faculty representatives appointed by the schools and two faculty representatives from the Faculty Senators Council, as well as two representatives each from the Student Senators Council, the Administrative Management Council, and the senior administration of the University. The faculty representatives include several with professional and scholarly expertise relevant to the Core project. More than half the faculty members of the Working Group are also longtime residents of NYU housing on the Superblocks.3

The charge to the Working Group was to provide the University with definitive guidance on space, including

- principles and priorities that should inform the development and use of the Superblock zoning envelope;
- strategies to improve the efficiency and usage of existing space;
- advice on the improvement of open space;
- recommendations for the amelioration of the impact of any construction on nearby residents; and
- specific advice on the construction or acquisition of new space within or near Washington Square, the Superblocks, and the closely surrounding area.

Given New York City Council’s decision that construction on the North Block could not begin until 2022 at the earliest, the Working Group chose to focus its attention and analysis on the South Block, specifically the advisability of construction on the current sites of the Coles Sports Center and the Morton Williams supermarket. It also decided to undertake a review of the University’s capital plan and an assessment of the financial impact of such a significant construction project. As its work evolved, the Working Group also broadened its scope to include a review of the stewardship and quality-of-life issues on the Superblocks.

To fulfill its charge, the Working Group explored the full range of options available to the University for the development of new space and the renovation of existing space, including the possibility of no new construction on the Superblocks.

3 Senior members of the administration, Robert Berne and Diane Yu, served as active participants throughout the 18-month period, but because they may be responsible for implementation of the Working Group’s findings, they did not participate in the voting on the final recommendations.
Figure 1.
Map of existing site conditions on the North and South Blocks.
The Process: Data-Gathering, Transparency, and Consultation

The Working Group decided at the start not to draw its data solely from the documentary material and final report submitted by NYU to the New York City Council or to base its recommendations on an assessment of the city-approved plan for the Superblocks. The Working Group reviewed the plans contained in NYU’s Core project application for new construction but did not consider itself bound by them. Instead, the Working Group assessed space needs, existing facilities, and financial resources de novo, independent of the University’s representations of them.

While much of the data reviewed by the Working Group were available from the very beginning, some data had to be compiled anew, refreshed, or provided in a different form, such as information on classroom inventory, configuration, and scheduling; student study and meeting spaces; operation and management of buildings and open spaces; and financial data on debt-financing, fundraising, and the specifics of University budget planning. To gather even more details about the University’s space-planning process, members of the Working Group met with the deans from all schools located near Washington Square and other relevant stakeholders from across the University.

To facilitate in-depth data gathering and assessment, the Working Group created three subcommittees:

- Academic and Non-Academic Space Subcommittee
- Finance Subcommittee
- Stewardship and Quality of Life Subcommittee

As the names of the subcommittees indicate, the Working Group broadened its assessment to include a comprehensive review of the University’s capital and financial planning process, with as much rigor as possible, the financial impact of a large construction project. As its work progressed, the Working Group also became more and more committed to a broad assessment of quality-of-life issues for those who live on the Superblocks.

From the start, and throughout its deliberations, the documents and data under consideration by the Working Group have been made available to the community at large via its website, where the Working Group also welcomed and received comments and submissions from any individual and interested party.4 To broaden its consultations, the Working Group sent invitations to meet with each of the faculty departments that expressed opposition or concern to NYU’s original 2031 plan and met with all those requesting such a meeting. In the spring of 2013, the Working Group held three town hall meetings, which were open to faculty, students, and administrators of the University as well as neighbors from the community.

In July 2013, after nine months of work, the Working Group published an interim report summarizing its consensus on a wide range of findings and recommendations. The three main recommendations were these:

1. The need for academic space at NYU is urgent and real, and it is the group consensus that a significant portion of this need can only be met by new construction on the South Block.
2. NYU must place a high priority on improving its stewardship of the Superblocks and its relationship to the neighboring community now and in the future.
3. NYU’s financial planning has adopted reasonably conservative and prudent assumptions, and unless there are unexpected or unforeseen developments, the proposed Capital Spending and Financing Plan is unlikely to impair the financial status of NYU.

Some Working Group members arrived at the interim recommendation in support of construction on the South Block with ambivalence, believing that although construction on the South Block is the only feasible solution to meet the University’s current space needs, it is not ideal.

Following publication of the Interim Report, the Working Group held two more town hall meetings in September 2013 and continued to welcome and receive comments via its website. Members of the Working Group also met with faculty in six schools (the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service; the Gallatin School of Individualized Study; the Faculty of Arts and Science; the Leonard N. Stern School of Business; the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development; and Tisch School of the Arts). The Working Group’s chair and subcommittee chairs made presentations and addressed questions from the University Senate, the Faculty Senators Council, the Student Senators Council, the University Leadership Team, and the Board of Trustees at forums in 2013 to which they were invited. The Working Group also responded in writing to more than 25 comments via its website. In November 2013, the Working Group circulated the document to Working Group members. The Working Group was already aware of the FASP document, which had been posted on the Working Group’s website. Over the course of the next few months, FASP declined invitations to meet with the Working Group to discuss “Room for Everyone.”

4 In spring 2012, a group of NYU faculty created a group known as Faculty Against the Sexton Plan (“FASP”) and circulated a document entitled “Room for Everyone: NYU Faculty’s Green Alternative to 2031.” Representatives of FASP appeared at the Working Group’s first meeting in October 2012 and asked to
responded in writing to more than 20 questions from the Faculty Senators Council. The Working Group is grateful to all who took the time to review the documents or offer comments either in person or in writing. (See appendix for a full list of the Working Group’s consultations.)

The Core: A Precious, Irreplaceable, and Contested Asset

NYU’s main campus in New York City is condensed into a few blocks around Washington Square Park, with satellite buildings and nodes of activity in Brooklyn, Midtown, the Upper East Side, the Financial District, and the so-called health corridor along the East River. NYU is thus a large university without a clearly defined campus.

The area around Washington Square, which includes the two Superblocks, is at once the heart of NYU, the closest thing to a campus for a university without a campus, and an integral piece of a dense and historically rich New York City neighborhood. It constitutes what the Working Group refers to as “the Core.” The Core is where the vast majority of undergraduate teaching and associated student activities take place, where approximately 2,600 NYU students live in dormitories, where nearly all of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in University housing live, and where most of the University’s academic departments and research laboratories for the sciences are located.

For students and faculty alike, proximity to the Core is a precious and irreplaceable asset. The density of urban life is mirrored in the density of University life: the proximity of home and work and the chance interactions of neighborhood life give NYU much of its personality. If students and faculty were widely dispersed across the city, rather than concentrated in the Core, NYU would be a very different kind of academic community. The Working Group believes that NYU should continue to concentrate its academic activities within the Core to the greatest extent possible.

Precisely because the Core is such a precious and irreplaceable asset located within a richly historical and still vibrant urban neighborhood, its use, and the proposed development of the Superblocks in particular, has become the flashpoint for an expansive, often heated debate involving every constituency of the University, as well as NYU’s community neighbors.

Over the course of its deliberations, the Working Group heard a great deal of interest expressed about the Core—its current state and future uses—including, but not limited to, the following:

- Many schools and academic units at NYU raised concerns about space compression, including inadequate office space and research space for faculty, a shortage of general-purpose classrooms especially during peak hours Monday through Thursday, and an undersupply of specialized spaces to support academic programs in the performing arts.

- Students said that they want the Core to contain as many University academic activities and residential services as possible and highlighted the potential positive student-life outcomes resulting from undergraduate student proximity to the Core.

- Faculty who live in the Core, and especially those who live on the Superblocks, want to ensure that their quality of life is not impaired, raising concerns, first, about the risks and ever-present nuisances of construction and, second, about the prospect of greater density on the Superblocks.

A Statement of Principle

Even as it became apparent that across the University community there was broad consensus on the need for more academic space, it was also evident that the Working Group’s recommendations—no matter how carefully crafted—would be unable to meet the needs of every constituency or satisfy every concern. Members of the Working Group itself reflected the divergence of views and interests on everything from the merits of building on the Superblocks as opposed to elsewhere in the city, to the scope, scale, and cost of the project.

To balance divergence of views and steer the Working Group’s fact-finding and recommendations, the Working Group settled on four guiding principles.

1. The University has an obligation to its students to provide adequate space for their educational purposes, including their interactions with faculty and staff.
2. The University has an obligation to advance improvements on the Superblocks, which directly affect NYU residents, community residents, the neighborhood, faculty, and students.
3. Any construction project should leave the neighborhood a better place in which to live.
4. The University’s proposed Capital Spending and Financing Plan should be fiscally responsible, and the process of planning and budgeting should be transparent.
• Some faculty and administrators expressed concern that without new housing in the Core, recruitment of new faculty will stall, while other faculty worry that construction in the Core will jeopardize retention and recruitment.
• Some faculty tenants on the Superblocks have also expressed concern about living next to an undergraduate student residence hall because they prefer not to mix their personal lives with their professional lives.
• NYU’s community neighbors, among others, raised concerns about preserving the character of the Village.
• A range of University constituents worry about the financial implications of a major capital undertaking.
• Students, faculty, and community members have ongoing questions about the fate of the Coles Sports Center and what interim accommodations will be available during a period of construction.
• Nearly everyone has concerns about green and public spaces, especially in relation to ongoing discussions about stewardship on the Superblocks.

Alternatives to Construction on the South Block
The Working Group came to a consensus regarding construction on the South Block after many months of fact-finding, as well as careful consideration of the full array of alternatives, both as it understood them and as presented to it by members of the community.

Here are highlighted four potential alternatives to any construction on the Superblocks.5

1. Reduce the Size of the University
While acknowledging the need for more space to address current academic needs, some members of the University community encouraged the Working Group to consider a reduction in the size of the student population as the best way to address the problem. Faculty members, in particular, were likely to express the view that if NYU chose to become a smaller, more selective University, the need for new construction would be reduced or eliminated entirely. In making this claim, some faculty raised specific quantitative and qualitative concerns over the expansion of the undergraduate student population over the last two decades.

The Working Group concluded that a recommendation to reduce the size of the University went far beyond its charge, reasoning that such a recommendation would constitute a fundamental alteration of the University, the kind of strategic reorientation that should only be consid-

5 Enrollment projections provided to the Finance Subcommittee by Executive Vice President Martin Dorph on April 29, 2013.

6 Zoning and landmarking restrictions affecting how properties may be used or built in the Core reduce considerably the University's flexibility. The Superblocks are located immediately adjacent to three historic districts: the NoHo Historic District, located east of Mercer Street; the South Village Historic District, located west of La Guardia Place; and the SoHo Cast-Iron Historic District, located south of West Houston Street. The Greenwich Village Historic District is located north of West Fourth Street and incorporates Washington Square Park and areas to the north and west of the park. Historic districts limit development opportunities in these areas. In most cases, the existing building must remain, limiting development to mainly gut rehabilitations of old buildings (for example, 383 Lafayette’s exterior facade must remain). In addition, zoning restrictions ex-
Both buildings would require extensive renovations, and even together they would not satisfy the unmet needs for space identified by the Working Group.

If new purchase opportunities emerge, the Working Group believes that they should be carefully evaluated in terms of location, permitted use, purchase price, and renovation cost. The benefit and cost of any other building or site in or near the Core has to be weighed against the benefit and cost of building on the Coles Site.

At current rates, the purchase price of a site similar in size and location to the Coles Site—if one could be found—would be roughly $600 million, a price that does not include the cost of any build out to accommodate NYU’s specific needs for space. Building on land the University already owns is substantially cheaper than purchasing and renovating real estate for sale in the neighborhood or elsewhere in the city.

3. Construction in Other Neighborhoods
Some faculty suggested that the Working Group recommend the construction of new space outside the Core, with Community District 1—the Financial District—and Brooklyn mentioned most often. In the fall of 2012, the Faculty Against the Sexton Plan (FASP) suggested that option rather than building in the Core:

> Students and faculty should use sustainable local transport to travel to class from their dorms and residential accommodation...For example, a 15-minute walk (at 3 mph), a 15-minute bike ride (at 10 mph), or a 15-minute trolley ride (avg. 20 mph with traffic) would allow students and faculty to travel easily in a radius of between ¼ mile and 1½ miles from their residences to the key nodes in NYU’s local university network. A 25-minute subway ride would allow students to travel between the “core” and the satellite campus in Brooklyn.9

The Working Group believes that the most important consideration in relation to academic space—especially for undergraduate students—is travel time between classes, not the daily commute from home to class. NYU’s current undergraduate class schedule allows for 15 minutes between classes, which means the suggestion of 15 minutes of travel time between classes—whether by foot, bike, trolley, or subway—is impractical, since it doesn’t leave any margin of error or account for the extra minutes it takes to enter and leave buildings, secure a bicycle, or gain access to public transportation, and then get into the classroom via elevator and stairs. To put this into some perspective: the distance from Washington Square Park to Union Square is roughly one-half mile and at least a 10-minute walk. Given the 15-minute gap between classes, even that distance poses difficulties.

If the Working Group recommended purchasing an existing building in the Financial District to provide for new academic space, students would be unable to take back-to-back classes between the Core and the satellite location. Granted, not all students take back-to-back classes every semester, but enough do so to make such a proposal undesirable. A satellite site makes more sense if it was designed to function primarily on its own, as was the case when the Stern Graduate School was located in the Financial District until the early 1990s, and as continues to be the case with the Institute of Fine Arts.

Leaving aside the financial implications of purchasing and renovating an existing building, the Working Group does not believe that a satellite site would satisfy the current needs of NYU’s various undergraduate programs, especially as the University now encourages more cross-school and cross-departmental coordination. The Working Group is committed to the view that greater density in the Core serves the University’s academic plan and academic mission.

4. Repurposing of Administrative Space Near the Core
Buildings in the Core include a number of administrative offices that could be repurposed into classroom spaces and other priority academic uses, assuming that suitable and affordable space can be found elsewhere for the administrative service, whether in owned or leased buildings. As it turns out, the University has adopted this strategy over the past decade, with offices such as Human Resources, Controller, Accounting, Bursar, Internal Audit, Treasurer, Registrar, Purchasing, Insurance, and Investment all moved away from buildings in the Core to free up space for academic uses.10

Table 1 provides a summary of available space in buildings in or near the Core. The total space available from administrative relocation is 134,000 GSF, while another 45,000 GSF is available if NYU chose to undertake the process of exercising expansion rights at 25 West Fourth and 383 Lafayette. But of this total, only the building at 25 West

---

9 Faculty Against the Sexton Plan, “Room for Everyone: NYU Faculty’s Green Alternative to 2031,” 5.

10 Accounting/Controller’s Office, Bursar, Internal Audit, Treasurer, Purchasing, Registrar, Human Resources, Insurance, and the Program Services Office have moved to East 17th Street. The Investment Office has moved to East 15th Street.
Fourth Street could be used for general-purpose classrooms, given zoning restrictions in the case of 20 Cooper Square and 726-730 Broadway. Of the larger buildings now available or coming available, 383 Lafayette cannot be used for general-purpose classrooms and does not have the footprint suitable for a large performance space; this option has been extensively reviewed by Tisch and was determined to be infeasible. The Forbes building, at Fifth Avenue and 12th Street, is slated to provide department space for the Global Institute of Public Health and the Marron Institute on Cities and the Urban Environment. It may also be used to provide space for academic departments or schools currently housed in leased space, such as the FAS Department of Sociology or Wagner, both located in the Puck Building.

The Working Group encourages the University to continue its effort to increase the overall percentage of academic-related activities in the Core by relocating administrative services wherever possible. Taken as a whole, however, even the additional space thus created does not fully address the current needs identified by the Working Group.

---

**Explanatory Note: Understanding Gross Square Feet vs. Assignable Square Feet**

In many of the tables, classroom and other space is stated in Assignable Square Feet (ASF). ASF is the measure used to express an activity’s functional space needs; ASF most typically represents the interior square areas of rooms.

GSF is inclusive of ASF and all nonassignable spaces that include corridors, bathrooms, closets, mechanical rooms, stairwells, elevator banks, and interior wall thicknesses.

In planning new construction or new space acquisition, Gross Square Footage (GSF) is used. The general planning parameter used by the University is that \( \text{ASF} \times 2 = \text{GSF} \).

Given that the zoning envelope is calculated in GSF, we have used GSF wherever possible.
Detailed Findings and Recommendations

I. Space

Main Recommendation on Space
The Working Group recommends that the Coles Site on the South Block should include the following uses and allocations in terms of GSF. Descriptions of each category appear in the sections that follow.

Table 2.
Recommended Allocation of Space for Coles Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Purpose</th>
<th>Gross Square Feet (GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic Space:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General-purpose Classrooms</td>
<td>132,000–214,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Space for the Performing Arts</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Study &amp; Student Life Space</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Space Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td><strong>367,000–449,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sports Center &amp; Emergency Community Facility</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Housing</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Faculty Housing</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gross Square Footage:</strong></td>
<td><strong>817,000–899,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Working Group believes that teaching and study spaces should be given the highest priority for construction on the South Block to meet existing academic requirements and to sustain the academic momentum of NYU. The Working Group’s recommendation is that classroom and related teaching and study spaces should comprise close to 50% of the new construction on the Coles Site, at a minimum of 367,000 GSF.

The Working Group’s overall recommendation for the allocation of space on the South Block can be compared with previous University-generated illustrations of use, such as the one contained in NYU’s Core Project Final Environmental Impact Statement of May 2012 (see Table 3).

According to Table 3, which was illustrative rather than definitive of future use, the University proposed to add the majority of new academic space on the North Block, with close to 50% of the total, or 484,000 GSF, below grade. The “Zipper Building,” which the Working Group refers to as the “Coles Site,” was slated to house 135,000 GSF of academic space, while the “Bleecker Building” (i.e., the Morton Williams Site) was to add an additional 38,000 GSF for academic purposes.

The Working Group’s recommendation shifts the emphasis to meeting the University’s need for academic space at the Coles Site on from the North Block to the South Block, taking into account the urgency of NYU’s space needs and the fact that the city’s July 2012 approval of the Core project does not permit construction on the North Block until 2022 at the earliest. (And, of course, the City Council’s decision eliminated the possibility of a hotel and a commercial overlay.) The Working Group’s recommendation also highlights academic space for the performing arts as a stand-alone category and identifies student study and meeting spaces as priorities. In terms of residential use, the Working Group recommends more square footage for faculty housing and less for student housing than the University’s illustration.

The other notable difference between the Working Group’s recommendation and the NYU Core plan is the manner in which the Working Group classifies space. For example, the Working Group distinguishes between classroom and other teaching space, academic department space, student study space, and research space. Furthermore, the Working Group considers studio, production, and performance spaces as academic space given their role in delivering the curriculum for the performing and applied arts.

The Working Group’s complete classification of spaces for the Core campus is as follows:

- General-purpose classrooms
- Academic space for the performing arts, including theaters, production workspaces, design studios, practice and rehearsal rooms, faculty and staff offices, and storage
- Student study and student life space
- Academic department space, including faculty offices
- Research space, including labs
- Recreational and athletic space
- Student housing
- Faculty housing
- Administrative space

---

12 It is the Working Group’s assumption that space needed for maintenance and/or building utilities and services is included within the total GSF ranges recommended for each category classified in the report. Some variations in the final square footage allocations are to be expected once architectural plans are rendered.

13 This is not a complete list of space at NYU. For example, it doesn’t include maintenance and utility spaces.
Table 3.
Illustrative Program for New Development in the Proposed Development Area in Estimated Gross Square Feet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use (GSF)</th>
<th>Zipper Building</th>
<th>Bleecker Building</th>
<th>North Block Below Grade</th>
<th>Mercer Building</th>
<th>LaGuardia Building</th>
<th>Washington Square Village Apartments</th>
<th>TOTAL (GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>484,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>4,583</td>
<td>1,071,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing (Dormitory)</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>370,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Housing</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Center</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,312</td>
<td>64,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/Conference Space</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School (PS/IS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Parking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical/Service Areas</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,814</td>
<td>376,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GSF</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,050,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>228,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>770,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>250,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>160,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,709</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,474,709</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.
Washington Square General-purpose Classroom Utilization Rates, Fall 2013 (Monday-Thursday)
(Data provided by Vice Provost Joe Juliano)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Auditoriums</th>
<th>Seminar Rooms</th>
<th>Regular Classrooms - Fixed Seats</th>
<th>Regular Classrooms - Moveable Seats</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00–9:15 AM</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30–10:45 AM</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM–12:15 PM</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30–1:45 PM</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00–3:15 PM</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30–4:45 PM</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:55–6:10 PM</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:20–11:00 PM</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Utilization during Prime Period</strong></td>
<td><strong>91.24%</strong></td>
<td><strong>93.04%</strong></td>
<td><strong>93.94%</strong></td>
<td><strong>93.52%</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.84%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Feet</td>
<td>31,194</td>
<td>13,470</td>
<td>5,188</td>
<td>58,042</td>
<td>3,167</td>
<td>111,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Rooms</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (number of students)</td>
<td>3,785</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>3,406</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>8,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room Distribution Percentage</td>
<td>10.59%</td>
<td>17.06%</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
<td>66.47%</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Avg. Utilization Rate</td>
<td>9.66%</td>
<td>15.87%</td>
<td>3.32%</td>
<td>62.16%</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Black box denotes prime scheduling period.*
Classroom and Teaching Spaces

General-Purpose Classroom Inventory and Utilization Rates

Across the University community, there is widespread agreement that a shortage of general-purpose classroom space exists, which affects the scheduling of classes and the addition of new courses. All standard measures and anecdotal evidence point to the same conclusion: NYU does not have an adequate supply of teaching spaces. The data on utilization rates reveal part of the picture (see Table 4).

Table 4 shows the fall 2013 utilization rates for NYU’s general-purpose classrooms Monday through Thursday. Average utilization rates between 9:30 am–4:45 pm run over 90%. By comparison, the norm for state colleges and universities with published standards is approximately 65%, while rates at comparable private colleges and universities run between 40-60%. Friday’s utilization rates are notably lower, though more so for the afternoon than morning hours. (See discussion on page 24.)

The pressure on the current stock of general-purpose classrooms is principally a function of an increase in the undergraduate student body over the past 10 years, from about 15,000 to 22,000 students. During that same period, the number of general-purpose classrooms has remained virtually unchanged at 170. New classroom facilities in the lower level of the Elmer Holmes Bobst Library and in the Global Center for Academic and Spiritual Life (GCASL) replaced classrooms that were taken out of service on the 7th and 8th floors of the Silver Center. The change was made for two reasons: to promote science development in the only large footprint building that could efficiently accommodate research labs and to reduce heavy student traffic on elevators and stairways.

The current inventory of general-purpose classrooms by building appears in Table 5.

Proprietary Spaces

Some “classrooms” may not appear in Table 5 because they are not considered general-purpose classrooms; selected schools and institutes also have their own proprietary classroom/meeting spaces (Stern and the School of Law especially), and some schools lease space for specific needs (Tisch and Steinhardt, for example). Of greater concern, given the current shortage of such classrooms, is that many classes are scheduled in departmental conference and meeting rooms. The Registrar’s Office has identified 131 departmental spaces currently used as classrooms. Most of these rooms accommodate small, seminar-style classes, with recent data showing that 477 hours of under-

Table 5.
Summary of General-purpose Classroom Inventory by Building and Category
(Data provided by Vice Provost Joe Juliano on December 1, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Address</th>
<th>Auditorium</th>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Seminar Room</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASF Seats</td>
<td>Seats</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>ASF Seats</td>
<td>Seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 East 12th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,949</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Waverly Place</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 University Place</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 West 4th Street</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194 Mercer Street</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,724</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 West 4th Street</td>
<td>8,198</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Washington Place</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobst Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantor Film Center</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Center</td>
<td>2,979</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,776</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goddard Hall</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer Building</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Center</td>
<td>7,911</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12,781</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisch Hall</td>
<td>3,736</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverly Building</td>
<td>7,184</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>31,194</td>
<td>2,947</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63,230</td>
<td>3,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
graduate instruction and 397 hours of graduate instruction were scheduled in noninstructional proprietary spaces.

Some larger spaces serve dual purposes: the theater in the Skirball Center for the Performing Arts has been used as a lecture hall, despite the fact that it was designed for a different purpose and its seats are not fitted with desk attachments; the Frederick Loewe Theatre serves as a venue for a daytime lecture class and evening performances, meaning that students often have to negotiate lighting boards and staging equipment during the course of the semester. While these proprietary and theater spaces relieve some of the demand for general-purpose classrooms, use of these spaces for their original purposes (e.g., large-scale events or day-to-day department business) is compromised.

Leased Classrooms
Of the 170 general-purpose classrooms, 17 rooms (572 seats/8,790 ASF) located at 194 Mercer Street are leased rather than owned by the University. Over the last decade, rooms in the Kimmel Center for University Life and Global Center for Academic and Spiritual Life (GCASL) also have been used as overflow classroom space.

Poorly Located Classrooms
Leaving aside design considerations, 43 NYU classrooms are located above the third floor in older buildings where elevator service is hardly sufficient, causing lengthy wait times. Over the past four years, NYU has worked to replace upper-floor classrooms with department space and research labs, work that addresses a shortage of research space for the sciences in particular. The 8th floor of Silver has been redesigned for science labs, with the 7th floor of Silver to follow. New classrooms in the GCASL and the Lower Level of Bobst Library were brought on line to replace the classrooms on the 7th and 8th floors of Silver. Of the current general-purpose classroom inventory, poorly located classrooms still comprise 23% of the total space (25,295 ASF out of 111,061 ASF).

Calculating New Classroom and Teaching Space
In calculating the overall need for new classrooms and teaching spaces, the Working Group, with the aid of data generated by the University’s Space Planning Working Group (cochaired by Alison Leary, Executive Vice President, Operations, and Joe Juliano, Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor, Strategic Planning) modeled options based on the following criteria:

1. Reduction of utilization rate for general-purpose classrooms
2. Reduction in use of proprietary spaces
3. Reduction in use of leased space
4. Reduction in poorly located space, including those located above the third floor in older buildings with elevator access

The Working Group is also enthusiastic about the prospect of building new, state-of-the-art classrooms that can be configured for greater flexibility in use. Many of NYU’s current classrooms are located in buildings with rigid interior columns that obstruct sight lines, have immovable seating, or are otherwise shaped or sized so as to make it difficult to repurpose them in response to pedagogical needs and enrollment changes. Newly designed classrooms offer NYU the opportunity to improve substantially the quality of instructional space and also to design more flexible space that can be adjusted from year to year to accommodate different enrollment maximums and seating configurations.

The recommendation for a minimum increase of 132,000 GSF and a maximum increase of 214,000 GSF is based on modeling that accounts for variations in how the University addresses utilization rates, proprietary classrooms, and classroom flexibility. The summary appears in Table 6.

Table 6.
Summary of Modeled General-purpose Classroom Needs by Estimated Assignable Square Feet
(Data provided by Vice Provost Joe Juliano)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly located</td>
<td>25,295</td>
<td>25,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased classrooms</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>8,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal ASF</td>
<td>34,085</td>
<td>34,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary use</td>
<td>6,032</td>
<td>24,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization rate reduction</td>
<td>22,327</td>
<td>32,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom flexibility</td>
<td>3,740</td>
<td>15,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal ASF</td>
<td>32,099</td>
<td>72,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ASF</td>
<td>66,184</td>
<td>106,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF:ASF (ratio)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GSF</td>
<td>132,368</td>
<td>213,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Not to be confused with the USPWG, the Space Planning Working Group (SPWG) is an advisory committee cochaired by the offices of the Provost and the Executive Vice President for Operations. The SPWG helps execute decisions on space priorities. For example, it undertakes the detailed planning for construction projects, working with designers, engineers, the Budget Office, and any relevant school to fine-tune space needs, identify and evaluate space options, assess design and construction parameters, establish timetables, and model cost estimates.
Table 6 assumes that all poorly located classrooms would be replaced, to be repurposed as other academic spaces, including research labs. Leased classrooms would also need to be replaced when leases expire. The Working Group's figures for proprietary space assume that half of all undergraduate classes in departmental space would be replaced with general-purpose classrooms for the minimum number (6,032 ASF) and assume for the maximum number (24,992 ASF) that all undergraduate and graduate courses would be removed from proprietary spaces. With respect to a reduction in the current utilization rate of over 90%, the minimum growth of 22,327 ASF allows the University to achieve an 80% utilization rate, while the maximum growth figure of 32,773 ASF assumes a utilization rate of 70%. Overall, the minimum figure would increase the general classroom inventory by 29% (32,099 ASF), while the maximum figure (72,905 ASF) would increase the general-purpose classroom inventory by 65%.
Turning GSF into Actual Classrooms
Classroom size varies by maximum seating capacity as well as the classroom’s design based on pedagogical preferences. Figure 2 provides an illustration.

As seen in Figure 2, a classroom designed to accommodate 20 students ranges from 350 ASF for a fixed-seat lecture room, to 600 ASF for a seminar room, to 750 ASF for a group-work room. Of all the classroom configurations, fixed-seating offers the most efficient use of space on a per-student basis, though the consensus opinion among faculty and students alike is that such classrooms are not always the ideal for teaching and learning.

Information from the University’s Space Planning Working Group provides a broader typology of classroom options for NYU (See Figure 3).

The Working Group’s recommendation for new classroom space is expressed in GSF as opposed to number of classrooms. The final decision on the exact distribution of classroom typologies should be made nearer the time of final design and construction.

As an illustration only, the minimum recommended 132,000 GSF could translate into the following:

- 5 120-seat lecture halls\(^{15}\) @ 4,800 GSF each
- 15 60-seat lecture rooms @ 2,400 GSF each
- 40 20-seat seminar rooms @ 1,200 GSF each
- 10 20-seat group work rooms @ 1,500 GSF each
- 10 12-seat seminar rooms @ 1,000 GSF each
- 80 new classrooms

133,000 total GSF

Extending the Schedule of Classes to Reduce Utilization Rates: Early Morning Classes and Fridays
In its assessment of the need for new classrooms, the Working Group also considered the possibility of increasing utilization rates at “off-peak” times and days, specifically the 8 am slot each weekday and all day on Fridays. The current utilization rate for 8 am is 30%, while the average utilization rate on Friday is 36% between 8 am and 4:45 pm (compared to an average of 80% utilization Monday through Thursday for the same time period).

Table 7.
Washington Square Adjusted 170 General-purpose Classroom Average Utilization Rates, Fall 2013*
(Data provided by Vice Provost Joe Juliano based on data during the week of September 23, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduling Modules</th>
<th>Audioriums (18)</th>
<th>Seminar Rooms (29)</th>
<th>Regular Classrooms - Fixed Seats (6)</th>
<th>Regular Classrooms - Moveable Seats (113)</th>
<th>PC Labs (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon-Thur</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Mon-Thur</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Mon-Thur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00–9:15 AM</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30–10:45 AM</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM–12:15 PM</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30–1:45 PM</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00–2:45 PM</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30–4:45 PM</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:55–6:10 PM</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:20–11:00 PM</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This data excludes scheduling use of ARC_LL01 - LL05, EDUC_176/303/306/307, UHAL_C02A, WEIN_SB20, & WEIN_SB35, which are spaces historically listed in the GPC inventory and have co-ownership.

Auditoriums = a space seating 75 or more
Seminar Rooms = a space with moveable chairs and tables, commonly used for seminar-based class sections
Regular Classrooms - Fixed Seats = a space seating 74 or less, with fixed seating
Regular Classrooms - Moveable Seats = a space seating 74 or less, with moveable tablet chairs and no tables
PC Labs = a space with fixed seating at computer stations, which have software suitable for a wide range of curricula

\(^{15}\) Lecture halls with a capacity for 120 students also require tiered or elevated seating. The GSF measurement does not account for ceiling height.
While the average utilization rate on Friday is significantly lower than Monday through Thursday, Table 7 shows that Friday classrooms are busy during peak hours (over 80% from 11 am to 1:45 pm, for example). The average lower utilization on Friday can be explained by lower usage rates in the afternoon and evening.

Increasing utilization of Friday—and especially Friday afternoons and evenings—would not address the current deficit of classroom space, alone or in combination with other strategies. One option would be to schedule more once-a-week classes, primarily on Friday afternoons. Thirty-two percent of all NYU classes now meet once a week, with roughly 1,250 hours of meeting time spread evenly across Monday through Thursday. Another 463 hours of once-a-week classes currently meet on Friday; to achieve better distribution, a large percentage of the Monday through Thursday solo classes could be shifted to Friday. The second option would be to change NYU’s basic undergraduate schedule from a two-day/75-minute grid to a three-day/50-minute grid and integrate more Fridays into the mix. At present, 44% of classes meet two days a week, 16% meet three times a week, and 6% meet four days a week. (Notably, of those classes that meet three or four days a week, Friday is not commonly among those days.) Neither option would generate the classroom space NYU needs.

One other option would be to make greater use of the 8 am slot: at 30% utilization, the 8 am slot yields 380 hours of classroom time. If 8 am could be scheduled at an 80% utilization rate, then 640 hours would be gained in the schedule (1,020 hours from 380 hours). Since each classroom provides 35 hours of course scheduling per week at the 80% utilization rate, the 640 hours gained would have the same effect as an additional 18 classrooms (640 hours gained/35 hours per week).

The Working Group is not convinced, however, that the combination of achieving higher utilization at 8 am and on Fridays would adequately address the need for more classroom space, and of course it would do nothing to address concerns about the suitability and quality of the current classroom inventory. Moreover, the Working Group would be hard-pressed to predict the success of such a significant change to NYU’s scheduling practice culture, especially shifting most one-hour classes to Friday afternoons and evenings, and making three-day-a-week classes the norm. At present, there are no institutional impediments to scheduling classes at 8 am or on Fridays, and yet in many departments and schools—notably those with large undergraduate programs in the liberal arts—these times are not commonly employed.

The Working Group nevertheless encourages that schools, departments, and faculty should schedule more classes at 8 am and on Fridays whenever possible. Future designation of these slots should be carefully monitored and be taken into consideration as plans develop to build new classroom space.

**General-Purpose Classrooms Recommendation**
Build between 132,000 and 214,000 GSF of general-purpose classrooms to accommodate a variety of pedagogical styles, ranging from large lecture halls to small seminar and group-work rooms.

**Academic Space for the Performing Arts**
NYU has an array of performing arts and theater-related departments in three schools—Tisch, Steinhardt, and Gallatin—distinguished in quality and notable in size. In the performing arts, studios and performance spaces serve as the classrooms. These are the laboratories for student and faculty creative research. The curriculum runs from the first rehearsal to the final, fully staged performance: workshop spaces, scene shops, design studios—all of these are teaching spaces integral to programs of study in the performing arts.

The discussion in the classroom section above takes account of general classroom spaces only. The Working Group’s findings found that utilization rates for certain studio, performance theatres, and production spaces to support teaching in the performing arts and music professions in particular are at or near capacity from early in the morning to late in the evenings, seven days a week. Of all the University’s current needs for academic space, none is more pressing than the need for new space to support NYU’s array of performing arts programs.

**Findings**

The performing arts departments at NYU have an outstanding reputation, but growth in these areas has resulted in academic space that is woefully inadequate to the needs of the students. Interviews with the deans, presentations, letters, and a review of data from previous attempts to secure space reveal needs that have reached a critical tipping point in the recruitment and retention of the top students, faculty, and staff.

Neither the undergraduate drama program at Tisch, the largest in America with nearly 1,300 students, nor the

---

16 Each time slot provides a maximum of 1,275 hours per day (1.5 hour time slots X 5 days/week x 170 classrooms).
Tisch graduate programs in acting and design for stage and film have ever—in the course of their five-decade existence—taught in spaces that were originally built in new construction to be purpose-built theaters or performance spaces. They do so in former banqueting halls, hat factories, and repurposed lounges and classrooms, without any dedicated workspaces for design.

The deficit of studio, classroom, and seminar rooms is a long-standing problem within Tisch, which has experienced remarkable growth of 300% in the student body over the past three decades. In 1983, the Institute of Performing Arts (IPA) had 500 students and 80,000 ASF of program space. In 2012, the IPA used 95,000 ASF of program space to service 2,050 students. The theaters are principally used as classrooms, and their secondary function is for performances of productions. As curricular needs regularly override the production needs, it is difficult to mount anything more than minimal productions in these spaces. In the undergraduate drama department, students, faculty, and staff spoke of the need for a large proscenium theater to accommodate large-scale productions, as well as design studios and light lab for design students that can also be used as a dedicated workspace. Currently, just one design lab, now filled to capacity with worktables, must also be used as a dressing room for performances, resulting in chaotic conditions.

Graduate acting and graduate design students in the IPA have no theaters available to them that were originally built as theaters. These two programs work together to create anywhere from 16 to 20 productions a year, often splitting a company of 16 student actors in two separate productions staged in retrofitted, inadequate spaces. However, these performance spaces are so close to one another—neither soundproofed nor designed to be theaters—that frequently productions must be scheduled on alternating nights or on a rotating schedule. To accommodate the production and design demands of these graduate programs, the departments need four dedicated flexible theaters/teaching stages (known as “black boxes” as opposed to proscenium theaters or auditoriums). Undergraduate and graduate departments need more production shops, with better ventilation and safety conditions, street access, and storage space.

Graduate design students have no dedicated workspace whatsoever, a basic fundamental requirement for every design and architecture program in the country. Currently, they work in two studios that must be cleared from time to time since they double as classrooms. Some students have pooled their own private resources to rent work space nearby. Some students build their projects at home and face the challenge of transporting them to campus.

The lack of teaching spaces in the Institute of Performing Arts is paralleled by a lack of office space. Some 87% of the total IPA faculty is without offices; 57% of the full-time IPA faculty have no offices, leaving them with no place to hold required student meetings. Over 200 adjunct faculty must share just two offices. New academic space for the performing arts includes office space for faculty and staff to provide supervision of curriculum and production.

An inventory list of potential appropriate performance, instructional, and community event spaces gathered in research conducted by the Tisch dean’s office for the solution to space needs over a 10-year period was shared with the subcommittee in interviews. The data reveals that alternate space is either not readily available or prohibitively expensive for rentals in the short and long terms. In 2012-2013, Tisch spent $1,096,252 in drama studio/theater and IPA storage rentals and $461,886 to lease space for the Clive Davis Institute of Recorded Music for a total of $1,158,138 per year to address their critical program needs. As lease rentals increase at roughly 3% annually, the 30-year cost of renting space will equal $77,408,729, which could be used to address purpose-built space and programmatic needs.

Interviews with the faculty and dean of Steinhardt revealed that the school was similarly in need of practice and recital spaces to support students in musical performance. Recital spaces in particular are in such short supply that Steinhardt students perform in classrooms that double as “concert spaces.” And, given that classroom space is overutilized, recitals are routinely scheduled at undesirable times. It is not uncommon for students preparing for their graduating concert to rent their own space in more professional venues such as the Greenwich House Music School on Barrow Street.

Steinhardt has only 25 rooms at substandard conditions for its 775 music majors, who need to practice on a daily basis. Those 25 rooms—scheduled for 13 hours a day, seven days a week—yield 2,275 practice hours per week, or less than a half hour a day per student. Adding 100 rooms would yield slightly more than two hours of practice time per day per student, which is still much less than

17 Dean Mary Schmidt Campbell’s presentation to the Working Group in November 2012 detailed TSOA’s decade-long search for a suitable site for full-scale instruction and performance space.

For more information, see University Space Priorities Working Group Final Report.
ideal for music majors. At an average 100 ASF per room, 100 practice rooms would require 10,000 ASF. Rehearsal spaces and recital spaces, especially for ensemble practice and performance, are generally larger in size, running from 375 to 900 ASF per room. Construction at the Coles Site can meet some, but not all, of the need identified for practice and recital rooms.

Just as in Tisch, performing arts students at the Steinhardt School are also in need of a large proscenium theater with an orchestra pit that can be covered for a stage thrust and that can accommodate state-of-the-art sound and projection capabilities for music, opera, and musical theater productions. Steinhardt currently leases large theaters such as the Skirball Center and Peter Jay Sharp Theater at Symphony Space for its large music concerts.

Skirball Center for the Performing Arts as an Alternative
The theater in the Skirball Center serves primarily as a presentation venue for short-term, outside productions, providing NYU and the broader community with a high-quality program of international and national work. However, Skirball is ill suited to meet the ongoing programming needs and pedagogical requirements of the performing arts. First, Skirball’s 850-seat house is too large for most student productions. Second, the dimensions are problematic: the stage lacks the minimum 75’-high fly space to elevate and lower sets (it measures only 40’ high), and the wing space is too narrow and too small for cast members, as well as for storage of props and scenery. The large columns at the front of the stage make set design difficult.

Why Should Academic Performing Arts Space Be in the Core?
Performance, studio, and production spaces need to be near the Core for several reasons: in the performance world, a host of disciplines—notably theater design, stage production, drama, dance, directing, musical performance, and teaching—are done collaboratively and involve hundreds of students. Moreover, undergraduate and graduate students are engaged in rehearsal and performance activities until midnight almost daily, while also taking their liberal arts courses in classrooms located in the Core.

Performing arts theaters and production spaces require a large footprint for well-designed, purpose-built construc-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Need</th>
<th>GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One large 500-seat proscenium theater</td>
<td>30,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four smaller 130-seat flexible “black box” theaters</td>
<td>44,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production workshops and storage spaces (Scenic, Costume, Prop, Electric/Sound Shops, and nonactive storage)</td>
<td>33,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated design studio workspaces and computer labs</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom/studio/seminar spaces and practice rooms</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and faculty offices for supervision</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GSF</strong></td>
<td><strong>195,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that these illustrations are for planning purposes and are not prescriptive to a future theater design process.

The Working Group hastens to add that its recommendations address the most acute academic space needs for the performing arts. Other needs would still need to be addressed, including more faculty office space, collaborative meeting space, replacement space for recording studios currently located in leased space, and ongoing needs for additional space for practice rooms and seminar space.

Performance Space Recommendations
1. Build a large proscenium theater, four flexible black box theaters, production workshops, storage, and specialized academic spaces for the performing arts, planned in consultation with theater architects and sound designers.
2. Design theatre and studio spaces for multiple uses and make them available across schools and to the neighboring community wherever possible.

18 This does not include the remaining 300 or so students in Music and Performing Arts Professions who require some practice studio time each week in order to fulfill degree requirements in programs that do not emphasize performance. There are 37 practice rooms located in Kimmel and the GCASL, shared across the University and used much of the time by nonmajors.
### Table 9.
Illustration of ASF Needs: Detailed Calculation for 500-seat Proscenium Theater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>ASF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Space &amp; Public Space:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage (45 ft. deep to include orchestra pit and cover for thrust stage, x 80 ft. wide and 80 ft. high; Proscenium 35 ft. wide x 25 ft. high)</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House (500-seat audience x 11 ASF per seat)</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Booth</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressing Rooms (2 chorus rooms (male/female) for 20 performers in each; 2 principals rooms (male/female) for 5 performers in each, at 40 ASF per person)</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Storage/Workspace (For costumes, props, and sets during production)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Space (audio rack room, lighting dimmer rack room, green room, etc.)</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lobby (500 audience members x 10 ASF per person; includes restrooms)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Office/Kiosk/Storage</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ASF</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GSF (ASF x 1.5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,150</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For comparison purposes, the Skirball Center with 860 seats is 21,250 ASF.

---

### Table 10.
Illustration of ASF Needs: Detailed Calculation for 130-Seat Flexible “Black Box” Theater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>ASF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Space:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater Room</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Booth</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressing Rooms (2 rooms (male/female) for 8 performers each, at 40 ASF per person)</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Storage/Workspace (For costumes, props, and sets during production)</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Space (audio rack room, lighting dimmer rack room, green room, etc.)</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal ASF</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,340</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal ASF x 4 Dedicated Theaters</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,360</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Space:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lobby (Shared lobby to accommodate 400 audience members x 10 ASF per person; includes public restrooms)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Office/Kiosk/Storage</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal ASF</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ASF</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,460</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GSF (ASF x 1.5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>44,190</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For theater spaces, the Working Group used a multiplier of 1.5 to convert ASF to GSF, since some elements normally included in GSF for most space types are instead included in the ASF for theaters, such as lobbies.
Student Study and Student Life Space

Findings
The Working Group finds that NYU needs more student study space. Bobst Library, with approximately 3,000 study seats, is incapable of meeting current demand.19 During the academic semesters, desks are fully occupied, and many students end up sitting on the floor in hallways or in corners to do their work. Even with an increase of just over 600 library seats since 2004, the occupancy rate has risen to over 80% as of spring 2011. (By comparison, the occupancy rate was 53% in spring 2006.) The benchmark standard for colleges and universities in the United States is that the number of study seats should be equivalent to 25% of the full-time student body. To meet that standard, the Division of Libraries estimates that NYU would need to double the current number of study seats. As an illustration, at 22 ASF (5.5’ x 4’) for each dedicated study space, 500 individualized study spaces would require 11,000 ASF.

The Working Group believes that the University should address this shortfall by ensuring that student study space is an integral component of new construction on the South Block and that, wherever possible, study space for students should be integrated into the renovation of existing NYU buildings.

The Working Group also believes that NYU needs more student life space, as well as space that could be used by commuter students, in particular. The Kimmel Center is filled to capacity, used day and night by departments for classroom, event, and conference space; by the University administration for meetings and events; and, on occasion, by non-NYU organizations for conferences and gatherings. In 2012, Kimmel hosted approximately 11,000 events.20 As well, four rooms in Kimmel serve as general-purpose classrooms during peak hours Monday-Thursday.

In addition, the Kimmel Center functions as the main student life building for student activities and organizations. Over 300 student organizations constantly vie for space in Kimmel. While the space is free for students, there are fees for technical support. Student leaders told the Working Group that their requests are sometimes “bumped” to accommodate paid events, and Kimmel Operations staff confirms that this sometimes happens. Given competing demands to service a variety of needs, Kimmel does not have enough space for student clubs and organizations, space that is needed to enhance the quality of life for students on campus.

NYU has more than 25,000 commuter and off-campus students. In interviews with the Working Group, commuter students emphasized the need for gathering and study space to suit their specific needs, since most are unable to go home between classes and there is limited space on campus for them to study, relax, or rest during off-times. While commuter students have access to one designated room in the Kimmel Center and also will soon have one room in Hayden Hall (a freshman residence hall), they cannot gain access to residence hall space, such as study, club, or gym space, because NYU policy only allows such use by residents in student housing.

Though the Working Group has combined student study space and student life space for the purpose of analysis, it is important to bear in mind that they are two distinct types of space. While spaces such as the Kimmel Center can be used as a makeshift study space, they are no substitute for quiet, dedicated study spaces, such as those in Bobst Library. The Working Group recognizes the need for both types of space.

Student Study and Student Life Space Recommendations
1. Build 40,000 GSF to provide new space for individualized student study and student life needs.
2. Include study space as an integral component in all new construction and renovation, planned in consultation with the Division of Libraries.
3. Expand space options for student meetings and functions, and improve accessibility to Kimmel by reducing its use as classroom space and by decreasing or eliminating support fees required for students’ use of Kimmel.

19 See Division of Libraries: Library-like Space Needs, March 20, 2013. Individualized study spaces come in many forms, including lounge seating, table seating, and carrels. Of these, table seating generally uses less ASF per person than carrel seating.

20 These data only reflect events that take place; Kimmel staff reported that currently there is no method to record requests that are turned away.
A New Space for Recreational and Athletic Uses and for Emergency Assembly

Findings
Now over 30 years old, the Coles Sports Center no longer satisfies the University's need for athletic training, fitness facilities, and both intramural and competitive sports. The current facility lacks air-conditioning and other basic amenities expected of a major university's sports and recreation center. The Palladium Athletic Facility located at Union Square, added in 2001, supplements some needs, but is not large enough to function as an adequate replacement. Together, the two facilities serve some 1,000,000 patron visits a year. About 1,250 undergraduates are members of NYU's intercollegiate athletic teams (NYU is a long-standing member of the NCAA Division III and the UAA—University Athletic Association), and over 9,000 students participate in intramural sports, the majority of which take place in Coles. In addition, more than 1,000 faculty members, 650 administrators, and some 700 Community Board #2 residents are dues-paying members of Coles. Given this extraordinarily high rate of usage and the importance of exercise and fitness in the lives of the community, the Working Group believes that the University needs a high-quality, modern sports center within the Core.

The Working Group is fully aware that the temporary loss of the current Coles Sports Center is a significant inconvenience for its members and regular users. The University should make every effort to find appropriate replacement facilities during construction.

In the days following Superstorm Sandy, the University was able to provide some assembly and shelter space for its students, staff, and faculty and limited, but appreciated, electricity and power stations for the community. The Working Group believes that NYU should extend its capacity to provide relief to the community by expressly designing a new gym facility as an assembly and emergency space, addressing an important need unmet by any building currently close to the Core or available to the vast number of residents on the Superblocks. While acknowledging that the University has an obligation first to the students in its care, the Working Group believes a new facility can provide the University with added capacity to accommodate our community and neighbors who may need cooling, heating, and access to electricity as well as other basic amenities for temporary emergency periods.

NYU's Cogeneration Plant, an independent energy system located below-grade at Mercer Street between West Third and West Fourth Streets, provides electricity and hot water to over 50 NYU buildings in the Core. The system significantly reduces CO₂ emissions and reduces energy costs. It proved a reliable source of energy during Superstorm Sandy.

This new facility could also serve as another venue for University events such as convocations and Commencement ceremonies (sorely needed given the fact that all of our schools now hold individual graduation events and face fierce competition and expense for appropriate rental space in New York City).

Recreational, Athletic, and Emergency Assembly Space Recommendations
1. Build a new recreational and athletic facility to serve NYU's competitive athletic and intramural teams, fitness and training classes, and recreational patrons and designed to UAA/NCAA specifications.
2. Design the new facility with the capacity to provide emergency assembly space for NYU and community neighbors.
3. Make available appropriate replacement athletic and recreational facilities during construction on the Coles Site.

21 The supply of energy from NYU’s Cogeneration Plant can be channeled to specific buildings on the network, as needed. During Superstorm Sandy, energy needs in classroom and office buildings were reduced so that buildings such as Bobst Library and the Kimmel Center could provide relief and shelter. In general, the Working Group supports any effort to reduce reliance on nonrenewable sources of energy. The University has confirmed its commitment to utilizing environmentally friendly and redundant energy sources to meet the thermal and electrical energy needs of the new building. Options for meeting the new building’s energy needs include the possibility of increasing the capacity of the University's existing cogeneration plant, construction of a new plant, and/or employing new technologies.
Science Laboratories

Findings
Science laboratories are in critically short supply. The only new dedicated science building NYU has added in the last 30 years is the genomics building (Center for Genomics and Systems Biology), located on Waverly Place. Current University planning calls for the dedication of 730 Broadway as new science space, which will require the relocation of some administrative offices, and the conversion of the upper floors of the Silver Center into science labs. As discussed in the classroom analysis, renovations in Silver will displace some classrooms and further increase the need for new ones. Based on these plans, there is no need for the construction of science labs on the South Block. That said, while continued backfilling of existing buildings is a reasonable incremental strategy, it is difficult to be either ambitious or efficient given the constraints of facilities built decades ago for other purposes.

Space for the Sciences Recommendation
The University should be alert for any opportunity to acquire a suitable site for de novo science lab construction somewhere in or near the Core and develop plans for a new flagship science building on such a site, to focus particularly on undergraduate science education.

Housing for Undergraduates in the Core

Findings
The transformation of NYU from a commuter school to a world-class university has been accompanied by a significant increase in the number of students housed in residence.

As of September 2013, NYU residence halls for the Washington Square campus accommodated 10,797 students. While that number comprises students at all levels of study, in the main the residential experience at NYU is a freshman experience. Freshmen comprise 42% of all residential students; 91% of the entire freshman class (4,523 students) participates in the residential experience in halls designated and programmed specifically for students making the transition to college. Those halls range from Third Avenue North (75 Third Avenue), which accommodates 928 freshmen within a range of room types in apartment-style units, to Goddard Hall, which operates on a residential college model with a capacity of 209 in a variety of room configurations. Notably, the most commonly requested residence halls for incoming freshmen are those closest to Washington Square, with 40% of all incoming freshmen requesting Hayden Hall, located on the west side of Washington Square.

Over the past decade, NYU has followed a national trend to integrate student services and academic programming into residential life. The freshman residential experience is one of the few common core experiences for each of NYU’s entering classes. It is now supported by some 50 faculty affiliates, 8 writers in residence, as well as 25 faculty in residence, up from one such designated faculty member just 10 years ago.

The available evidence on student residential life, both at NYU and across the US, indicates that the transition to college life is improved when freshmen live in residence halls located close to the main campus that are modeled as residential colleges. Living in residence halls on or near campus, especially in the freshman year, improves retention, graduation rates, participation in extracurricular activities, and academic performance as measured by GPAs.

With its current inventory, NYU is able to guarantee housing to all admitted freshmen and to guarantee continued housing to all undergraduates who choose to stay in University housing. Graduate student housing, however, is limited, with just 451 beds currently available to NYU’s more than 21,000 graduate students. NYU’s current inventory runs at capacity for both undergraduate and graduate students each year, with the Housing Office frequently placing students in hotels at the start of each semester, until beds open up in dormitories.

Owned vs. Leased Space
Of the 10,797 beds for students, just less than 25% (2,658) are in leased buildings, the largest of which is Lafayette Hall (below Canal Street) with roughly 1,000 beds. Over the last 10 years, NYU has been able to move some of its student residence halls from leased buildings into build-

22 726-730 Broadway (345,000 square feet) was purchased in 2009 for $212 million. Before then, the University leased 195,000 square feet in the building. In 2018, the cost of the borrowing used to purchase this building will be less than the original lease costs projected for that year.

23 The residential college experience at Goddard builds community through an extensive suite of residential services and programming for students. The available evidence—both from the Office of Student Affairs and from students themselves—suggests that Goddard should serve as a model for future residence halls.

ings that it owns. Ownership has two advantages: the first is programmatic; the second is financial.

In terms of programming, leased spaces generally provide the University with fewer opportunities to design the residential halls in a way that best suits students. The landlord may not be amenable to all the renovations and services proposed by the University, and the University should think twice before undertaking expensive renovations in buildings it does not own. It is notable, for example, that of all the residence halls, Lafayette Hall routinely scores the lowest in student satisfaction, because of both its distance from the Core and the perceived lower quality of its facilities—it is a business-style apartment building rather than a specially designed residence hall with the typical student-friendly amenities and ambience. In general, ownership of residence halls is more likely to provide NYU students with the best possible residential experience.

If programming and quality-of-life considerations favor ownership over leasing, there are also financial advantages to consider. Over time, University-owned residence halls become a positive capital investment because once the debt incurred to purchase the property is repaid, there is a substantial increase in the net revenue on the residence hall, whereas lease payments continue in perpetuity and are subject to increase each year.

Given the Working Group’s mandate to scrutinize the financial aspects of the University’s capital plan, it explored the financial dimension of leased space in some detail.

NYU currently leases space for a number of uses: classrooms (194 Mercer Street), administrative services (194 Mercer and others), academic departments, institutes and research units (the Puck Building at 295 Lafayette Street—which houses the Wagner Graduate School of Public
Service and the Department of Sociology), and student residences (Lafayette Hall and Senior House on West 13th Street, for example).

The University’s current perspective is that academic-related uses and housing should be given priority in any effort to reduce reliance on leased space. In fact, over the past decade, the University has moved certain administrative services from owned to leased space to increase the density of academic activities in the Core (see Table 1). That process should continue, the Working Group believes, especially when it can satisfy academic objectives and offer financial savings.

As of 2013, the total amount of academic leased space in the Core is 200,000 GSF, with an average base rent of $34.36 per square foot. The total amount of student residence leased space is 745,313 GSF, at an average base rent of $46.82 per square foot. Table 11 provides further detail.

Recent Conversion of Leased to Owned Space and Future Modeling: Financial Savings

In 2007-2008, NYU took ownership of Gramercy Green and East 12th Street (now Founders Hall), replacing two leased properties, the Water Street and Cliff Street residence halls. Gramercy Green and Founders provide 1,710 beds, some 175 more than the two leased properties. Before the conversion, the total yearly cost for the leased beds was $30 million (and was subject to annual rent increases). Ownership reduced the annual cost to $28 million per year, with no annual increases. After 30 years the buildings will be owned outright and the buildings will generate a positive cash flow.25

The modeling for construction of a student residence on the Coles Site would yield savings as well. If 2020 is assumed to be the first year of occupancy, and borrowing costs are estimated at 6% (roughly 1.5% higher than they are currently), a bed in a newly constructed dormitory on the South Block would cost $17,880, while the average leased bed would cost $18,360 in the same year. Though the difference is modest in the first year, it is important to bear in mind that leases are subject to annual increases. Over the 30-year period, the net present value of borrowing vs. leasing would be over $60 million. Once the debt is paid off, the net cash flow for 500 beds is projected to be nearly $9 million per year.26

Of course, a similar scenario would apply to academic leased space. Shedding leases, especially given the opportunity to build on land that comes at no cost, is a financially prudent decision, regardless of the type of leased space.

The Working Group concludes that leased residential space has a higher priority for conversion and construction on the South Block than leased academic space, for a number of reasons. First, in terms of available space within the Core, the ongoing relocation of administrative services continues to yield modest space opportunities (some 100,000 square feet in total) more suited to academic uses than residential uses; second, conversion of residential space may yield higher financial savings, since its average cost is significantly higher per square foot (see Table 11).

Students Living in the Core

In overwhelming numbers, students express a preference for housing in the Core, and there is ample evidence that proximity to the Core enhances the freshman experience. The Working Group believes that new, University-owned residential facilities close to the Core are consistent with the principle that NYU should provide students with the best possible environment in which to excel in their academic pursuits, build meaningful relationships with one another, and develop a deep connection to the University. Housing freshman students as close to the center of campus as possible is the norm in universities across the United States. Of all the quality of life issues affecting students, none may be more important than the best possible residential experience.

At 300 GSF per student (the standard estimate for student housing), the Working Group's recommendation of 150,000 GSF for student housing would yield space for approximately 500 students on the South Block. Based on conversations with the Office of Residential Life and Student Services, the Working Group assumes that the final design would follow the residential college model of Goddard Hall, widely regarded as the most successful freshman housing option at NYU.

Student housing has the further advantage of being more fungible than faculty housing over the long term. Since students vacate the residential halls each year, at some point in the future the University could choose to convert residential halls into space for academic units or classrooms, for example.

---

25 NYU residence halls are used at capacity most of the year and generate significant added revenue during the summer months.

26 NYU does not have to build student residence halls on the South Block to benefit from tax-exempt bonds issued by either the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York (DASNY) or the New York Economic Development Corporation (NYEDC). Though its name suggests otherwise, the DASNY can sell bonds for any type of postsecondary construction, such as classrooms, faculty offices, or a sports center.
The Working Group's recommendation on student housing does not remedy the lack of University housing options for graduate students and postdoctoral researchers, which consists mostly of apartment-style studios in Washington Square Village, Stuyvesant Town, Alumni Hall, and the Palladium. The number of graduate student units in Washington Square Village has dropped from 500 to just over 100 in recent years, as more studios have been converted into two- and three-bedroom units for faculty with families to address the acute shortage of larger faculty apartments. Efforts to establish dedicated graduate student housing in Brooklyn have been unsuccessful, as students have preferred to find their own accommodations instead of using NYU housing far from campus. At present, there are 240 postdoctoral researchers at the Washington Square campus (FAS, Courant, and Steinhardt). Of these, 163 are housed in apartments held aside from the faculty housing stock—overwhelmingly studio apartments. While recognizing the clear benefits for freshman students in providing more residential halls in the Core, the Working Group also grappled with the impact of a new freshman dorm in such close proximity to the two faculty housing apartment buildings that comprise Silver Towers. In December 2013, the Silver Towers Tenants Association reported strong apprehension about creating a residential unit for students so close to faculty members and their families. It was a sentiment to which the Working Group

---

**Table 12.**

Faculty Housing Vacancies, February 2013

(Data provided by Assistant Vice President Karen Gulino; Response to follow-up inquiries regarding faculty housing.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Ready for Occupancy</th>
<th>Under Construction</th>
<th>Allocated, Not Yet Occupied</th>
<th>Held for Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Units:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Bedroom</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Bedroom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Bedroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacancy Rate:</strong></td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Premium Units:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Bedroom</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Bedroom</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Bedroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Bedroom</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacancy Rate:</strong></td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose for Hold</th>
<th>Number of Units Held</th>
<th>Percent of Held Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Purposes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean-level Recruits</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Conversion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated, Not Yet Occupied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

27 The Stern School of Business maintains four floors in the Palladium. The School of Law and School of Medicine operate their own student housing.

28 There is also recent evidence that a residence hall in the outer boroughs is not an attractive option to undergraduate students. During August 2013, the week before Welcome Week, 300 undergraduates whose housing requests could not be accommodated at any of NYU’s Manhattan residential halls were offered guaranteed housing at NYU Polytechnic’s Othmer Residence Hall in Brooklyn. The average price per semester of a double room at Othmer is about $2,000 less than the average price of a double room at NYU’s Manhattan residential halls. None of the students took the offer.
was already alert, in part because quite a few faculty members on the Working Group reside in Silver Towers and across the street in Washington Square Village. Few items generated more spirited discussion within the Working Group, and the final recommendation is an attempt to strike the appropriate balance. It became apparent that some of the faculty apprehension reflected uncertainty over the size of the student residence halls and specifically the number the students who would live on the South Block during the school year. In one of the University’s own estimates, the number ran to 1,000, roughly equivalent to Lafayette, the largest, leased freshman residence hall. The Working Group’s final recommendation would accommodate roughly 500 students. And though the Working Group has not ventured into the details of final design, its view is that entrances to student residence halls should be located on Mercer or Houston Streets, away from the two Silver Towers apartments and the open plaza they share.

Student Housing Recommendation

1. Build 150,000 GSF of student residence halls to accommodate up to 500 freshman students, designed to provide the best possible residential college experience, including integrated University programming to address the specific needs of freshmen.

2. Continue to make studio apartments available in faculty housing for doctoral students and postdoctoral scholars, especially those whose research requires them to be in laboratories and other specialized research spaces in or near the Core.

Housing for Faculty

Findings

Faculty housing is an essential strategic resource in NYU’s recruitment and retention of high-quality teachers, scholars, and practitioners. As of 2013, NYU maintained roughly 2,100 housing units for tenure and tenure-track faculty, community residents, visiting faculty, graduate students, postdoctorate fellows, retirees and surviving spouses, and administrators. Between 100 to 125 new faculty are housed each year. The annual vacancy rate hovers around 7%. Table 12 provides a detailed breakdown of the vacant units as of February 2013.

Given that units have to be refurbished from time to time, that new faculty are provided with a limited choice from among vacant units during the summer months, that studio apartments are held for possible retirees, and that some studios and one-bedroom apartments are combined to create larger units, the vacancy rate of 7% is reasonable.

Incoming tenure-track and tenured faculty largely occupy one- and two-bedroom apartments. A much smaller number of incoming faculty members are housed in three-bedroom apartments.

All the available evidence points to a serious shortage of two- and three-bedroom units. Long waiting lists are common, especially for current faculty with growing families.

29 In this section the Working Group only addresses the number of units, not their quality or upkeep.
There is no easy way to balance recruitment and retention with the current housing stock, especially if providing larger units to faculty with growing families is a priority.

Over the past decade, the University has addressed the shortage of larger units by

- combining two or more studios to form larger units;
- periodically offering home ownership loan programs as an alternative to University housing; and
- offering lifetime rights to retirement studios for eligible faculty who vacate larger units.

**Accommodating Family Needs**

Increased pressure on the existing stock of faculty housing has created significant inequities in the distribution of a limited resource and raises trenchant equity issues. While the University does not maintain data on family size, it is commonly understood that a good number of multibedroom units are occupied by long-serving faculty whose children or other dependents are no longer permanent residents. At the same time, far too many early- and mid-career faculty often spend years in apartments ill suited to their growing families.\(^{30}\) Underused space is indeed available, but the current system does not allow it to be effectively used by those who need it most. For example, there is no requirement that faculty move to smaller units when the number of permanent household residents declines.

Currently, faculty planning to retire who live in NYU housing are offered a studio apartment for life, so long as they own no other residential property. For faculty in larger apartments, this may not be much of an incentive to retire, especially when the monthly rental cost of the studio is not substantially less than the rent for their current unit.\(^{31}\)

The Working Group recommends that the University administration work with the faculty to identify mechanisms to encourage faculty in larger apartments to downsize to smaller units before retirement. Consideration should be given to lump sum payments, more significant reductions in monthly rental costs as inducements to move to smaller units, and a conversion program that includes one- and two-bedroom apartments, as well as studios.

**New Faculty Housing: Multiple Options**

No amount of voluntary reallocation is likely to address the shortfall of faculty housing, especially with respect to the larger units. The Working Group concludes that the University needs to take further steps to provide for faculty housing. Aside from reallocation of the existing housing stock, the Working Group has identified the following options:

- Mortgage or rental assistance programs for housing not owned by NYU.
- Shared equity programs to buy housing either currently owned or not owned by NYU.
- New construction.

**New Faculty Housing: Construction**

Estimating future need for faculty housing presents multiple challenges. The calculation requires an assessment of future faculty replacement and recruitment, as well as assumptions about future demand for housing in the Core, alongside the impact of new incentive plans for reallocation of units and possible new financing options for mortgage or rental assistance.

In Figure 4, the University’s most recent projection of net demand for faculty housing comes to the conclusion that roughly 300 units should be added over the next 20 years. The higher projected demand until 2020 includes pent-up demand by currently underhoused faculty as well as Global Network University (GNU) faculty visiting the New York campus.

Assuming that a two-bedroom apartment requires 1,100 square feet and a three-bedroom apartment requires 1,400 square feet, 150,000 GSF would be sufficient for 86 three-bedroom units (120,400 GSF) and 26 two-bedroom units (28,600 GSF), for example. As is the case with student housing, the opportunity to build on land already owned by the University is a significant incentive. Any alternative—the purchase of already existing units or the development of some alternative residential site—would be more expensive than construction on the South Block.\(^{32}\)

**Faculty Housing Recommendations**

1. Build 150,000 GSF of new faculty housing on the South Block, consisting primarily of larger units suitable for families.

---

30 The Working Group is aware of many examples of underhoused families, including one faculty member who had spent almost 10 years in a one-bedroom apartment with a family of four before recently moving to a two-bedroom unit.

31 The University has been raising base rents to higher levels while capping rent increases on currently occupied units. When a faculty member moves to a new unit–larger or smaller—the higher base rent is assessed. Thus, moving to a new apartment can involve little or no reduction in rent. This issue of rent increases requires more consideration.

32 Depending on building size, the cost for faculty housing construction is likely to be between $810-$877 per square foot. If the University were to build similar-sized units elsewhere in the city, the residential site cost would add at least $500 per square foot. See, Martin Dorph, Executive Vice President, Finance and Information Technology, “NYU Core Project: Student Housing and Faculty Housing,” October 2013.
2. Undertake an analysis of other options for faculty housing—such as mortgage assistance, rental assistance, and shared equity programs—in consultation with the faculty.

The Morton Williams Site

Findings
As a condition of New York City’s approval for the Superblock zoning envelope, the School Construction Authority (SCA) has until the end of 2014 to decide if it will partner with NYU to construct a building with up to 170,000 GSF of usable space at the corner of Bleecker Street and La Guardia Place on the site of the current Morton Williams supermarket. If the SCA chooses to move forward with construction on the Morton Williams Site, the SCA would use it for a K-8 school of up to 100,000 square feet, and NYU would have access to 70,000 square feet of below-grade space.

If the SCA does not exercise its option, then NYU has the city’s approval to build up to the same total density of 170,000 GSF, with the condition that not less than 25,000 GSF of the above-grade space be available for community use.

A fully owned and operated NYU building on the Morton Williams Site has the potential to accommodate some of NYU’s academic needs but because its total potential envelope is 145,000 GSF (170,000 minus 25,000 GSF for community use), the site cannot possibly accommodate the priority needs identified by the Working Group. The Working Group also notes that, compared to the Coles Site, the cost of construction per square foot would be higher at the Morton Williams Site, primarily because the economies of scale are less and because a greater percentage of construction would be below-grade.

Morton Williams Site Recommendation
Review possible plans for this site with the proposed Superblock Stewardship Committee, following the decision of the School Construction Authority, expected by the end of 2014.

II. Stewardship and Quality of Life

Background and Overview
The Working Group established the Stewardship and Quality of Life subcommittee to review issues related to how the possible construction of a building or buildings on the South Block would affect the lives of residents of the Superblocks. In addition, the subcommittee took into account how construction might affect the neighboring community and its residents, as well as the stress that ongoing construction might put on the University’s current system of operations and its ability to support such a large-scale project.

The Stewardship and Quality of Life Subcommittee is composed of five members, four of whom are longtime residents of Washington Square Village. As the subcommittee progressed through the first five months of meetings and deliberations, the definition of its task expanded: to research and inquire into NYU’s ability to be a responsible steward of the two Superblocks (and beyond), with or without any construction. Stewardship, in short, became the primary concern. A renewed commitment to stewardship was built primarily around the need to clarify and improve the University’s ongoing relationship with NYU residents and neighbors, as well as concerns about mitigating the effects of construction, environmental sustainability and enhancement, architectural design, and efficient and timely responses to construction issues.

The Working Group has encouraged the University to initiate some interim improvements (i.e., prior to a decision on South Block construction) to enhance the Superblocks, provided they are undertaken in consultation with residents. Since the Working Group first met in October of 2012, the University has completed an extensive restoration of the Sasaki Fountain (and improved signage in the garden), a restoration of the oak grove along Bleecker Street, and a first pass at demonstrations of noise-reducing windows in all Washington Square Village and Silver Towers apartments, along with other improvements. In addition, a renovated and expanded day-care program supervised by University Settlement (a non-NYU-affiliated nonprofit organization) has opened in 4 Washington Square Village, a new meeting space has been provided to the Washington Square Village Tenants Association, and Visiting Neighbors, which provides free services for seniors in Greenwich Village and the Lower East Side, has been given office space in 3 Washington Square Village. The University is to be commended for these improvements and the spirit in which they were undertaken; it is hoped they will continue to work with the recommended
Stewardship Committee and Superblock residents on other projects that still need attention.

Principles
NYU must place a priority on improving its stewardship of the Superblocks and its relationship to both the NYU and neighboring communities, now and in the future.

The Superblocks and the neighborhood surrounding them should be better places in which to live: better in terms of their physical environment and better in terms of the relationship between NYU and the community.

In light of the ULURP agreement to postpone construction on the North Block until 2022 at the very earliest, the Working Group concentrated its recommendation for construction on the South Block. However, because the nature of the construction of the South Block will involve extensive noise, traffic, and other disruptions to the Core, as well as demanding a great deal of attention from the University’s Division of Operations, the University must be diligent in managing the upkeep of and improvements to the North Block as well, independent of the timetable for possible construction there.

Findings
• The Superblocks have been a source of strain between NYU and the community for the past 50 years. There have clearly been difficulties on both sides. Members of the community see NYU as repeatedly breaking promises and ignoring community needs. For their part, some NYU administrators feel NYU cannot make even minor improvements without being attacked as destroying the neighborhood. Partly, this is a matter of some ineffective public relations. Partly, this is due to an intractable history, laden with misperceptions and suspicion.

• Several projects on both Superblocks have been stalled, either because of decisions not to prioritize renovation or to allocate funds or because of unresolved questions about the proper jurisdiction over the affected property. As an example, the sinkhole next to Coles Sports Center has remained unattended since the mid-1990s.

• Historically, unanimity over NYU building projects has been extremely difficult—if not impossible—to achieve.

• The chain of accountability within the Division of Operations is unclear, including those responsible for the maintenance and care of the buildings and open spaces on the Superblocks.

• The Division of Operations, in compliance with the Restrictive Declaration of July 2012, initiated a series of open houses and distributed informational material regarding ongoing mitigation for windows and air conditioners on both Superblocks in the spring of 2013, independent of the Core construction plans. Since then, the University has applied for a variance on the landmark status of Silver Towers; if approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission, these variances would allow for further options for noise and dust mitigation. Plans are currently under way to provide residents with another series of open houses that would address concerns if the Landmarks Preservation Commission approves the variance.

• The commercial strip on La Guardia Place, from West Third Street to Bleecker Street, which is owned and leased by the University, has lost three of its tenants within the last five years; as of 2014, these commercial spaces remain untenanted, unused, and dark.

• There is significant desire to ensure that the University can respond more efficiently to needs of the residents of the Superblocks, as well as residents of the neighborhood, in an emergency such as Superstorm Sandy.34

Stewardship and Quality of Life Recommendations

A Stewardship Committee
1. Establish a standing Superblock Stewardship Committee to provide the University with ongoing assessment and advice for the maintenance and improvement of quality-of-life issues concerning University properties on the Superblocks before, during, and after any construction.

   • Make all committee proceedings and related documents available for public review and ensure that the committee provides regular reports to the University.

   • Ensure that the committee is composed of faculty, including a significant number who reside on the Superblocks; a representative from each of the tenants associations; at least one student; and representatives from the University’s Division of Operations, Faculty Housing Office, and Community Relations Office. Ideally, the committee would

also work closely with the Housing and Benefits Committee of the Faculty Senators Council and any other relevant Senate-level committees.

- Create a special subcommittee to advise on construction, including the final allocation of space, architectural design, environmental sustainability, and use of public spaces.

Related to Improved Management and Stewardship of the Superblocks

2. Proceed immediately with suspended maintenance and improvement projects on both the South and North Blocks.35

3. Clarify the chain of responsibility within the Division of Operations and communicate it to residents of the Superblocks so that, before, during, and after construction, residents and neighbors know exactly which office and/or individual is responsible for their concern.

4. Keep the La Guardia commercial strip occupied, well lit, functional, and attractive. Explore the option to utilize the space for University needs, including the possibility of new classrooms, if commercial tenants cannot be found.

5. Identify and implement the best possible window, air-conditioning, and façade improvements on the Superblocks in consultation with residents, as soon as possible, with or without construction.

6. Continue efforts to ensure that Washington Square Village is provided with a reliable source of back-up electricity in emergency situations.

7. Increase the presence of the Office of Faculty Housing on the Superblocks to improve awareness of, and response to, ongoing quality-of-life and stewardship issues. All or part of the Office of Faculty Housing could be relocated to a space on the Superblocks, for example.

8. Set up a consistent policy for usage and maintenance of the public spaces on the Superblocks.

Related to Construction on the South Block

9. Engage an independent consultant with expertise in community impacts of construction projects before any construction begins to assess whether the procedures outlined in the Restrictive Declaration are adequate and to examine any construction plans for both short-term and long-term effects on the neighboring community. This consultant should report to the Superblock Stewardship Committee to ensure transparency in the process of choosing mitigation strategies and accountability on any environmental effects of construction.36

10. Set high standards for architectural and design excellence, and meet high environmental standards of sustainability. Demonstrate leadership and innovation in terms of design and sustainability by ensuring that University buildings enhance the neighborhood.

11. Provide high-quality mitigation measures for residents on the Superblock. Reserve relocation for those NYU residents and families with exceptional health or mobility needs, and ensure that the Superblocks remain ADA-compliant throughout any construction process.

12. Establish a "work-study center" away from the construction site for faculty who currently work at home and who have no other office options.

---

35 Projects that have been allowed to lapse, such as the Coles sinkhole, the rocket ship playground, the Mercer Street dog run, the green space behind the commercial strip on La Guardia Place, the pavement throughout WSV, and the broken and redundant fencing on both blocks, should be prioritized.

36 Such independent consultants are called "industrial hygienists" and can be accessed through OSHA, which routinely sets guidelines for their assessments. http://www.osha.gov/dte/library/industrial_hygiene/industrial_hygiene.pdf. Although the Restrictive Declaration for the Core project calls for a consultant, that consultant is hired by the city of New York and paid for by New York University.
III. Financing

Introduction
The Working Group’s consideration of the proposed financing of any additional construction related to the Core project was governed by the general principle that the construction and subsequent operation of any new building should be financially responsible and the process transparent.

The Working Group established a Finance Subcommittee to examine the consistency and reasonableness of the University’s financial assumptions and to inform recommendations for construction on the Coles Site. The data herein reflect a compilation of information provided by Martin Dorph, Executive Vice President for Finance and Information Technology, and include information on the University’s comprehensive Capital Spending and Financing Plan for the years 2013-2022. Most of the data were initially prepared in June 2012, to support discussion of the Core Project with the NYU Board of Trustees and others prior to the certification of the plan by the city of New York. However, the Working Group and its Finance Subcommittee made numerous requests for additional information and modeling, and all requested data and modeling were provided. The data were also updated in December 2013 from what was presented in the Working Group’s Interim Report.

Only a Coles Site building is included in the University’s overall Capital Spending and Financing Plan, which is consistent with the Working Group’s recommendation that the new construction to accommodate the needed additional new space be confined to the Coles Site. The Coles Site building, whether in its originally proposed version or in the proposal that is put forth in this document, represents just one component of the University’s overall Capital Spending and Financing Plan, which totals approximately $3 billion over 10 years. The Working Group recognizes, however, that the content of the building that it proposes for the Coles Site differs in both size and makeup from the original illustrations that were submitted as part of the ULURP. Specifically, the Working Group proposes a greater proportion of academic space than was originally conceived. In addition, the financial modeling for the original Coles Site building was undertaken with a 670,000 GSF building in mind—the remainder of the zoning envelope for that site was to be filled with a hotel, which was eliminated as a possibility in the ULURP.

The Working Group is confident that a building that is composed primarily of academic space that totals 817,000-899,000 GSF can be accommodated within the University’s capital spending framework. The additional annual debt-service costs for this larger building (instead of a building of 670,000 GSF) represent less than 1% of the University’s overall annual operating budget (or less than 0.5% if the Medical Center’s annual budget is included). This is coupled with the Working Group’s conclusion that the University has undertaken reasonably modest and prudent assumptions in modeling, especially in terms of construction contingencies and the projections of its annual operating margins.

The Working Group also examined the role of so-called “revenue-generating” space—student and faculty housing—on the decision to undertake construction and on the overall financial viability of the plan. The Working Group determined that any decision to include student and faculty housing in the proposed building on the Coles Site should be driven by the need for such spaces and not by a need for additional revenue. In addition, the actual ability of these spaces to generate revenue for the University following the repayment of the original debt depends on the University’s decisions regarding replacement and use of existing housing units. For instance, no new revenue will be generated if the University decides to take an equivalent number of existing student beds in leased buildings out of service and replace them with new housing on the South Block; the revenue generated for those beds will remain the same regardless of where they are located, although high-cost leases can thereby be shed.

Information Provided to the Working Group

Summary of Proposed Capital Spending and Financing Plan
1. NYU’s Capital Spending and Financing Plan for 2013-2022 involves $3.01 billion of spending. The details of the specific projects, their costs, and their additional square feet (which apply to new buildings, as compared to renovations of existing buildings) as projected in December 2013 are contained in Table 13.

2. The proposed $3.01 billion in projected capital spending for these 10 years is almost identical to the $2.95 billion on capital improvements that NYU spent in the preceding 10 years.
3. Of the buildings for which NYU received zoning approval from the city of New York on the South and North Blocks, only the Coles Site (with a cost of $727 million and GSF of 670,000) is listed in Table 13. Although the Coles Site is the largest by cost and by square footage of any single component of the Capital Spending and Financing Plan, its cost constitutes only 25% of the overall proposed capital spending for the 2013-2022 period.

4. The University proposes to finance the $3.01 billion in capital spending for 2013-2022 as follows:
   - Long-term borrowing: $1.45 billion.
   - Short-term borrowing that will be repaid before 2022: $360 million.
   - Fundraising: $136 million.
   - Drawdown of cash: $130 million.
   - Reinvestment of annual operating surpluses during the period: $933 million.

5. Although the plan calls for $136 million in capital fundraising for the period 2013-2022, for comparison, during the 10 years 2003-2012, NYU raised $159 million for capital purposes.

6. The $1.45 billion in borrowing will result in an increase of $105 million in annual debt service costs.

7. Budgeted surpluses during the 2013-2022 period are projected to total $1.33 billion, with $933 going toward capital spending (see Table 13).

8. Building on the Morton Williams Site on the South Block is not included in the 2013-2022 Capital Spending and Financing Plan. If the New York City School Construction Authority (SCA) exercises its option to partner with NYU and build a school on that site, NYU would be able to use the below-ground space of 70,000 GSF at an estimated cost to NYU of $91 million. If the SCA declines its option, NYU could construct a 170,000 GSF building on that site for its use at an estimated cost of $201 million, with a requirement that it dedicate 25,000 GSF in above-ground space for the community, which would allow up to 145,000 GSF for NYU’s use.

9. The information provided here is for South Block construction only. North Block construction, which could not begin before 2022 in any event, is not included in the Capital Spending and Financing Plan, and no financial information about these buildings was requested by or provided to the Finance Subcommittee.

**Assumptions Included in the Proposed Capital Spending and Financing Plan**

1. Revenue and cost assumptions:
   - Undergraduate enrollment at Washington Square will increase at an annual rate of 0.27%. At NYU Abu Dhabi (NYUAD) and NYU Shanghai (NYUSH), undergraduate enrollment will increase more rapidly as they expand to their full planned size. Graduate enrollments will rise at an annual rate of 0.21%.
   - Undergraduate tuition will increase at an annual rate somewhat above the general rate of inflation, but not as sharply as in recent years. Graduate tuition increases will be consistent with recent history. Increases in fees and room and board will be consistent with recent history.
   - Faculty salaries are expected to increase slightly less than the rate of tuition, but be consistent with maintaining market competitiveness.
   - Energy costs are expected to rise somewhat more than in recent history.
   - Other nonpersonnel costs are expected to rise at an annual rate of 2.5%.
   - Cost contingency factors: 10% for design contingencies and 10% for construction contingencies have been included in the cost estimates for all capital sites, including the Coles Site.

---

39 Within the context of the plan, the Coles Site building’s 670,000 GSF is assumed to be allocated as follows: student dormitories (339,600 GSF); classrooms (25,000 GSF); performance space (77,400 GSF); replacement for Coles Gym (121,400 GSF); retail (19,900 GSF); and mechanical (86,500 GSF). As will be discussed herein, the Working Group’s recommendations involve a different size of the Coles Site building and a different allocation of its space. Both dimensions of differences will have financial consequences, which will be addressed herein after NYU’s existing plans are analyzed.

40 It is important to note that all debt servicing costs, including any repayment of principal, are included as a cost in NYU’s annual operating budgets and thus are subtracted from operating revenues before the annual budget operating surplus (or deficit) is calculated.

41 As we discuss herein, NYU has been able to achieve annual operating surpluses (margins) over the past 10 years that have exceeded the planned/budgeted surpluses by an average of approximately $120 million annually.

42 Both of these cost estimates assume that the Coles Site building will be built and that the costs of mitigation and the costs of public improvements (which together total $42 million) are included in the costs of the Coles Site building. If the Morton Williams Site building were the only one to be built, then this $42 million should be added to the cost estimates of the alternative versions of the building. According to the Restrictive Declaration, the maximum density of the Morton Williams building is 170,000 GSF.

43 Tuition from NYU Shanghai is not included in the projections because NYU Shanghai is expected to operate on a “breakeven basis.” The absence of this information is unlikely to have a significant impact on revenues.

44 The total value of these contingencies included in the final 10-year capital
A separate cost escalation factor of $105 million, to account for possible changes or delays in construction on the Coles Site, is included.

The debt service costs in the projections use a 6% interest rate for the additional $1.4 billion debt (which will be in the form of 30-year fixed-rate bonds) for the capital expenditures. This can be compared to NYU’s current ability to borrow for long-term purposes at 4.4%.

The NYU Board of Trustees has adopted a long-term goal of maintaining a debt service level that does not exceed 7% of its annual operating expenses. In the period between 2003 and 2012, the level ranged from 3.6% to 6.9%. During the proposed capital construction and improvement period 2013-2022, the debt service rate would range from 5.3% to 7.2%, before settling at a level of 6.7% for 2021 and 6.6% for 2022 (see Table 14).

NYU’s Current and Future Financial Status

1. NYU has been able to achieve annual operating surpluses (margins) over the past 10 years; the actual annual operating surplus has exceeded the planned/budgeted surpluses by an average of approximately $120 million annually (see Table 14).

2. NYU’s financial position has been judged by two major credit-rating agencies to be favorable. Standard & Poor’s (S&P) rates NYU as AA-, which puts it in the category of “Very strong capacity to meet financial commitments.” Similarly, Moody’s rates NYU as Aa3.

---

Table 13.
NYU Capital Spending and Financing Plan 2013-2022, as of December 2013
(Data provided by Executive Vice President Martin Dorph on December 10, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Purpose</th>
<th>Cost ($ million)</th>
<th>Additional Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New &amp; Lease Replacement:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coles Site (including Tisch IPA)</td>
<td>$727</td>
<td>670,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes Renovation</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Avenue: Dental/Nursing/Bioengineering</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370 Jay Street (CUSP) + tbd</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383 Lafayette Acquisition and Renovations</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Center for Academic and Spiritual Life</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>79,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetroTech Center (lease)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC, site</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,488</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,489,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renovations, Capital Maintenance, Upgrades:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Maintenance</td>
<td>$713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Chemistry Renovations / FAS</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730 Broadway Physics Renovations / FAS</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer Brain Science Renovations / FAS</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinhardt Renovations</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU Poly Renovations</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwarz and Witkin / Dental Clinics and Labs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous School Projects</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Housing Renovations</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Infrastructure and Equipment</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Cooper Square</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,520</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,008</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which puts it in the category of “Rated as high quality and very low credit risk.”

3. However, Moody’s has characterized NYU’s balance sheet as “highly leveraged,” citing NYU’s 0.51 ratio of “expendable financial resources to direct debt” as “thin.” Because a large portion of the proposed capital expenditures will be funded by drawdown of cash reserves ($130 million) and revenue from operating surpluses ($933 million), this ratio will decline to as low as 0.33. However, if actual operating margins exceed budgeted operating margins, as has been the historic experience, the decline in the ratio will not be as significant.

4. Budgeted surpluses during the 2013-2022 period are projected to total $1.33 billion, with $933 going to the capital plan (although if actual margins exceed budgeted margins in amounts in line with historical experience, actual surpluses during the period may be about $1.2 billion larger).

5. The approximately $1.2 billion in damages and mitigation expenses at the NYU Langone Medical Center (the School of Medicine and the Hospitals) caused by Superstorm Sandy are not expected to have a substantial adverse effect on University finances. These expenses should be covered by Medical Center resources such as proceeds from insurance, payments from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the National Institutes of Health, Medical Center reserves, and borrowing. Furthermore, the Medical Center is expected to remain insurable following post-Sandy reconstruction, renovation, and new construction.

---

Table 14.
(Data provided by Executive Vice President Martin Dorph on December 10, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual Operating Margin</th>
<th>Budgeted Operating Margin</th>
<th>Actual – Budget</th>
<th>Expendable Financial Resources / Direct Debt</th>
<th>Annual Debt Service as % of Operating Expense Budget</th>
<th>Cash and Unrestricted Investments</th>
<th>Outstanding Long-term Debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>$718</td>
<td>$998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>1,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>1,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>1,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>1,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>1,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>2,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>2,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>2,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>$1,655</td>
<td>$2,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>2,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>2,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>2,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>3,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>3,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>3,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>3,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>3,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>3,413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AAA: “Extremely strong capacity to meet financial commitments.”

46 Moody’s slightly higher ratings of Aa1 and Aa2 are also in the category of “Rated as high quality and very low credit risk.” Moody’s highest category is Aaa: “Rated as the highest quality and lowest credit risk.”
Modeling Alternative Assumptions and Scenarios

Favorable:
1. Additional fundraising for capital purposes, above the $136 million that is the fundraising component of the overall financing plan for 2013-2022, would allow less borrowing and improve the financial position of the University. During 2003-2012, NYU raised $159 million for capital purposes excluding the Medical Center; an additional $591 million was raised for the Medical Center. For example, if an aggregate of $600 million were raised instead of the currently budgeted $136 million and borrowing were reduced commensurately, NYU’s annual debt service would be reduced by $31 million, and the ratio of annual debt service to operating expense budget would fall to approximately 6% (instead of 6.6%) by 2022; in addition, the ratio of “expendable resources to direct debt” would rise to approximately 0.7 (instead of 0.48) in 2022.

2. If the pattern noted above of actual annual budget surpluses exceeding planned budget surpluses by approximately $120 million continue, this would mean an additional $1.2 billion in net revenues over the 2013-2022 period, which could be used to reduce borrowing and/or build up financial reserves.

3. If the cost contingency factors that aggregate to $500 million over all of the NYU capital projects for 2013-2022 are unused, this would mean an additional $500 million in net revenues that could be used to reduce borrowing and/or build up financial reserves.

4. If NYU actually borrows at a 4.4% interest cost (as it is currently able to do) rather than at the 6% that is assumed in the plan, the savings would be $22 million per year.

Unfavorable:
5. If undergraduate enrollments (including NYUAD and NYUSH) do not increase after 2013 (through 2022), budgeted operating surpluses will decline, with the shortfalls growing larger over time; operating surpluses would become negative for the years 2017-2020. These shortfalls would substantially reduce the reinvestment component of the financing of the capital spending program. To cover these shortfalls from NYU’s liquid resources (cash and unrestricted investments) would cause the level of these resources to be at approximately $1.0 billion in 2022 (instead of $1.924 billion, as projected), or some components of the capital plan would have to be delayed.

6. If NYU’s nonpersonnel costs were to increase at an annual rate of 6% or greater (instead of 2.5%) after 2013, but the rate of tuition increase does not change commensurately, then annual operating surpluses would shrink and turn negative starting in 2017; the annual deficits would continue to grow in subsequent years. Again, these shortfalls would substantially reduce the reinvestment component of the financing of the capital spending program. To cover these shortfalls from NYU’s liquid resources would cause the level of these resources in 2022 to be at approximately $0.57 billion (or even more of the capital plan components would have to be delayed).

7. If long-term interest rates were at 8% (instead of 6%) on the $1.45 billion in borrowing, there would be a $29 million annual reduction in the operating surplus (and a commensurate reduction in liquid resources would be needed). If long-term interest rates jumped to 10%, the annual reductions in the operating surplus would be $58 million.

8. If fundraising for capital purposes falls below the projected amount of $136 million for 2013-2022, NYU’s cash holdings would likely fall by a commensurate amount. Thus far in 2013 and 2014 (through mid-February), fundraising for capital purposes other than the Medical Center has had a slow start, with only $3.3 million being raised; however, fundraising for the Medical Center has totaled $51 million.

9. If massive open online courses (MOOCs) and online education become major disruptive forces to the standard tuition-based business model of NYU, a more protective strategy—less capital spending, less debt, and a commitment of any near-term operating surpluses to additions to NYU’s liquid assets—would put NYU in a better financial position for transition to an appropriate business model for a MOOC/online-oriented environment.

Findings with Respect to NYU’s Current Financial Plan
1. NYU has adopted reasonably conservative and prudent assumptions in its financial planning for capital construction.

2. Building on land the University already owns is less financially costly than building on land that it must first buy.

3. Unless there are unexpected or unforeseen developments, the proposed Capital Spending and Financing Plan is unlikely to impair the financial status of NYU.
4. Given the University’s policy of holding the NYU Langone Medical Center fully responsible for its own finances, the Capital Spending and Financing Plan assessed in this report is expected to be insulated from the final impact of borrowing for damages and mitigation at NYU Langone Medical Center that were caused by Superstorm Sandy.

5. Construction on the Morton Williams (MW) Site is not included in the 2013–2022 Capital Spending and Financing Plan. Regardless of whether the New York City School Construction Authority exercises its option, further analysis will be required to assess the financial impact of any construction on this site.

6. Construction on the North Block is also not included in the 2013–2022 Capital Spending and Financing Plan and requires substantial further analysis to assess its impact on NYU finances.

**Findings with Respect to the Working Group’s Recommended Coles Site Building**

7. The Working Group’s space recommendations (817,000–899,000 GSF) are larger than the size of the Coles Site building (670,000 GSF) that is included in the proposed Capital Spending and Financing Plan. This may mean additional borrowing and additional debt servicing costs beyond what is included in NYU’s current plan. In addition, the recommendations involve a different allocation of space, which also has financial implications.

8. The additional construction cost for classroom and similar space is estimated to be about $885 per GSF. Thus, the additional space that is recommended by the Working Group would involve approximately $128–$201 million in additional construction costs.

9. The annual debt servicing costs for additional borrowing (at an assumed borrowing rate of 6%) appear to be approximately $72,400 per $1 million of additional borrowing. Thus, if all of the additional construction costs were financed through additional borrowing, the additional annual debt servicing costs would be approximately $9.3–$14.6 million. In turn, this would mean that the annual debt service level as a percentage of the annual budget would be 6.8%–7.0% in 2022, rather than the 6.6% that is currently projected.

10. In addition, the Working Group’s recommended allocation of space would involve 150,000 GSF devoted to student dormitories and 150,000 GSF devoted to faculty housing, rather than the 340,000 GSF devoted to student dormitories that is assumed to be in the 670,000 GSF Coles Site building in NYU’s proposed plan. Thus, the Working Group’s recommended allocation involves 190,000 GSF less space that would be devoted to student dormitories and 150,000 GSF new space that would be devoted to faculty housing. Although NYU would be able to charge rents to faculty and thereby make up some of the lost revenue from fewer student dormitory rooms, it seems unlikely that the extra faculty rents would fully recover the shortfall. The Working Group believes that about $5 million less in annual net revenues, starting around 2019, would be the consequence.

11. The Working Group’s recommended allocation also does not include any retail space (as compared to the 20,000 GSF in NYU’s proposed plan). However, NYU’s proposed plan assumes incremental revenues from the retail space that would cover only the relevant building operation maintenance costs of about $0.5 million annually. Thus, the elimination of this retail space would mean approximately $0.5 million less in annual net revenues, again starting around 2019.

12. Overall, the Working Group’s recommendations for the Coles Site building involve additional costs and/or reduced revenues—an annual negative budgetary impact—that sums to approximately $20–$25 million per year.

13. This negative budgetary impact of $20–$25 million per year should be put in context: NYU’s annual budget for 2014 (excluding the Medical Center) is approximately $2.8 billion; it will be above $3.0 billion within a few years. The negative annual budgetary impact is thus less than 1% of the overall budget. In addition, the Working Group discussed in connection with NYU’s proposed plan two major areas where NYU’s projections appear to be financially conservative: NYU’s record of achieving substantially greater annual budgetary surpluses than were originally projected and the sizable cost contingency allowances in the planned construction projects.

14. As a consequence, the Working Group’s recommendations with respect to the Coles Site building can be comfortably accommodated within the financial framework that NYU has projected.

---

47 If the medical school and hospital are included, the annual budget is approximately $6.5 billion.

48 For example, if the unplanned additional annual budgetary surpluses were only a quarter of those achieved over the past decade, then there would be no need for additional borrowing to meet the additional construction costs entailed by the Working Group’s recommendations; similarly, if half of the cost contingencies that are part of the capital plan are not used, the negative annual budgetary impact of the Working Group’s recommendations would be covered.
Financing Recommendations

1. Plan and schedule capital projects at the non-Coles Sites to scale back these projects if unforeseen or unexpected developments arise.

2. Preserve current tuition assumptions even in the event of unforeseen or unexpected financial shocks. Address these shocks as much as possible by delaying capital projects and/or reducing cash reserve targets.

3. Preserve current faculty, administrative, and staff salary assumptions (including benefits) even in the event of unforeseen or unexpected financial shocks. Address these shocks as much as possible by delaying capital projects and/or reducing cash reserve targets.

4. Commit to an increase in fundraising for capital purposes, replacing the current target of $136 million with a substantially higher target.

5. Provide the University Senate with the same detailed financial information reviewed by the Working Group on a regular basis.

Conclusion

All Working Group members care deeply about NYU: the continuation of its academic momentum; the well-being of its students, faculty, and staff; the quality and ability of its physical space to support the academic and artistic mission; and the quality of its relationship with its constituents and neighbors. All are united in the conviction that diligent research and rigorous examination of primary source data provided the foundation for a responsible and thorough review of the highly complex issues surrounding NYU’s Core plan. All members of the Working Group believe that a transparent process, a serious attempt to explain the data, and an openness to further discussion and reexamination will substantially improve the decision-making process and engender a new level of civil discourse within the University community.

The Working Group is confident that its recommendations—and the analyses on which they are based—are consistent with the University’s academic mission and will sustain the momentum that has transformed New York University into one of the world’s leading institutions of higher education.
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For More Information
All relevant documents examined by the Working Group over the course of its deliberations thus far, as well as meeting agendas and summaries, messages to the University community, video of the town hall meetings, and answers to frequently asked questions are available for download on the Group’s website:

http://www.nyu.edu/about/university-initiatives/space-priorities.html

For further details about the NYU Core Plan, including the full text of NYU’s submission to New York City’s Uniform Land Use Review Process (ULURP) and the Restrictive Declaration of July 24, 2012, please visit:

http://www.nyu.edu/nyu2031/nyuinnc
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University Space Priorities Working Group
Charge
(October 5, 2012)

The University Space Priorities Working Group—first announced at the May 2012 meeting of the University Senate, made up of faculty representatives appointed by the schools and the Faculty Senators Council, as well as representatives from the Student Senators Council and the Administrative Management Council—has been formed to solicit meaningful input from our community. With the zoning envelope now defined, the Working Group will take up the task of giving definitive guidance to the University Administration on implementation; of taking account of the existing, pressing space needs of academic units and programs; and of listening to the implications of the NYU Core Project for members of the University community. The charge to the working group includes:

- identifying ways to continue to increase the efficiency and usage of existing space;
- submitting criteria and key principles to apply to the development of the spatial endowment we have been granted under the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP), including providing a crucial voice on plans for the initial building on the southern block;
- establishing the criteria to consider in the selection of an architect and on a process to receive comments on designs as the project proceeds;
- specifying which future academic programs are most important to locate close to the core NYU neighborhood;
- providing specific advice on NYU’s proposals to improve open space; and
- using the resources allocated to minimize the inconvenience of construction, and determine the elements of the University proposals to provide amenities or accommodations.

Its work will be transparent, and it will include solicitation of opinion and sentiment from the NYU community. The Working Group will maintain a website with regular reports of meetings, documents under review, and the capacity to receive advice and comments from faculty, students, administrators, and staff. The Working Group will also develop its own strategy for consultation with the NYU community. Moreover, the University will not undertake any construction authorized by the NYU Core Project, beyond routine maintenance or any required grounds improvement projects, before the receipt of the Working Group’s report in May 2013.

To access the NYU Framework 2031, please see:
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## University Space Priorities Working Group

**Plenary Meeting Schedule**

All meeting agendas and summaries are available on the Working Group's website: [http://www.nyu.edu/about/university-initiatives/space-priorities/meeting-schedule.html](http://www.nyu.edu/about/university-initiatives/space-priorities/meeting-schedule.html)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Friday, October 5, 2012</td>
<td>12:00pm – 2:00pm</td>
<td>Kimmel Center (60 WSS) Rm. 905/907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Friday, November 9, 2012</td>
<td>10:00am – 12:00pm</td>
<td>Kimmel Center (60 WSS) Rm. 905/907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thursday, November 15, 2012</td>
<td>4:00pm – 6:00pm</td>
<td>Kimmel Center (60 WSS) Rm. 914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thursday, November 29, 2012</td>
<td>12:30pm – 2:00pm</td>
<td>Faculty Club (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tuesday, December 11, 2012</td>
<td>4:00pm – 6:00pm</td>
<td>Faculty Club (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thursday, December 13, 2012</td>
<td>5:30pm – 9:00pm</td>
<td>Presidential Penthouse 37 Wash. Sq. W., 18th Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 22, 2013</td>
<td>3:00pm – 4:30pm</td>
<td>Lipton Hall (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 13, 2013</td>
<td>12:30pm – 2:00pm</td>
<td>Lipton Hall (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tuesday, March 5, 2013</td>
<td>3:00pm – 4:30pm</td>
<td>Lipton Hall (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Thursday, March 14, 2013</td>
<td>3:00pm – 4:30pm</td>
<td>Kimmel Center (60 WSS) Rm. 914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Thursday, April 4, 2013</td>
<td>3:00pm – 4:30pm</td>
<td>Kimmel Center (60 WSS) Rm. 914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Friday, April 12, 2013</td>
<td>2:00pm – 4:00pm</td>
<td>Kimmel Center (60 WSS) Rm. 914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 17, 2013</td>
<td>1:00pm – 2:30pm</td>
<td>Lipton Hall (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Friday, May 3, 2013</td>
<td>11:00am – 1:00pm</td>
<td>Lipton Hall (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Monday, May 6, 2013</td>
<td>1:00pm – 2:30pm</td>
<td>Lipton Hall (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Wednesday, May 22, 2013</td>
<td>4:00pm – 5:30pm</td>
<td>Kimmel Center (60 WSS) Rm. 914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Friday, June 14, 2013</td>
<td>10:45am – 12:45pm</td>
<td>Lipton Hall (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Friday, September 20, 2013</td>
<td>2:00pm – 4:00pm</td>
<td>Kimmel Center (60 WSS) Rm. 905/907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Thursday, September 26, 2013</td>
<td>12:30pm – 2:30pm</td>
<td>Lipton Hall (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tuesday, October 8, 2013</td>
<td>12:30pm – 2:30pm</td>
<td>Lipton Hall (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tuesday, October 29, 2013</td>
<td>12:30pm – 2:30pm</td>
<td>Global Center for Academic &amp; Spiritual Life, Grand Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Wednesday, November 13, 2013</td>
<td>2:00pm – 4:00pm</td>
<td>Lipton Hall (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tuesday, November 26, 2013</td>
<td>2:00pm – 4:00pm</td>
<td>Global Center for Academic &amp; Spiritual Life, Grand Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Wednesday, December 11, 2013</td>
<td>12:00pm – 2:00pm</td>
<td>Lipton Hall (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Thursday, December 19, 2013</td>
<td>2:00pm – 4:00pm</td>
<td>Lipton Hall (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>February 4, 2014</td>
<td>7:00pm – 9:00pm</td>
<td>Lipton Hall (108 W. 3rd St.) Ground Floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## University Space Priorities Working Group

### Subcommittee Meeting Schedule

### Academic and Non-Academic Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Friday, February 22, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 26, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tuesday, March 26, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 10, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 16, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 30, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stewardship and Quality of Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 26, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tuesday, March 5, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Friday, March 22, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 3, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wednesday, May 8, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Friday, May 17, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tuesday, November 26, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Monday, March 4, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tuesday, March 26, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Monday, April 29, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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University Space Priorities Working Group
Summary of Consultation with the Community

Town Hall Meetings:
- Space Subcommittee: March 27, 2013
- Finance Subcommittee: March 28, 2013
- Stewardship and Quality of Life Subcommittee: April 10, 2013
- Interim Report: September 17, 2013
- Interim Report: September 23, 2013
- Members of the Working Group from the Faculty of Arts and Science also co-hosted a town hall-style meeting with FSC faculty senators from FAS on October 28, 2013, to which faculty from FAS were invited.

Presentations on the Activities of the Working Group:
- Board of Trustees: October 16, 2013; February 12, 2014
- University Senate: February 7, 2013; November 7, 2013
- University Leadership Team: September 10, 2013; January 29, 2014
- Faculty Senators Council: September 13, 2013

The Working Group met with the following individuals/groups as part of its consultative process. This list includes individuals who gave presentations at meetings of the Working Group.

Departments and Faculty:
- Humanities and Social Sciences, Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development
- Politics, Faculty of Arts and Science
- Anthropology, Faculty of Arts and Science
- Economics, Faculty of Arts and Science
- Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences
- Psychology, Faculty of Arts and Science

Members of the University Leadership Team:
- Lynne P. Brown, Senior Vice President, University Relations and Public Affairs
- Martin Dorph, Executive Vice President, Finance and Information Technology
- Alicia Hurley, Vice President, Government Affairs and Community Relations
- Joseph Juliano, Associate Vice Chancellor for Strategic Planning
- Alison Leary, Executive Vice President, Operations
- David W. McLaughlin, Provost
- John Sexton, President

Deans and Directors:
- Charles Bertolami, College of Dentistry
- Mary Brabeck, Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development
- Mary Schmidt Campbell, Tisch School of the Arts
- Tom Carew, Faculty of Arts and Science
- Scott Fritzen and Tyra Liebman (co-interim deans), Wagner Graduate School of Public Service
- Peter Blair Henry, Stern School of Business
- Carol Mandel, Division of Libraries
- Eileen Sullivan-Marx, College of Nursing

1 The Working Group extended an offer to meet with faculty from each of the 37 departments that passed resolutions of opposition to or concern with NYU2031. The list here reflects the meetings that took place.
• Lynn Videka, Silver School of Social Work
• Suzanne Wofford, Gallatin School of Individualized Study

Other University faculty, students, and administrators:
• Jonathan N. Ross, Director of Operations, Kimmel Center
• Christopher Bledsoe, Director of Athletics, Coles Sports Center
• Karen Gulino, Assistant Vice President, Faculty Housing and Residential Services
• Eve Klein, Assistant Vice President, Strategic Assessment and Design
• Beth Morningstar, Assistant Vice President and Deputy to the EVP for Operations
• Roger Printup, University Registrar

Other internal and external constituents or consultants:
• Tom Hier, Principal, Biddison Hier, Ltd.
• Washington Square Village Tenants Association
• Silver Towers Tenants Association
• Community Board #2

---

2 The Working Group extended an offer to faculty from the Faculty Against the Sexton Plan (FASP) group to make a presentation. FASP declined to present to the Working Group.
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University Space Priorities Working Group
Communications Sent by the Working Group to the University Community

1. “Update on the University Space Priorities Working Group”
   January 30, 2013
   Link: http://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/spacePriorities/documents/USPWG_UpdateMemo_01.30.13.pdf

2. “USPWG Schedules Town Hall Meetings”
   March 20, 2013
   Link: http://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/spacePriorities/documents/USPWG.3.20.13update_FINAL.pdf

3. “FAQs, and Videos of Recent Town Hall Meetings”
   April 17, 2013
   Full text:

   TO:             THE NYU COMMUNITY
   FROM:  Ted Magder, Chair, University Space Priorities Working Group
   RE:             FAQs, and Videos of Recent Town Hall Meetings

   The University Space Priorities Working Group, which has been charged with making recommendations
   regarding the implementation of the NYU Core Plan, has posted answers to a number of frequently-asked
   questions on its website. Many of these questions have been derived from meetings with University constitu-
   ents, including deans, faculty members, and students. In addition, the Working Group has posted video of its
   three recent town hall meetings on its website.

4. “Release of the Interim Report from the University Space Priorities Working Group”
   July 2, 2013
   Full text:

   To the NYU Community:

   It is my pleasure to submit this Interim Report on behalf of the twenty-six members of the University Space
   Priorities Working Group.

   The Working Group was constituted in September 2012 to examine NYU’s projected space needs and to give
   advice on how they can best be met. Our work stems from the New York City Council’s approval last July of
   NYU’s application for new construction on the “superblocks,” the NYU-owned land bounded by Houston to
   the south, Mercer to the east, La Guardia Place to the west, and 3rd Street to the north, with Bleecker bisect-
   ing the area into a south and north block.

   From the beginning, the Working Group has striven to conduct its business openly, making our meeting
   summaries and all the documents we reviewed available on our website, posting Frequently Asked Questions,
   conducting Town Halls and making video recordings of those sessions available on the website, and seeking
   comments from anyone in the university community.

   The Working Group has met regularly in plenaries and subcommittees, reviewed an extensive array of data,
and consulted with deans, administrators, students, faculty, and representatives of the nearby community. We considered the rationales and evidentiary support for the University's space needs as articulated in the application, as well as the financial assumptions underlying the University's capital plan and the implications on other University priorities of the proposed construction. In addition, we discussed various approaches to improve the stewardship of the superblocks. We have spent the better part of May and June crafting a report that offers detailed interim findings and recommendations.

The Working Group will reconvene in the fall to continue its deliberations, to receive and consider responses to the Interim Report, and to deliver a Final Report scheduled for December 2013. You can send comments to the Working Group at any time via our website. We have also scheduled two Town Hall meetings for September to hear feedback on this report and inform us as we move to complete our task. We welcome your participation.

Fall 2013 Town Hall Meeting Dates (additional dates may be scheduled):

» Tuesday, September 17, 2013, 7:00 – 9:00 PM (Kimmel Center, Eisner & Lubin Auditorium)
» Monday, September 23, 2013, 2:00 – 4:00 PM (Kimmel Center, Rosenthal Pavilion)

On behalf of the University Space Priorities Working Group,
Ted Magder, Chair

Click HERE to download the Interim Report.

To submit a comment to the Working Group or view related documents, please visit our website: http://www.nyu.edu/about/university-initiatives/space-priorities.
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University Space Priorities Working Group
Comments and Letters Submitted to the Working Group’s Website

I. Comments

Comments were submitted digitally via a form on the Working Group’s website. Anyone, whether a member of the NYU community or not, could submit feedback. All of the comments submitted appear below; they have been de-attributed, as they were intended as private communications to the Working Group and not messages for the public at large.

October 5, 2012

For what it’s worth, I’d share the following with your colleagues: The debate at NYU has focused more on the idea of a ‘superblock’ and less with the practical execution of the idea. In principle superblocks can work, provided they follow a couple of rules. They need, first, to be easily penetrated, which means lots of ways in and out of the over-all assemblage of buildings. Second, the ground plane of the solid structures needs to be porous, which usually means lots of small offices and shops at street level, each with its own entrance. Penetration and porosity actually increase the security of superblocks, since there are lots of people, so more “eyes on the street.” Washington Square Village was built at a time when isolation of the block from its urban fabric was the ideal, but today that old way of designing has proved deadening. Superblocks built the old way can be converted, though, following the two more modern guidelines; my team, for instance, worked on such a conversion in London at the Brunswick Centre. The key in conversion is puncturing the solid wall mass that existed before, and adding informal activities out in open space -- the latter requires imagination more than a construction budget. I wasn’t asked to work on the NYU project, so can only judge from its published drawings and plans. Some of the architects involved are good designers, but the urbanism looks like a throwback to an earlier era. If more discussion of this proposal takes place, I’d strongly suggest exploring the relation of the block to LaGuardia Place: here is a broad boulevard, it forms a nice “T” with Washington Square, it should be full of activity, but all the NYU buildings along it are dead at street level. I also worry -- again just looking a published plans -- about the handling of the edges on Mercer St. and Bleeker and West Houston. With small streets like Mercer set in a grid, the principle of good urban design is to intensify activity at the corners, but the proposed plan seems indifferent to this best-practice principle. I hope these comments are useful.

I have worked with many NYU students, faculty, staff and community members for 13 years in the Coles Sports Center. Will I be able to have any input on the future pool design?

November 14, 2012

NYU’s lack of public space can be greatly improved if most of NYU’s buildings turn its ground floors into public spaces (no more classrooms at ground level). Second, the public spaces of NYU can be more readily identified if all the pavements around NYU buildings has a distinctive design (e.g., red brick pavements).

January 22, 2013

I have been asked by members of the Administrative Management Council to propose to our Working Group that a child care center dedicated to the needs of the NYU community be considered with alongside the other space needs of the institution. Many of our peer universities are able to provide child care solutions, making this issue a potentially strong contributor to recruitment and retention at all levels. This issue was comprehensively examined and rejected in prior decades due to the complexities of NYU space and NYC regulation, but the recent approval for development of the south blocks removes many of the previously articulated obstacles. Thanks for your consideration, and see you all soon.

January 30, 2013

Have you considered building up on the existing buildings instead of building new?

Hello, I just had a comment. It would be great if in addition to academic and administrative space, event space was
also taken into consideration. We have a lack of spaces on campus that can accommodate a large dinner. Thanks!

Of what value is it to NYU to build a public school on the Morton-Williams site? How does this contribute to NYU’s space needs?

January 31, 2013
you must be aware of the need for faculty housing. This is particularly acute for the Medical School, where it is usually a key part of recruiting. What priority is this being given?

February 5, 2013
Another suggestion from the AMC membership: When (and if) Coles is offline, many university athletics needs could be addressed by increasing the existing university relationships with area facilities. I trust that in addition to expanding our relationship with Chelsea Piers and Poly athletics, we could also expand on the existing discounted gym membership benefits offered to faculty and administrators. The gap can probably be addressed at a more reasonable cost than attempting to offer a quality transitional gym space.

March 20, 2013
I submit this comment with some trepedaton. I don’t want to legitimate this committee. As someone who has actively opposed the 2031 expansion, I allowed my name to be put forth for this committee just to see if I would be selected. Of course I was not. While this is an N of one, it would be naive not to think that you are a hand picked committee being used strategically by the NYU administration which has no intention of reversing course, in spite of community and faculty opposition. I would ask just one thing. That you consider that NYU many years ago gained permission to build the 30-story Silver Towers in exchange for leaving the space around the buildings alone. That includes air space. The trade off was tall buildings, but a lovely open space amidst the crowded buildings of Manhattan. Now years later, NYU is back, breaking the agreement that allowed the buildings to be build in the first place. This should give the space committee pause on an ethical level. Do you really want to collude in this? More specifically, what is the plan for those people who will have an ugly zipper building (freshman dorm) a few feet in front of their living room window, blocking the sun and the view? Clearly, the reason that the Cole Center was build underground was to protect the esthetic and practical integrity of Silver Towers. I would encourage you on ethical grounds to protect the integrity of the Silver Towers block. NYU has has success in obtaining and rehabing existing buildings in the area. NYU should fit into the already existing buildings rather than build more (frankly ugly) buildings in the village area. Wouldn’t it be great if this space committee took an ethical stance and instead of being a tool of the administration took a principled position on this?

March 26, 2013
The “Rocketship” park closed for repairs June 2012. Is it still closed! The UPNS kids (especially the 2 year old ones) have to cross the street to reach a playground. Also, why is the playground in front of Coles always closed? What is the purpose of having a park that no-one uses for years?

Could this space be provide for issue facing the LGBT youth community?

March 29, 2013
To whom it may concern: I appreciate the move towards transparency, but I do have a few questions. The two most prevalent questions are: 1) Why is there such a need to fund new buildings all over the city? It seems like an encroachment onto the other boroughs is happening. Why not just update the buildings that are currently in use? 2) I understand the school is admitting ore and more students, and therefore there is a “need” (need because surely not every room is used in every present buiding at every hour there is a class), but why not spend some of that funding for financial aid? There are plenty of students who could use the help through a university grant instead of taking out thousands in loans each year. I for one am one of those students. While there are students who qualify for certain tuition assistance programs (such as HEOP), there are a sizeable number who fall right over the qualifications for such programs and as a result end up taking out nearly $30,000 every year. Should the priorities of the university really be space? Thank you for your time and willingness to listen to my opinion
I’m interested at how NYU is planning to expand its partnership with neighboring businesses (local stores, nearby restaurants, partnerships with spaces that hire students, art studios, theaters, museums, etc). That kind of planned integration as we continue to expand alongside NYU-proximate and NYU-friendly organizations is what I mean by ‘soft expansion’ as opposed to physically building more real estate which is “hard expansion.” A major determining factor, for example, for a Tisch Student or a Stern Student to come to NYU versus another university is our proximity to the bevy of organization that can lead them to successful careers and teach them useful skills alongside their school work. Most students go to NYU for the amenities our surrounding neighborhoods. PlaNYC is a great example of equal parts hard and soft development plans for example. I’ve been to several town halls on 2031 and, in each instance, I’ve asked what plans are being made to expand our accessibility for students to take advantage of the many advantages our city has available. The response had been consistently that there is no group currently working on such plans for the long term in tandem with our plans for physical expansion. The last town hall I was able to attend however was several months ago and I’m hoping something has developed since that time. Please let me know if there is a subcommittee group working on increased integration with organizations on campus which students frequently utilize. If there are no groups working on this please let me know if it would be prudent to start a group like this as NYU plans its next several decades.

April 24, 2013

This is a continuation of a question I asked at the QoL Subcommittee Town Hall: The windows in Silver Towers have been problematic for over a decade. They leak air. They rattle. They are difficult to clean. I won’t recount the history, but requests to have them replaced or updated have been numerous since I’ve lived here (1996), and as I understand, have been rejected because of cost or (more recently) landmarking. I was pleased to learn at the QoL Town Hall that 2031 planning and a separate budget for mitigation have allowed the University to move forward with a solution to this longstanding issue. But by the same token, I am concerned that the focus on mitigation has forced a rapid decision based solely on sound-reduction capabilities. Since the tenants of these buildings will live with these windows for the next 30+ years, I’d like to understand how this solution compares to other options in terms of other important criteria: energy efficiency, maintenance/cleaning, safety, ease of opening/closing, aesthetics. I’m sure many of us would trade of a few dB of sound-proofing in exchange for improvements in these other categories. Thanks for your hard work in helping to advise the University in these tough decisions.

July 2, 2013

How much are you looking into the feasibility of a net-zero building in place of where Coles is currently?

I would like to see the full text of the letters from Faculty at Tisch and Steinhardt as referenced at the end of the Interim Report. Thank you.

NYU should build net-zero energy consumption buildings when they replace Coles and build in the Washington Square Village. It’s right by the community, the people and the planet and will help NYU lead the way in sustainable development. NYU should make its best effort to reach these goals.

I would like there to be a net-zero energy building where Coles is currently standing.

July 3, 2013

First, I would like to commend the committee for their hard work, sometimes under extremely unpleasant circumstances. I will take issue with one “fact” presented, however. On p6 right column end of first paragraph you state that 40% of the faculty reside in FH. Since only tenure track and tenured faculty are eligible, it would be better to clarify that statement. TT faculty represent only approximately half of the full time faculty at NYU. The balance (NTTFTF or contract faculty) are ineligible for this benefit. Again, thank you for your hard work and thoughtful report.

A comment to the working group: I am a graduate school, so in reading the interim report, I was content to see that the space constraints on students was prominently mentioned in the report and the allocation of new space. I would simply urge the committee to consider that lack of working space and accommodations for graduate students is a serious deterrent to attracting top quality PhD students. We are far behind our peer institutions and it is no hyperbole to call the space situation for graduate students a crisis across the various departments and schools in the University.
Hello, I have had a glance at the so-called Green Plan suggested by a subset of NYU stakeholders ("Room for Everyone"), and while it seems reasonable to me I lack the tools to properly judge it against the current plan. Why has this proposal not been addressed? I was hoping to see it discussed in the Working Group's interim report, though from what I understand it has not been acknowledged at all.

July 22, 2013

I would love to see a “net zero” building constructed where Coles is currently standing. NYU can definitely make it happen, and it would be a great way to show its commitment to sustainability and environmental responsibility.

September 4, 2013

I would love to see a “net zero” building constructed where Coles is currently standing. NYU can definitely make it happen, and it would be a great way to show its commitment to sustainability and environmental responsibility.

September 22, 2013

Dear QoL Sub-committee: I’m a member of the Silver Towers Tenants Association Exec Committee, and have (twice) heard presentations by your group in which you’ve stated that STTA-EC has been unable to meet with you. Not sure where/how communication has failed, but the four of us (Karen Wolff, Oliver Buhler, Peter Rea, myself) would be more than willing to meet if you feel that would be productive at this stage.

October 8, 2013

Dear Space Priorities Working Group, Thanks for your hard work in assembling your July interim report. Below are some questions and comments: * The original zipper building plan called for substantial below-grade construction, expanding the underground footprint all the way to the mercer street sidewalk. Presumably, this is appealing because it greatly increases the square footage without bumping into zoning restrictions. But underground construction is much more costly, time-consuming, dirty, and generally disruptive than above-grade construction, and the resulting windowless space is generally inferior. Is it really worth it? How much space would we lose by constraining the below-grade portion of the design to lie within the existing “bathtub”? * I don't know what fraction of the use of Coles is for intercollegiate athletics, but assuming it is substantial, I think the University should consider leasing or building a separate permanent facility for those activities at an off-campus site, as is done in most Universities. * Coles is a critical facility for the NYU community, and yet the quality of the facilities is often mediocre. The exercise rooms are cramped, overused and underventilated (with no A/C in the summer - for many years I chose to join NYSC, which is only a bit more expensive, but has far better facilities). The surfaces for tennis are poor. The roof, which lay inexplicably fallow for about 10 years, was resurfaced with a moveable mesh which is barely useable, and the indoor surfaces are essentially coated concrete which is a strange surface for tennis and very tough on the joints. The University should commit to substantially improving these facilities in the new gym. * As you note (p. 13), the University has a poor track record in maintaining street-level facilities on the superblocks. Sink-holes, rusting and decrepit fences and gates, crumbling concrete, garden areas filled mostly with weeds... Although there have been some recent improvements (e.g., removal of chain-link fences near 100 bleecker, landscaping and sprinkler system in the Oak grove, repairing the Sasaki fountain), but these were long overdue, and I have the impression that they were done primarily with the intention of calming the uproar over the 2031 plans. Your report recommends formation of an advisory committee - I think it should be charged not only with overseeing construction and mitigation issues, but more generally with ensuring that the University adhere to a consistently higher level of quality in the maintenance of the superblocks. * In my view, the University has expanded the undergraduate population far too much over the past 15 years. As the largest private university in the US, we are now roughly 4x the size of most of our high-end competitors, and this growth has caused (or at least greatly amplified) our current space crisis. I do realize we are critically dependent on the tuition revenues, and that slimming down is thus not a realistic option. But we have to break this unsustainable cycle. The 2031 plan should include a commitment to 0% student population growth for the forseeable future. * I find the growth of tuition over the past 10 years even more excessive and unsustainable (an average rate of over 5% per year - more than double the inflation rate of 2.5%, and far above the 3.1% average of all US universities). We need to put the brakes on before it is too late - the 2031 plan should include a commitment to limit tuition growth to the rate of inflation.
II. Letters
Some University stakeholders, including faculty members from various departments, submitted letters directly to the chair or to members of the Working Group. On other occasions, messages sent to deans or department chairs were shared with the Working Group. A list of these items appears below. Full text of these letters is available upon request.
- Letter from chair and faculty of the NYU Game Center
- Letter from staff members of Theatrical Production at NYU Tisch School of the Arts
- Letter from chair and faculty of Undergraduate Production and Design Studio at NYU Tisch School of the Arts
- Letter from chair and faculty of Graduate Acting Program at NYU Tisch School of the Arts
- Message from G. Gabrielle Starr, Dean of NYU College of Arts and Science, to CAS chairs and directors regarding classroom space
- Message from chair and faculty of the Music Department at NYU Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development
- Memorandum from the Student Council at the NYU Gallatin School of Individualized Study
- Questions from the Faculty Senators Council (to which the Working Group responded on November 6, 2013)
- Message from the Undergraduate Student Council at NYU Tisch School of the Arts
- Message from Prof. Gregory Guy of the Department of Linguistics, NYU Faculty of Arts and Science
- Letter from chair and faculty of the Department of Art and Public Policy at NYU Tisch School of the Arts
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