



42 U.A.S. SB2

Minutes from November 29, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 7:31 pm.

1. Guest Speaker on Kendall Square Initiative: Michael Owu

Jonté: We have here Michael Owu, the Director of Real Estate for MITIMCO. I believe Steve Marsh is also here with us tonight; we'll give the floor to you guys. This area has attracted almost a billion dollars of donated capital; as a result, we're in a position to really take a leading effort on a variety of initiatives that used to be loading docks.

Steve: My name is Steve Marsh. I'm the management director. I'm joined by Michael Owu who handles all of our Cambridge activities. MITIMCO is really an enterprise that invests MIT's donated dollars over time to support institute initiatives. We exist to generate capital for the Institute's spending needs in terms of scholarship, research, and ongoing activities. The other piece of what we do is running real estate. MITIMCO is...well...one of the things that we do in the real estate end, we not only do that, but we actually have made a dedicated effort to real estate around campus. We've been doing programs for 35 years in running. It's got a couple of principles or missions. It's to give a sense of improving the environment. If you were here 20 years ago, you probably would have thought twice about walking down some of the streets that surround the campus. It was fairly challenging. One of the things we're in charge with is systematically improving the institute. This gives the institute some flexibility in the long run to have some influence around the environment. Clearly, we're trying to put investment dollars in and return capital.

So, if you look back, say on the last decade, MIT has gone through a dramatic change in 10 years. Today, around Main St. and Ames St. You'd see the Broad Institute, Whitehead Institute, Stata Center, Brain and Cognitive Building, and even the Koch Institute being created as we speak.

As a result of some of these activities, today we have a very powerful center of innovation. That is important for a couple of reasons. #1: Smart people want to be around other smart people, creating a diverse intellectual environment...very productive and helpful for MIT. This is helpful for the businesses that are in this environment and also very helpful for the city's environment. Cambridge is one of those growing cities. Fiscal stabilities are working. This is an enterprising environment most people want to enjoy. From a student perspective or faculty perspective, you'd find that this type of activity has provided stability and growth. What we're trying to talk about today...it's been quite successful. One of the things we have not been successful in is the creation of place around the MIT campus. One of the things we're trying to do is to create a place that gives people the opportunity to gather, looking for a place to gather and interact on a more organized basis.

First of all, any questions on that? Today we're going to talk about Kendall Square. I'm going to give you a couple of slides on the process. Michael is then going to give you some more insight on the scope. We really want to try and gain your insights and any recommendations you may have about activities.

A couple goals. Susan Hockfield has charged us with the following 4 goals. 1. To establish a vibrant gateway and connective link to the Institute. If you walk through the campus, it's not keeping to the



representation of the Institute to companies around it and this world class city. We're trying to also create a destination of place. We're looking to add lifestyle amenities – maybe some entertainment, maybe bowling – and a variety of services that would be a place most people can stay and linger at from 5 to 9. It becomes basically a ghost town after 5. In doing this, we want to maintain expansion potential. We want to show we have the ability to grow over time – whatever we're looking for in potential opportunities. At the same time, we want to provide space. The last thing is we want to make sure the efforts of what we're doing here is, at the very least, neutral to the Institute's finances; we don't want to take capital from research initiatives or student initiatives. We're doing something that's self-sustainable.

Our principles in general: MIT has gone through a process called MIT 2030. 2030 was looking here for the next two decades, looking at what the framework might be. . The first thing we have to do is be consistent with the networker. We have to work closely with the campus plans, complementary but not inconsistent. Second, we're trying to reflect strong Urban Planning principles. We want to make sure it has the right pedestrian vehicular access. Last we want to make sure that anything we want to do is viable as a developmental initiative. Many in the Boston area have seen through decades of planning with no action. One of the things we're trying to do here is to make it rational. It has to be physical possible, has to be embraced by the market, has to be financially sustainable, and has to be legal and politics.

Just to give you some quick progress to date; we've done the circuit talking to a variety of people. We've presented preliminary ideas to MIT leadership and governance back in the spring. We've held brainstorming sessions; we've renewed detailed concepts. We're making a round with the MIT community. We've gone to neighborhood groups, other student faculty groups, and others that have expressed interest.

Let me bring you to a quick process slide. We're now at the planning phase, talking about the envelope we can develop. The initiative we're undertaking involves a zoning channel. We need to go through a process to reevaluate the zoning. We have signed a lease recently for a restaurant, but the zoning did not allow the use; the laws we have today don't support that initiative. We will go through a zoning process that takes 6 months to 12 months. Then, we go through, after a resulting change, we go through and actually project planning and entitlement. That means we are now to specific levels. Today, we're at a very conceptual level. We won't move into detailed design until we know we have entitlement. The entitlement probably takes about a year. Then, we finally go into implementation. Implementation is probably somewhere in the 5 to 12 year initiative. By the level of time it will take...most of you would have presumably graduate. It is a legacy, and it's important that we plan right away

Let me pass this on to Michael, and he can walk through the concepts.

Michael: So, I'm going to go through some of the larger ideas to get to the plan. Here's some real quick context. This is Kendall Square; this is Main St., and we're somewhere over there. That's the new Koch Center. Main St. is sort of the main northern edge; it's the boundary between the campus and what is essentially the commercial district. This represents a 5 min walk and a 10 min walk. You're all familiar with the Infinite Corridor. If you go through the Media Lab courtyard, when you come out through the atrium, you dump and face a parking lot. It kind of fizzles out. There's clearly an opportunity to begin to see a way to bring these two paths together, and also see if there's a way to extend the Infinite Corridor, possibly to Sloan, too. These are the sort of broader principles; the key for us is a real emphasis in on this area right here which is where these two paths come closest. The subway station and the plaza on the other side, Marriot...there's a bunch of things that could really create a great opportunity to create a focal



point. As we go through this exercise, we also need to think on a broader perspective how what we do connects with 3rd St. There are more restaurants and other activities; there are things we want to make sure we're cognizant of. Kendall Square is right near the river. These are just the broad principles.

This is a diagram. This is Main St. The new Koch Center is over here. The T-stop is right in the middle. The focus is on creating Main St. and making it an active, lively, and pedestrian friendly. That's what this ellipse here represents. We only control the south side. The focus is still on Main St. This ellipse is that connection where the infinite comes to an end, creating the connection where these two things come together, creating a place here that is interesting and vibrant. We want it to be a destination, to create opportunity, to create a sense of place, to provide basic services, and to basically rebuild the public realm. The dotted line represents the area we are studying in broad terms. As we got through this exercise, we want to make sure that what we're thinking about is consistent with what the campus is thinking. We want to think what's possible of all of MIT's holdings there even if we focus on the Main St. area. This boundary represents the study area. It also represents the area we'll propose. Again this is what it looks like today. I'm sure you're all familiar. This place right here is mostly, today, surfaced by parking lots. This here is a couple of middle buildings. There are a couple of older buildings; most of the area is dominated over by low density developments. This is a rendering plan; this is the render plan of our initial concept; we're in the very early stages of this process. We need to put some parameters around what you think this might look like. This is what we're trying to achieve with these buildings. Over here is the Ford parking lot; this is the other service lot that serves a major receiving area. It's right across from Legal Sea Foods; it's essentially like a 90-foot wide area. It does not present the most attractive face.

Building 1 here is what we call an info building; its primary purpose is to create a more pedestrian friendly experience. Buildings 2 and 3 are larger buildings that would house housing and office usage. Building 4 is really a small appendage to 25. Building 5 is a small building focus on retail. Building 6 is a parking lot. Building 7 is a larger building, and Building 8 is really an appendage on Broad. The goal is to make buildings 1-8 to have ground floor retail services, retain restaurants on the ground floor of all those buildings – the kinds of retail that will have openings on the street, activities that spill out, outdoor seating on the sidewalks. I'll come back to some of the retail concepts in a second. As you can see we're proposing a courtyard here. Buildings 2 through 5 create the 4 edges of a courtyard. I'll show you some renderings of this. The idea is to create a place that can serve multiple purposes or maybe even larger events. That's basically the conceptual plan we have right now. This represents about a million square feet. To put it in perspective, I think the Koch center is 360 000 feet, so this represent 3 Koch centers. I'm going to show you a series of renderings, sort of before and after images. I should preface this by saying we are in the very early stages where we need to get entitlements first and get to specific uses in the building. This is to give people a sense of what the potential might be for this area; we have to take pen and paper and draw things. I think the renderings you'll see are artists' rendering.

This is a view looking down Main St. Legal Sea Foods is on the left. This is where the Cambridge Trust Bank and MIT Price buildings are. This is a view today; and this is a conceptual view of what it might look like. There are a couple principles here. One is we want the ground floors of what we're proposing to be active retail uses. We don't want uses that are blank walls. We want uses that are actually activities that create a dynamic street age. We want those uses to be at ground level. For example, the MIT Price Building: you kind of have to go up these stairs into the building on the side. Even though it's a good bookstore, we want that retail to really engage the students.



We want to create the opportunities for different characters and facades. We want to create the variety so each retailer has their own identity. That makes it more interesting; that's another concept we're trying to establish.

The 3rd one is to establish a sale at the street edge that is a couple stories. Your experience is a lower scale building; the larger mass is a bit back from the street so you don't have the impact. That also sort of helps. Those are some basic principles we're working with – and activities that spill out on the street. We want to have retail restaurants by engaging the street and having stuff spill out onto the sidewalks. This is a view a little bit further down. The Longfellow Bridge is down here. You're looking partially into the courtyard. This is the place we're proposing to reconfigure. Two story retail element with different characters, potential for activities to spill out, and even some terraces where activities can spill back and really create some activity into the plaza. This is the current front door to mit; if you get off the T, this is what you're presented with. It's not particularly friendly. The Price Building, with a raised lower floor...you don't engage the city. This was done in '95; not very friendly. This is the view of what it could look like. There are a couple principles I'll describe. This is configured so that the T that would be integrated into the building. It needs to be a little more transparent, maybe have newsstands, really something that really engages the public realm. A critical dimension here: right now we're looking at 75-80 feet; we're trying to create a scale of a courtyard that is small enough that where there are not that many people there it doesn't feel empty, but big enough that you still have a couple people there. It still feels lively. Whatever retail you have here has to be close enough to what's on the street. You can kind of see what's going to be on the street.

We show you the screen here on the building that's sort of set back from Main St. This is an idea. We show you guys the screen here. Who knows: by the time we get to build these things, who knows that that technology will be. The idea is to have something in the space that can have updates: where is Hockfield speaking today, what is happening at X, what cool research is happening at mit. Within that 5 minute radius walk of campus, there are some really amazing companies doing some really amazing things; but if you stand right there you have no idea what that is. You can really celebrate what's great about MIT, what's great about Kendall Square and MIT as a whole. There are opportunities to have things like the World Cup on these things to draw people. You bring them in and it activates the space and gets people to be here. We want to create a more activate and dynamic Kendall square. These are some ideas we're trying to play around with to try and create these kinds of things. There are some basic concepts, and we also looked at couple renderings. What I might look at is night and winter environments. One of the things we have to be careful of: we want to makes sure whatever we do here works at day and night, not just for those quick sunny days.

This is an area perspective. That's Main St, the Koch Center, etc.; this is what it might look like. The proposal it might have on the table. There is a small building here, a couple of larger buildings there, a lower building at the end, another building there, etc. One last thing: what we're trying to do with the retail service is multifold. One is we want to create the kind of uses and activities here that bring people to this space, whether its students, faculty, or the staff employees of MIT, 40000 employees within a walk of the square. We want people to linger in Kendall Square and engage. Food is obviously important; restaurants that cater to both ends of uses: both at high end (so if your professor X is having a business meeting, right now, the only option is Legal Sea Foods) and the lower end, to have a 24/7 diner. We're trying to give a range to engage the kind of footprint we have. Some of those things that have a daily



thing that people need are good as well. Maybe some of that good utilization of space. That's a big overview of where we are.

Where we are right now, we are, in the next month or so, by the end of this semester in December, we expect to finish around sharing this sort of the same basic images and plans with multiple groups of people internal and external to MIT. The plan is to solicit all the important factors and factor it into the proposal. Then, we can file for a zoning change in the city some time in the winter depending on how much you guys can get. In terms of the overall schedule, this is basically the process we go through for the city. What kind of uses can you put in there? The next step is when you get down to the specific details, where you get into the design of the building. Then, you get into the specific uses. What kind of restaurant? In terms of the kind of uses, there's going to be plenty of time for input.

Steve: The fundamental question we're trying to ask: the material you have here is the same thing that everyone is seeing. Everyone is seeing the same exact presentation. Is this initiative worth pursuing? That's fundamentally what we're looking at. Today, we think Kendall square is undeserving, and the city, it's not a recognized place. I think the initiative here we're trying to do is to create a place here consistent with MIT's mission. That's a key question we have for you; we're happy to take questions.

Betsy: I think this is definitely worth pursuing. The people I've talked to, they're not really happy. I had one question about how specifically one could get from the Infinite Corridor through Kendall Square. Right now, going through Kendall Square is less than ideal. I couldn't catch what that step is.

Steve: We have to do something physically to open up the doors to have a porous environment, but we'll recognize it as other people have made this a comment. We have to figure that out, we clearly want that to be an environment. We like MIT to be fairly welcoming to our surrounding environment. We want this place to be an area where the community feels comfortable. We want the MIT population to be using it. To make it porous I think makes it more successful; there are probably 10000 reasons. My sense is that's a detail we can probably address.

Adam: The plan that you presented makes Kendall Square really active and vibrant. I didn't see a whole lot that makes a pedestrian corridor from Medical onto E51 and E53.

Michael: We're also considering, let me get to the plan. The intent would be in between building 3-5 and 6 are what we're talking about as a new pedestrian corridor. It would pick up where the end of the Medical building is. We are thinking of it more as providing another alternative for people

Steve: We actually figured if we took the fence down that would have helped. People have talked about if we can create art stuff; there's some really cool stuff. So, formalizing that, we think is a good start; we can find a way to landscape and make it a heck of a lot more effective.

Plaz: What's the deal of having that be indoors vs. outdoors? The Infinite Corridor was originally indoors. Then, it takes a bend and it goes into 16 and 66, then outside through the media lab courtyard. Does anyone think the Infinite Corridor should be indoors? Maybe indoors in the basement?

Shuang: Winter's cold, right? So...

Alex J: that kind of just brings to mind a question; would these buildings be things you want to connect to MIT in the tunnel system?

Steve: That's a good question. In general, we're in a level of detail. We're thinking about loading and parking. We'll have underground parking garages; how could they connect to adjacent buildings? We



haven't done enough research where we'll end up, etc. We'll find more of that out, more opportunities and more constraints around that way. They're trying to activate streets as well; that's a point of view that will be discussed in the city. We're talking about things like a courtyard that will be partially closed. We're trying to deal with the open space issues. We're making it functional; we're wrestling with some of those ideas.

Owen: One of the renderings, it was kind of unclear Main St. is traffic or pedestrian only.

Steve: We think it has to be vehicular. Cambridge has done a good job with traffic calming; we think it should be two ways here and should be slower than now. We think it's important for the visibility. We want to be like more of an urban district. It may be able to take place from the end of one side of Main St. down by the clock tower all the way down to Legal Sea Foods. You might want to shut the area off, and that can be done in collection with other landowners. We want to make it still useful because it's another vehicular pathway.

Kathy: I was wondering, is this all going to be financed by MIT?

Steve: It may be both. We're certainly be assembling capital; it won't be 100% an MIT investment. How we do it at the end of the day...we have a history of doing everything from ground leases to joint to equity. It could be a compilation of all of those depending on our opportunity set. It's a lot of variables, and it will leave our options open.

Kathy: What is the interest level of outside investors?

Steve: Fair amount of interest in general. Cambridge has become, you know, today it's a traditional environment in terms of attracting capital. There are a fair amount of other companies. My sense is there won't be a lack of interest. It will depend on the final scope and schedule; conceptually this will be something we'll track.

Tim J: One of the things I've gotten is, when you get out of the T stop, if you're not an MIT student, you're not kind of sure where MIT is at. 77, it's obvious that that's MIT. It might be because MIT Medical has the back to the T stop. That build makes it really difficult to have another entrance. I think that's something that, if tourists come off the stop: oh, I'm at MIT where all the great stuff is coming. The retail on the first floor is excellent. That's another thing I've gotten a lot of feedback from. With that, the student center shuts down at like 10 pm. People working at labs...we don't shut down at 10 pm. I'm sure you've gotten this before, but a lot of late night options before midnight, 1 am – 2 am, would definitely find a lot of uses. People coming out of labs would like to hang out.

Steve: My office is right there in the clock tower building. I'm telling someone where MIT is all the time, whether it's a prospective student or not. It may just be tourists coming in; it might just be they put a foot in campus and have no clue what it is. We've talked a lot about imagery, and some of this stuff is sort of conceptual with scale. A dome, that a gateway. The notion is right on. We need some identity that is what is MIT. We want it to feel like it's going to be cool and edgy. I'm sure we have the right people around the table. It's not just MIT; we're looking for better stuff in all of Kendall Square.

Will: I'm a senator and the space planning chair. I think it's wonderful, but you were talking about retail on the first floor; what about for the upper stories?

Steve: Second stories...every retail we want, they want to have two steps; everywhere we have two steps on the building, the retail fails. They want to meander down the streets and window shop. The upper



spaces...there may be some opportunity. The back building, retail service space throughout the whole building there. Depending on the uses; it might be a couple of stories, but we're trying to figure out how to make that work. The rest of the stuff we'd like to be office. We want to try and create something that's a little bit more like what Harvard used to be and David Square. It's got to be enterprise; it's got to be Cambridge; it's got to be something unique. We've recognized what we really need to do here is trying to finance that kind of retail. We have to do this, so it sort of stands on its own two feet.

Will: The second thing is, East Campus and Senior House are close dorms. There are people that want to be around on Main St.; if there's a way that there's a building that has student use near that space, that will encourage late night students in general. That will help improve the image.

Steve: It's funny. Part of that is thinking about things like that. We've talked about a student perspective, via perspective. What if they walk around with backpacks? What about lockers? What about a rule that students can come in and make their sales pitch? Those are all great concepts we'll try and factor in.

Betsy: I was wondering if you have any plans for cycling.

Michael: I think that it's something that MIT is very serious about, in terms of what you've probably noticed on bike stations on campus now. So, cycling is obviously something the city is very concerned about. We haven't quite figured out exactly what we're going to do and how we're going to do it, but I think supporting public transporting, supporting walking and cycling...there will be appropriate facilities here to meet the demand and attract people.

Steve: It's part of the culture of Cambridge, given that we're developing something on the T. We've got to factor in biking, walking, driving T buses, the details we haven't had. We've met with the MTBA the other day; we've met with the city. Those topics are on the table.

Betsy: One of the things that I've gotten a lot of support about is a grocery store. I know that in Harvard Square there is an organically prepared food grocery store. 24 hour food options would be really popular. Also, non-chain retail would be nice.

Steve: Those are helpful. We've talked about urban; smaller; 5000 square feet. Some of these big chain stores are 50000. I think we're thinking about something that will provide services on the way home from work. That works probably pretty well here. Some different concepts. I don't know how viable some of those are; we'll try and figure out some component of that.

Adam: For the lab and office space, what's your target on what is MIT and what is revenue?

Steve: This is planned as essentially 100% revenue making. MIT's academic ambitions are behind this in the future. That doesn't say MIT might not lease space here; as they ramp up the program, they may build a new building. MIT leases space I think in the 60s for around 30 yrs. That's a decision they'll make on procurement. They may be part of this, but they may not be a part of this.

Adam: So, it's sort of targeted. Ok.

Allan: You've geared it off so far towards people that are here. Do you have plans for tourists; are you planning on trying to attract them or not attract them?

Steve: We're struggling to figure out how some of this will work. We're wrestling with how to maintain some semblance of "this is MIT" and how to make something that's cool and attractive but still MIT. I think what we're trying to do is we're trying to have a fair offering. We'll want a place where people can, if we can create enough of that. We think we can create a place that people will go to. We're only a short



walk over the bridge from Boston. We're near the residential neighborhoods. We hope that those people will come here.

Alex J: I'm just going to sort of list some recommendations, just to give you a sense of what people were saying. A grocery store or Trader Joe's was requested; a liquor store was also requested, a coffee shop, boutique shops, things that aren't chains...people also asked, there are also kind of two questions that came up. One is the ability to traverse to certain areas. One person said there were a lot of buildings in between Sloan and getting on Main St. You have to walk around 3 buildings. If you did build more buildings, how accessible would it be through the ground floors? Are we going to make changes to existing ones so people can walk through them? Then another person asked about if there was the possibility of building a residence, either commercially or a dorm style. I'll let you guys answer that question but that was brought up.

Steve: I think in general, a grocery store we talked about. I don't think our plan is to have a big Stop and Shop. Frankly, we don't know it will drive traffic; it will also kind of create place.

Alex J: I think the Trader Joe's on Boylston...it's like the basement floor of a building, but every time you go there, people are always shopping.

Steve: Liquor store, wine store...we'll be looking to do something like that. Coffee shop, absolutely. Boutiques, this isn't going to be competition for Cambridge Side Galleria. It's going to be a little funky to revitalize itself. We're thinking about 10 small boxes. We can have people rotate them. The really strong survive and stay, and we replenish. Accessibility through the buildings; clearly what we're trying to do here is kind of start of a little bit on a Master Plan; there may be some other improvements. It makes to get from Sloan to campus; it should make it easy to wander over. Hopefully, we can make sense of all of those. We seem to have some sort of residential idea, whether housing or not. How much of it is something we're wrestling with. I think the suggestions are great, and we can use as many of those as you can come up with.

Jonté: I'll take one last question

Janet: How receptive do you think Cambridge will be, and how easy will it be for the zoning petition to be passed?

Steve: They all start with: they hate how it's like today, and they'd like to see it revitalized. This is big; this is complicated. Every one of these things needs to be addressed. I started this with: it has to meet a couple principles. It has to meet MIT gateway; it has to be good urban design. It has to be viable; at the end of the day, we'll try and package all the stuff, and if it doesn't work, we'll end up with what we have now. We'll need to take risks; we need to be bold. We need to ask for things, and there will be a lot of discussion on that. That's a big initiative. We want to get it right; we'd like to have something happen sooner rather than later. If it takes longer to get it right, then we'll take longer to get it right.

Michael: In terms of feedback, we're early in the process. We're always looking on feedback. If you have ideas, it's great to have this kind of retail. You can send an email to kendallsquare@mit.edu, if you have similar ideas. You can send to that email address. We're collecting as much information as we can now to get as much information as possible. Please send us as much as you can.

Recess Begins: 8:30 pm, Recess Ends: 8:38 pm



2. Opening Remarks

Jonté: This is our next to last meeting of the semester. A lot of people have had constituency events. There's still a few more weeks left if you haven't started. Please take the opportunity. I think probably later on this week, I'll be sending out a senator self-evaluation, so you can look back this semester and see how you did. I'm getting a lot of smiles; I don't know why. It's also good for us so we can figure out how we're doing as offices of senate and the UA. I'll get more information on that to you guys later on. Other than that, I said it is non-voting, but we are going to take amendments to the budget tonight. That's all I have right now.

3. Exec Update

Sammi: So, a very important part of the Exec update: the advisory committee is meeting on Thursday from 8:45 to 9:15 for senators and from 9:15 to 9:45 for committee chairs. You guys should all come unless you have class, and tell us that there's an excuse if you don't. It's an opportunity to meet cool people, many of whom have been mentioned here. It includes faculty members, including the faculty-chair elect, a corporation member, some alumni, and an administrator. There are some really awesome people, and you should come meet them and talk about how your experience has been thus far – what things you think are working and what has not been working. They help us improve.

Will: Do you have the location?

Sammi: Here and there will be food. We have also been working on moving registration online, and the people who are designing the interface and coding are ready to get students involved in the process. Anybody who did this would be looking at different interfaces: do we think this makes sense; do we think there should be something else that goes here? That would be useful. Let me know if you would be interested. We'd like a group of 2-5 students. They're interested in what you guys would think. They'll make the design if possible in order to implement it. Also, Hawkins is here, Richard is here, and Riley is not here. You guys need to send enrollment reports.

Will: And me also.

Sammi: Yes, I forgot, and you also. You guys need to do that. I think that's everybody with the exception of David who already sent his. And midterm reviews for committee chairs: we've already begun to schedule that. Senate, you'll see that a week from today at the Senate meeting.

4. Discussion of the Spring 2011 Operating Budget

Jonté: The big item tonight is the Spring 2011 operating budget not 2010. The special senate budgetary committee looked over a few things. We didn't change many things. Some people pointed out things. Some other items we looked at and amended before we came here. I think we'll go ahead and get started. Oh, important point, Ellen's not here right now because she has a commitment for class.

Vrajesh: So, I can present and take questions. By in large, this budget is created with a similar approach as the one that was created for that semester, as those of you who looked at it saw. There were a few changes. I guess, why don't I start with some of the ones that had a larger impact in terms of dollars and then we can go to line items. One of the changes is the change in the overallocation from 30% to 40%. I met with Kerri and essentially she was fine with that number. It was based on 2009 information where



basically the information she pulled up seemed to suggest that student groups spend an amount such that 30% and 40% basically gets you to the target.

Alex D: My copy says 50%.

Vrajesh: This was changed by SBC. It met the meeting before this.

Jessica: Can we get a copy?

Tim J: I'll send it to senate-members. It should be in your inboxes.

Vrajesh: Other than that, changes were, if you can scroll up a little bit...one of the larger changes we're adding in...we'd like to highlight student alumni dinners, similar to student-faculty dinners. We added \$5000 as a pilot program for 50 dinners in the spring. If that goes well and is successful, then we should provide additional funding for that in the future. I think Ellen was saying somewhere around \$8000 we allocated to students has already been spent. In general, we're going quite a bit better than in the past. I can run through all the numbers, but is there any particular area?

Tim R: It looks like the Princeton Review number is missing.

Vrajesh: It's not so much gone, but they haven't sent in the second set of requests yet. We don't know how much we're going to get from that. We could've put in an estimate.

Tim R: Then, if you do get a similar amount of money, would it go to student groups?

Vrajesh: Yeah, I think so.

Alex D: I think it would be reasonable to reduce the \$40000 withdrawal from the reserve.

Owen: 50 dinners, does that seem reasonable?

Vrajesh: We allocated similar to student-faculty dinners; it's about 100 a dinner because there are about 5 people.

Owen: How will the alumni be identified?

Ashley: What do you mean identified.

Owen: How will you decide which alumni are eligible?

Ashley: The idea is to establish a bottom line. This year it might be like 2007, and then it might move ahead. It should be someone you haven't been living with for the past two years.

Vrajesh: I think someone who would've been a recent graduate doesn't really qualify as an alumni.

I think perhaps the best way to go forward would be to just look at the details. I don't think there's anything else that jumps out. Operating is more or less the same of what it was in the fall. Exec is also more or less what it was in the fall. We reduced the amount of money for Chief of Staff. We really didn't know how much money gets spent, because that was a brand new position. At this point we have a better idea. I think we allocated somewhere around \$3000 in the fall. I can tell you how much was spent. I personally had wanted to see more outreach. It think that number we picked into eh fall was probably too high, so it's been lowered.

For VP of Resource Development, it's the same. We're going to continue running Trader Joe's and Whole Foods shuttles.

Alex D: For Chief of Staff, it was \$1980.



Vrajesh: It's about a third. I think that's something we'll work on. If that's too little, it will be supplemented with Exec discretionary.

Alex D: So you have down 65 reps at \$10 a person for \$650 total. Is the expectation Alex will be paying for herself?

Alex J: That was kind of generous estimate. I'm actually think that's fine, as we sort of will be slightly less than \$10 a person. I don't think that is going to be a problem.

Vrajesh: I'll also say for that particular line, I think we've had a number of really productive meetings. I don't think the whole process is down to an algorithm. I'll put that as something we're still working out. We don't have an exact estimate.

For Senate, I think it's pretty much the same. From the version you saw, we added 3 more pre-senate admin dinners at the request of the speaker or maybe Alec; someone said we should be more optimistic. We increased it to \$240 for mentor dinners. I'm not quite sure of the reasoning.

Jonté: Essentially a mentor is going to be meeting with mentees multiple times.

Vrajesh: As far as the senate constituency fund, we decided in SBC...we've decided to reduce it to 15, and its \$150 each. If more people are close, then Jonté will request more funds. I completely support anything that happens; I think communication is a very important part of what we do. I think we realized this semester that 100% utilization is not realistic. It didn't make sense to tie up money beforehand,

Allan: Is this because people haven't been having a lot of constituency events?

Vrajesh: That \$2250 is from receipts; it's from an estimation.

Jonté: I think the number of people is much closer to 15 this semester. If we get more participation, it will warrant the extra time it would take to have more funds.

Tim J: What would the procedure be? Would that come out of Senate discretionary?

Vrajesh: I think a senate bill needs to be written to allocate additional money.

Alex D: I think it would be reasonable to attach a note saying the estimate amount is \$2250 and the cap of spending is \$4500.

Vrajesh: I would be hesitant to even set such a cap. I actually completely support spending more if it's been used effectively if it's toward to goal of communication. If everyone's spending \$150 efficiently, I don't see why we shouldn't be spending more. I wouldn't add the cap, but I think it's reasonable to say we're willing to fund something more.

Alex D: I don't want to see a blank check.

Vrajesh: It's a not a blank check; it's \$2250.

Alex D: I think it's the potential. We could modify the budget saying we're putting in the figure of \$2250, but that increasing it up to \$4500 is preapproved and does not require additional procedure.

Jonté: I'm not sure how to respond to that.

Almas: What's the problem with more than 15 people?



Alex D: I think there isn't one. I think expecting all 30 people to spend \$150 is foolish and not going to happen, so tying up \$4500 for that is foolish. It also seems to set a lower cap, but it seems foolish to over think the bill if it will go sort of over that lower cap. I think it would be appropriate to add that note.

Jonté: Where would the funding come for that?

Alex D: A pre-approved senate fund.

Vrajesh: Any other question on the Senate Constituency line? I don't want to go into the details of ASA. I'm confident this is what they're spending based on history. Athletics is just meeting food. One thing I'll point out in committee food, it seems pretty consistent among committees.

In communications, we've added a couple of extra midnight study breaks. We've also increased the amount of money that we're allocating to each one. The turnout was enough that we should allocate enough money for these in case it turns out to be a very positive thing. We did collect a lot of feedback, I think it was a good feedback.

Alex D: What was the feedback?

Vrajesh: Janet and I looked at it. The relevant committees got it.

Janet: Just a note, you guys didn't change the subtotals but changed the relevant numbers.

Vrajesh: Okay I'll change that; that should be changed. Likewise with community conversations, which we lowered from 5 to 3. I'm guessing it's not just a matter of refreshing the street. On history it's pretty straightforward. Housing, you can talk about it, but I think the idea is that you would be meeting with RACs and wanted food for those meetings. As many of you know we've revitalized the housing committee; it's kind of different committee, and we're trying to find out what its role is at MIT. Hopefully we'll see some cool things come out of there over the next semester. Nominations is pretty straightforward. Space Planning is straightforward.

CSL, one difference is during the spring is Wellness Week. I don't know if...oh, Richard is here. I know a couple of line items were removed between when you submitted this budget and what's here. I don't know if that's something Senate should figure out or something that should get funded afterwards. The other things that were added in were the Boston daytime shuttle on weekends. At least tentatively, we'd like to work with IFC on this. I think they have a meeting tomorrow, so we'll have a more definitive answer by the time we work on the budget next week.

Richard: We did see a strong positive responses, I think there as a very strong demand for the shuttle, since IFC is willing to cosponsor it. We'll work on that. One of those, community service TBD. I will come next Senate Meeting with an amendment to change the TBD. Otherwise, that number will be a 0.

Vrajesh: Sustainability is pretty straightforward. ElecComm, they have funding for that. Events Committee as usual operates somewhat autonomously. FinBoard has one additional meeting. To take a step back, one thing where I, Ellen, Sammi, and Cynthia are currently working on is taking a look at FinBoard and what changes are beneficial to student groups, what changes will help allocate the appropriate amount of money. It think one of the suggestions, which we're willing to try out this upcoming semester, is this idea of having two cycles instead of just one cycles, which is why there's two of these allocation meetings instead of just one. The other thing I should add is another on FinBoard: I might bring legislation to senate next week to create and ad hoc committee over IAP to take a look at FinBoard. If that's the case, I'll certainly be interested in Senate input. If that's something you're already



interested in, get in touch with Jonté. That way, we'll have an idea of who wants to be on the ad hoc committee.

Allan: Going back to sustainability, are they not planning on doing anything? Do they not have anything in the works for the spring semester? I know the light bulbs were funded as a grant.

Some confusion about the budget

Vrajesh: So they are helping with Recycle Mania.

Allan: With FinBoard, I'm not opposed to it, the overallocation, but does this mean we're spending more money? I understand the purpose of this overallocation percentage.

Vrajesh: We allocate a certain amount for student groups; the student groups don't always spend all that we allocated. They spend a fraction of that. We allocate more than that, so when they actually spend the certain number its back where we want to spend.

Allan: So FinBoard will still be allocating. Are there going to be new guidelines?

Vrajesh: What I can say is I'm very interested in looking at the process. I want to create an ad hoc committee. From what can I see at first glance, I think it makes sense to revisit some of those policies.

Jessica: I was going to ask, for Boston Daytime on weekends, is it for sure happening? What happens if it doesn't happen?

Vrajesh: This is conditional on hearing back from IFC. If I hear back from them that they don't want to cosponsor it, I guess that a decision Senate has to make. Currently this is who we think we're going to end up paying the cost with, but it's not finalized.

Richard: I will say IFC is all but 100% committed to it. They want to split it with Senate. They'll want to do this.

Vrajesh: As I currently understand it, there's nothing in writing. From my side, a very strong verbal commitment means 0. I shouldn't say 0, just like epsilon.

I guess the last points were, SCEP is kind of business as usual. I think they requested a lot of money compared to some of the other committees for food. I don't know, that's something you guys can take a look at. Other than that, I don't see anything in particular. Oh, the printing committee, it's kind of a new. It's an ad hoc committee; we've added \$50 for publicity.

Alex J: Sorry I might have missed it, was NomComm up there? Oh okay; alright, thanks.

Rachel M: For SCEP, do we know how much of that was this semester? I know there was a transition inadvertently attached to the file.

Ellen: What was the question? How much did SCEP spend last semester? What I have right now is \$300; I just know that from the few receipts.

Janet: For resource development, is there no plan for a Target shuttle?

Vrajesh: I know we decided not to put it in a budget. I think the reasoning is that Diana and Richard were considering some sort way of getting Target/Costco to fund it?

Richard: Both.

Vrajesh: So, we didn't budget.



Richard: What's likely going to happen is they are going to want to split it with us. If that's the case, we may come to you next semester.

Vrajesh: I don't think I've left anything out. I guess to reiterate, total spending is about the same. We're trying to keep it steady from the fall to the spring which involves withdrawing a certain amount.

Tim J: How much is left in the reserve?

Ellen: \$112000. It's currently at \$82000. I think we'll have about \$25000 that's unspent. If we add that back that's \$107000. There's something we'll talk about later in the meeting.

Vrajesh: I think something I'm actually happy with. This particular semester we haven't added more to the reserves based on Ellen's projection; we've kept it approximately steady.

Almas: Can you go back to the alumni relations? I have a question about...how many students are expected? How many dinners do you expect to have?

Vrajesh: We expect 50 dinners with 5 students. 4-5 students each, we estimate about \$100 which is what we estimate for student faculty dinners. I imagine, although we haven't come up with the specific policies, it will be similar to student faculty dinners.

Almas: What happens if there's no demand?

Vrajesh: Then, it won't happen in the fall.

Rachel M: It's not like they're going to spend \$5000.

Vrajesh: The policy hasn't been set, but it's been modeled off of student faculty dinners which are pretty successful. Any other questions?

Alex D: Do you guys have a sense of how much the various committees are spending verses how much they were budgeted?

Vrajesh: So, as we said, we have an excess of 25000. This budget reflects that. If you go back to the overview page, the budget for the number of committees has been updated to bring those two numbers more to alignment.

Alex D: I would like to see more. I don't really want to go through all the transactions, but I would like to see a summarized version by line item. That was available from last years' information online. Is that something you guys think you can provide us with?

Vrajesh: I don't think it can be provided next meeting, but I think sits a reasonable thing to ask for after finals.

Alex D: I would be interested in even a preliminary estimate.

Vrajesh: I think there's a value to it. If it doesn't happen by early IAP, please send a reminder, and we'll try to make it happen.

Ellen: Do you want overall what each committee spent overall?

Alex D: Yea, ideally it's a breakdown of per line item. If you go to the UA website and go look at reporting under budget, there's a web interface you can see for the spring semester on how much money got spent for each line item.

Vrajesh: I don't think there are any additional questions.



Jessica: What the committees don't spend, does it go into each committee's reserve?

Jonté: It just rolls back as far as I know. The question for the budget in Senate is, is there something you saw that shouldn't be there or is there something you didn't see in the budget that you think should be there? Think about that question over the next week, and please bring forth an amendment or start a discussion next week.

Alex D: Have we seen anything on Fresh Fund?

Ellen: No.

Rachel M: We'll have Fresh Fund things later.

Alex D: I move to amend senate discretionary to \$5000.

Vrajesh: Originally the previous version did set that amount at 5000; the Senate special budgetary meeting, at the request of the Senate Speaker, decided to raise the amount to \$7500. I guess there's a hope that more senators will use those resources this upcoming semester.

Jonté: I'll respond to that real quick. I think the reason we have that is Senate, as a body, as the money funding organization on campus for undergrads, should have a commitment to undergraduates in funding projects and initiatives. I don't feel like decreasing the amount to the extent that we are by lowering to \$5000 was consistent that level of commitment. I think we saw, it's been added to the spring budget as a separate line item, but I think we were going to have the Boston Daytime Shuttle come out of Senate Discretionary. I think that's an appropriate use.

Ellen: But it's not coming out of Senate Discretionary.

Jonté: I just said that. My personal opinion, then I'll sit down and be impartial again. I feel as though we can't tax that too much. As far as I see it, it doesn't hurt and only helps to have that money available. Then, we don't have to go through the extended effort of withdrawing from the reserve.

Allan: Historically, what kind of things would this fund fund? Is this something that senators should bring to the table or is this a group coming to us?

Alex D: I think that is something that Senate should be taking initiative and doing. Groups usually should go to FinBoard. From a report last year, the FPRC Report, they had recommendations of what should be used for senate discretionary. The quote is here: "In light of the above, the FPRC recommends that Senate Discretionary Fund focus on funding the following: - Unique requests from students or student groups that do not meet FinBoard regulations but either: 1. Benefit a large portion of the entire undergraduate student body, 2. Promote the positive image of MIT students in the broader world; - Unforeseeable events or initiatives run by student groups; - Undergraduate Association committees' new initiatives; - Changes in Undergraduate Association committees' budgetary needs." An example of that was, I think 1.5 years ago, there was a big uproar concerning Iranian elections, and the group came to us for funding that was unforeseeable. They were presenting the budget, and they had no idea this was going to happen.

Allan: And, we haven't spent any of this? I almost feel like cutting it wouldn't be fixing the problem. I think fixing it would be finding a way to utilize the money. Mind you, not just, throwing it away.



Almas: I'd like to agree with that. I think reducing this is a very bad thing to do. Our job as Senate is to respond to the needs of the undergraduates. If we don't have money waiting for unforeseeable things, then this would reduce the purpose of the Senate.

Alex D: First of all, \$5000 is not a fair way away from unforeseeable needs. The Senate Discretionary Fund is not the only amount of money we have for unforeseeable things. We have the undergraduate reserve. I think there's a requirement for a 2/3 vote and maybe also there may be another requirement related to notice/tabling. (Note: Later it was found that there is no such requirement.) It's certainly not something that totally impossible to get. Third of all, by allocating money towards Senate Discretionary fund which doesn't get spent...that's directly taking away money from FinBoard's pool that could be allocated. Given the increased withdrawal from reserve and overallocation, I'm not actually sure that FinBoard is institutionally capable of allocating all the money, so that complain is less important in my mind.

Will: Two points: talking about use of discretionary, I think one of that major needs constituents is dining and housing. If you can think of any way to address it, that would be good. The motion at the table has been talked to ad nauseam. Can I move to end discussion/call the question?

Amendment does not pass.

Vrajesh: I move to close discussion on the budget.

Discussion is closed.

5. Discussion

Vrajesh: I move to suspend the bylaws to consider 42 U.A.S. SB2.1.

Bylaws suspended.

6. 42 U.A.S. SB2.1: Bill to Revise FinBoard Funding and Allocations for Spring 2011

Vrajesh: ***Reads bill*** So, as you all just saw, we're considering a number of changes. One such change is dividing allocation into two separate rounds. As far as I'm aware, there's currently no policy or guidance. There's nothing on how to divide that out. The money that we allocate at the first meeting is the money that will get spent this spring. As we recently heard, we've also had an excess of dollars. What we're proposing to do is to take that money and put that towards the appeals from the first round Spring 1, put that number towards the appeals. That number was about \$28,000. The second part of the legislation provides some guidance to FinBoard on who to approach doing those allocations. The 75% of the money we allocated should be allocated this Friday, and the remaining 25% can wait for the second part. I can try to explaining the 75% and 25%, but those are arbitrary at least to seem effect. I think the perspective is that, first of all, a lot more people would be applying under the assumption that this will be one large cycle. I don't think there's a lot of publicity at this point for the whole round 1, round 2. I there might be some provision made to kind of allow them to transition. If someone hasn't done that, know that they will be applying for two cycles. Those details have to be finalized. The reason why you don't do 50-50 is because you might end up with more unallocated at the end. Therefore, you make the first part bigger.

Alex D: Have you talked about Kerri in SAO?



Vrajesh: I mentioned it earlier today. She had reservations, but at this point, from my conversation with Cynthia and other people, I think its fine.

Alex D: Did Kerri have any logistical reservation about how SAO can do their normal distribution and enforcement? SAO is usually responsible for processing.

Vrajesh: her reservations weren't about vouchers. One of those reservation was about committing time for allocations. I didn't think that an SAO presence was required at FinBoard allocations.

Alex D: No, but it's very helpful.

Vrajesh: Yes, but not necessary.

Alex D: I would be more reserved to do so, if Kerri felt like it's easier to do just one.

Vrajesh: I don't want to have to figure out the entire FinBoard allocation at Senate right now. That something a committee needs to do. The rest of the process in its current state doesn't need two rounds. I think the whole thing needs to be reexamined. I want to try this semester, but I think enough people are in support of this deal.

Jessica: When they say that Spring I will be covering January and February, does that mean when student groups write their budgets, they're only taking into account what they're spending in those two months?

Vrajesh: I think there's some confusion, but applications...

Rachel M: Applications have been submitted.

Vrajesh: There will be some confusion.

Rachel M: I think it's actually Jan, Feb, and Mar and Apr and May as the two periods.

Vrajesh: I move to amend the legislation to reflect that.

Amendment passes without objection.

Alex D: I move to add roughly before 75% and 25%.

Amendment passes without objection.

Rachel M: First question, are you planning on passing this tonight?

Vrajesh: I wanted to, yes.

Rachel M: Are you planning on having unspent money return to FinBoard? Then, how are you going to deal with groups that get their whole semester allocation?

Vrajesh: I don't know the logistical answer; I don't know the answer to that.

Rachel M: I feel like at this point it hasn't been publicized enough. I haven't looked at the applications for all the groups that I'd apply for. All the groups I know haven't tacked out. My concerns will be there is some unfairness in groups that have already made their budgets. The separation only works for events in other categories.

Tim R: Will you be creating a bit of a subcommittees to hash out these other concerns?

Vrajesh: Yes.

Tim R: I think it's good we're going to be taking direct action, so I call the question.



Motion to close discussion fails.

Rachel M: My concern with forming a committee is FinBoard is meeting Friday. I don't think we can form a committee before then. I think this is guidance, and this isn't appropriate guidance.

Vrajesh: The 75% does allocate for that. We want them to allocate that on Friday.

Will: Hypothetically, could you have half of Senate go out and talk about it right now and have the rest stay at the meeting? It seems like Rachel is trying to work this out.

Jonté: Are you motioning to postpone this legislation definitely for 15 minutes...?

Tim R: I believe he's asking for a caucus.

Jonté: We're going to pretend there's motion to recess. We're going to discuss this, too. If you have a concern in one way please voice them.

Alex D: Seems reasonable to me.

Jonté: We're going to vote on a 5 minute recess.

Recess begins: 9:45 pm, Recess ends: 9:52 pm

Rachel M: I move to strike the final two that clauses and add that FinBoard be tasked to assessing the request compared to previous semesters and with regards to whether groups requested...

Alex D: I think roughly we're concerned we have no idea whatsoever between what sort of balance we're going to get between groups that saw the email and understand stuff versus what collection of groups didn't notice and didn't pay enough attention and went ahead and requested whatever they were going to request this semester. Groups that initially ignored it, and things they could get away with. The general idea is, instead of precisely specified percentages, we'll have FinBoard sit down and attempt to make some sort of compromise on what a reasonable separation is. Does that overall plan sound reasonable to everyone?

Ellen: I don't think that's possible for FinBoard in 4 days.

Some further confusion.

Will: Outside of the last two clauses, the rest of the bill is acceptable?

Alex D: I'm a little doubtful of the second clause.

Rachel M: According to someone on FinBoard, they weren't planning on doing appeals because they're already doing two allocations, and 4 meetings is a lot.

Jessica: Does FinBoard have to hold appeals?

Alex D: Give me a second.

Rachel: Why don't we move to have discussion first?

Motion to postpone definitely to after discussion passes.

7. Discussion

Allan: My committee had decided, rather than busting down all undergraduate doors, we're going to try and talk about this briefly and try and grasp some common answers here in Senate. So what I'm here to do is talk about a few questions. Some of them I guess might seem to have some obvious answers. First



off, there's a quota: 3000 pages per semester. If anyone has any big concerns, we've heard that only about 100 people go over it including faculty and students. If they do go over quota, IS&T hasn't decided yet. Will a charge occur? Will it be the cost per page, or some sort of penalty?

Betsy: My constituents think that a small fine is a good idea because people shouldn't be printing more than 3000. Something like 10 cents a page. Charging people mid-job would be something that they could do. It would be helpful if people could know what was printing in an accessible manner.

Hawkins: I think 3000 is a lot, if people do need to go over that, they should pay some price per page that would be equal to or greater than cost to IS&T. I don't think people should be; there should be an error message that something's going to make you go over quota.

Shuang: An email when you are past the 2000 or 2500 mark is fine.

Alex D: I think a warning is email is a reasonable substitute if an error message is hard.

Allan: Other commentary?

Tim J: My constituents really like the idea of integrating course notes.

Jessica: If there's going to be a quota, is there an issue with cancelling print jobs?

Allan: I have no idea how that will work. That's something good to look into. I don't know if it's something that can easily be done.

Alex D: In terms of cancelling print jobs before they start printing, that should be looked into.

Allan: Should we consider special cases for requirements – like a humanities class or a disability?

Betsy: When presented with the idea, people seem to be very okay for them to get extra paper. Figuring out how many classes come close to 3000 is difficult. Disabilities can be worked out by a case to case basis.

Hawkins: Since there are only 100 people, I don't think there are classes that constantly do that.

Alex J: I also think encouraging people to read electronically is not a bad thing.

Alex D: I would like to see some move for open note, open book, whatever to have open laptop.

Allan: That's probably way out of the scope of my job. I guess, for those of you that are in other students groups, would you be interested in having your own printer in your office, or would you like to have a group quota?

Betsy: They were definitely interested in having a separate quota for each group. People like an idea of having a printer in each group, but it is not necessary. It would be nice.

Almas: Are they going to be all changed? Are we going to get a bunch of new printers?

Allan: The printers we have now should be compatible with the new system.

Almas: In our dorm, we have only one old printer.

Allan: You might be one of the edge cases.

Almas: The majority of my constituents definitely want to up the plan and apply for one of them.

Allan: I think IS&T will be considering that.



Jessica: About the student group printings, are you guys expecting them to print like mass amount of something, and that's why they have a group quota?

Allan: For like he UA, if you want to print posters, that goes over quota.

Jessica: Don't they go through CopyTech?

Allan: The whole thing is like through CopyTech now.

Alex J: Like printing out senate binders shouldn't fit specifically under a person's quota.

Rachel M: If we have the CPW midway a Saturday afternoon, if we don't get the handouts to CopyTech on Friday, they need to come from somewhere. Second point, as far as quotas go, would this discourage groups from adding their own printers to networks? It wouldn't just discourage them ...

Allan: Like if you brought your own printer?

Rachel M: Right now, we'd set up our own printer as an Athena printer. If that's counting in our quota, will our quota only go to IS&T operated networks?

Allan: I think they can specify which printer gets which quota.

Alex D: There definitely is a concept of different classes of printers. That's used, for example, in the list of printers that are available when it contains only clusters and dorm printers.

Allan: I guess we should ask; it probably won't be a problem. Speaking of big printers, where would you like to see a high capacity printer, color printer, etc.?

Alex J: Fifth floor in the Student Center, and also somewhere more in the Main Campus, maybe in the Building 12 cluster.

Rachel M: Even the printer room in Building 11. I feel like a lot of people are printing and then coming away for jobs. That's sort of a convenient place. If you're heading to lecture, you can set up your printer job and pick it up on the way.

Betsy: It depends a lot on what we define as high capacity. People were thinking it takes like 30 seconds to print a job. It doesn't seem like that long. They would like one high capacity and one low capacity. If we define high capacity at over 120 pages, that might be a different story. For high capacity printers that are actually very large, can you go hold and release for that? If you go and stand there, if there were like 3 super high capacity printers, hold and release model would work. As for color printers, they might require a separate quota.

Allan: The themes I'm getting are that new printers are coming they don't have the budget to start planting things everywhere. We might get one or two. That brings me to the next question: separate quotas? Seems like a good idea unless someone opposes.

Will: I was wondering if the high capacity might be clogged by people spending a relatively small job.

Allan: What do we consider high capacity, and what would qualify? Should we limit what can be paired with what?

Hawkins: There's also a distinction to be made. I think you'll find that the HASS class will give you huge file, as far as 50 pages, which is a clean official .pdf.

Allan: It seems the general consensus is that large files should only be allowed to send to high capacity printers.



Hawkins: Either that, or there was an idea of smaller jobs trumping bigger jobs and skipping line. I think that's a good idea.

Allan: IS&T does want to do something with scanners. Would students prefer standalone devices or multifunction?

Betsy: People didn't like multifunction. They thought there would be a lot of clogging going around. There's definitely a desire for scanners and copiers. Multifunction printers, not so much.

Rachel M: We want a scanner and a printer, but it depends on what multifunction.

Allan: I think that's good with the new SAO policy.

Tim R: As a general policy, it's better if you find one thing that does one thing well than one thing that does everything kind of well.

Allan: So we talked about large files in high capacity. Are there any sort of features you'd like to see come online, such as printing stellar files and from mobile files?

Shuang: In regards to a scanner, being able to bring your own computer and having the driver automatically install and scan your own file would be nice.

Allan: IS&T is thinking about it, but not plugs in your own laptops. That's interesting, I'll bring it up.

Owen: As a counterpoint, I'd like it to fall under Athena too.

Allan: What are the ideas of CopyTech printing course packets but coming out of your quota? It would be essentially free.

Betsy: People like that idea.

Allan: I'm not sure anyone was really going to object. With this new hold and release model, would people prefer card swipe or Athena login? Would you prefer different types at different locations?

Shuang: I feel like everyone has their IDs with them, so card swipe is the way to go.

Alex J: If there's a keypad, you might as well add that in. You will probably always have ID, but if you don't, having some other way to get in would be nice. I don't know how much more it will cost.

Betsy: I think a keypad would be slow. The small increases in time would add up. I think maybe if one in the Student Center had a keypad instead, that would be enough of a backup.

Alex D: I think there would be value in having a couple, maybe 1 in 5 have a keypad. Then, you have more flexibility about what cluster to use. My experience involving having a keypad to scan or print...the keypads are really painfully slow.

Paul I would strongly encourage us to not have a password for the Athena account. That would, on a whole, drive people to shorten their Athena passwords, which would not be a general favorable thing to do.

Allan: Would you want a separate password?

Paul: I don't understand the problem. Are we afraid people will walk up ahead of you and print your job in front of you?

Betsy: It's also for quota purpose.

Paul: I wanted to know if we're doing kerberized printing anyway.



Tim J: ID numbers are generally quasi-private, too. You don't know peoples' numbers off hand.

Allan: What about jumping in line if you have like a one page job?

Betsy: I think it would be annoying if you're trying to print a large job relatively soon, and it keeps getting delayed.

Owen: Is the assumption that you would get an error or wouldn't get printer delayed, etc? If it's over 50 pages, you have less priority on this machine, or you print to a high-efficiency machine.

Allan: Alright, other comments?

Hawkins: I think the larger printer machines are supposed to be better and more cost effective.

Paul: I would be intrigued to know what we currently have as knowledge about print jobs. Do we have an estimate about the time it takes to print it? Do we actually have a page count? I don't care about the page count, I just care how long it's going to take. What information could we reasonably build restriction on? I think page count is actually difficult to get.

Allan: I'll bring up what is actually possible with the new system here.

Will: In terms of redirecting people, if people were told to redirect in terms of queues...

Allan: So, like some sort of features that lets you know where the queues are. How far do you go to print jobs? Do you normally print from your dorm rooms?

Betsy: Most people didn't like the idea of restricting the area that you could print to; people here like choice.

Allan: The motion as it stands, all the black and white printers will have one queue. The problem may arise in terms of usage that that becomes bogged down and slow, like maybe a student center black and white queue and maybe a campus one. If it's common for you to print at a dorm, and pick it up on the other side of campus, then...

Will: Could this be advertised?

Allan: Are you saying break it up to different sectors?

Will: I was going to say people can bring up a specific printer.

Almas: When you say print from your dorm room, do you think that it's to anywhere on the campus?

Allan: They haven't decided how to do that. I'm asking for just the physical location.

Hawkins: Remember the off campus people.

Rachel M: Yes I was going to say; how far do you have to go off campus.

Allan: They want to test run at an Athena cluster or dorms. If you would like to nominate your dorm, please send it to me. Anything else that would be good? Does anyone else have anything specific to me that we need to talk about?

8. 42 U.A.S. SB2.1: Bill to Revise FinBoard Funding and Allocations for Spring 2011 (Continued)

Rachel M: I sent the amended version. ***Reads amendment.***

Vrajesh: I call the question.



Motion to close discussion fails.

Alex D: Motion to amend: to swap points 3 and 4 and to replace “this” with “these.”

Amendment to the amendment passes.

Jonté: Okay, we’re back to main queue.

Alec: I call the question.

Amendment passes.

Alex D: Motion to amend the second to last clause to say “be put towards...spring 2011 allocations with a lowercase A.”

Amendment passes.

Jessica: So, does this still stand to have it be in two rounds? It’s just now it’s not signified how much is allocated.

Rachel M: I guess it was sort of unstated. If they do those 4 things, they should be able to sort of competently do that.

Jonté: What degree of oversight?

Vrajesh: The UA Treasurer sits on FinBoard.

Rachel M: Also, FinBoard is supposed to submit a written report with the final that clause.

Alex D: Motion to amend by adding a that clause, second to last that clause, that FinBoard allocate an appropriate amount during the spring I and spring II allocation cycle based on the above proportions.

Amendment passes.

Shuang: Call the question.

42 U.A.S. SB2.1 Legislation Passes

9. Discussion (Continued)

Hawkins: On housing and enrollment, yes, I was supposed to submit a report, but basically it says I haven’t gotten a straight answer. The general sense is we should fill it in gradually and preserve the identity of the Phoenix Group, making sure we don’t devastate other dorms. There is not concrete process yet.

The other thing, MIT online study group. Tonight, I’ll be sending you guys some ideas that the group has been looking at for online offerings that MIT students could do, anything from offering online bachelor degrees to doing some sort of certification. I would like your feedback. It’s very open ended at this point. I think the group is bringing some ideas to the faculty in December. What direction do you think we should take over the course of the next semester to figure out what we should actually do?

Will: I was asked to meet with the Committee on Student Life. They should have a meeting December 3rd.

Alex J: Yeah, they’re going to have meeting on dining.

Allan: Do we have discussion on the current state on dining?

Tim J: There’s an email from Colombo, you should read it.



Vrajesh: I think this is the first thing with specifics on what plans students outside can opt into.

Ellen: I think it's been made explicit. They can opt into anything.

Alex J: No, it's based on class year.

Vrajesh: I think you should read the documents by the Dean of Student Life. Step 1: Make sure you get informed and really understand the details. Please please do this as soon as possible because it's likely to become a topic of conversation. I would say the second step is to talk to you constituents, and I would encourage you to be a source of information but then also take the feedback that you get. This is maybe a good time to start using the ua-senate list. I think we need to do something in order to collect feedback on what the impact of this thing is. Sammi and I are working to collect information, too.

Owen: The survey that has been talked about has not gone out yet?

Vrajesh: I'm unaware of any survey that was sent out by this committee.

Allan: I did send you all the document, so.

Ellen: I have an announcement about reimbursements. I only have received receipts for two constituency events. I know more than two have happened. Please give them to me soon. The last possible day I'll process reimbursements is next Thursday, the last day of class. If you have reimbursements, please give them to me by next Thursday.

Vrajesh: Recently, Exec discussed dining as a discussion topic. I think one of the takeaways from that particular conversation is that the UA, me and Sammi, ought to take a slightly stronger position than what we're taking. If you have even slight opposition to this, please come and let us know. We want to also know any new ideas. You guys come up with policy, and Exec acts as a sounding board to help us implement it. If there's discontent, please let us know before we do it. That should happen.

Jonté: Are there any other topics of discussion?

6. Closing Remarks

Jonté: thank you guys for coming tonight. It's been kind of a long meeting, but I think with the guest speaker we had tonight, and the discussion we had on the budget, and the piece of legislation we had tonight, and the discussion on printing, this has been a rather productive meeting. I think we all have a lot of things to think about and a lot of things to come back to our constituents about. If you haven't submitted your receipts, please do it. If you haven't done an event, let's talk. Other than that, one more meeting...let's try to work on more things.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:42 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Alec Lai
UA Secretary General