



LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

Minutes of the special meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin: May 5, 1965. 1965

Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Board of Regents of the University of
Wisconsin System, 1965

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/RQYWOYGVMZFOA86>

Copyright 2008 Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System

The libraries provide public access to a wide range of material, including online exhibits, digitized collections, archival finding aids, our catalog, online articles, and a growing range of materials in many media.

When possible, we provide rights information in catalog records, finding aids, and other metadata that accompanies collections or items. However, it is always the user's obligation to evaluate copyright and rights issues in light of their own use.

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Held in the Main Conference Room, Chapman Hall
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee

Wednesday, May 5, 1965, 2:30 P.M.

President DeBardleben presiding

PRESENT: Regents DeBardleben, Friedrich, Greenquist, Nellen, Pasch, Rohde,
Steiger, and Werner.

ABSENT: Regents Gelatt and Rothwell

Regent DeBardleben reported that this was a special meeting of the Regents of the University of Wisconsin called for the purpose of hearing persons desiring to be heard on the matter of the long range campus plan of University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee, as tentatively adopted in principle by the Board of Regents at its meeting on April 9, 1965. He stated that he had before him a list of individuals who had indicated that they desired to be heard; that the number of names on the list seemed to be reasonable; and he suggested that each speaker be limited to about 10 minutes. He stated that, unless there was objection or suggestion of some other system to be followed, the meeting would proceed in that manner. He announced that, if any speaker desired to submit additional data for consideration by the Board, any written statements could be filed and would, of course, receive consideration. He stated that he would like to call on Chancellor Klotsche for a brief statement of just what this long range plan consisted of, in order to refresh the members of the Board and also to advise those present just what the subject was that was under consideration.

With the use of charts and maps, Chancellor Klotsche briefly described the proposed long range campus plan for the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee, indicating the present "L" shaped campus, which he indicated would be adequate until the student enrollment at University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee reaches about 25,000 students. He stated that this enrollment would probably be reached between

1973 and 1975, at which time it would be necessary to break out of the "L" shaped campus and move to the west toward the Milwaukee River. His presentation of this subject followed that reported at the meeting of the Regents held in Milwaukee on April 9, 1965. He reiterated that the presentation of this long range plan at this time was in response to the requests of individuals and of organizations in the city of Milwaukee regarding the intentions of the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee with reference to future expansion. He emphasized that the property to the west of the present "L" shaped campus is not needed at this time, but that the various interested individuals and organizations should be informed as to the future intentions of the University. He indicated that the long range expansion of University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee campus toward the Milwaukee River, as outlined in this plan, should take care of the needs of this institution to the end of the century.

President DeBardleben stated he would proceed to call on the list of persons that had been submitted to him and stated that everyone would be given an opportunity to be heard.

The first appearance was by Attorney William Willis, 3509 Summit Avenue, Milwaukee, representing the Lakeside Community Council, a copy of whose remarks is attached as EXHIBIT A.

Dr. William E. Kartsch, 2400 North Farwell Avenue, Milwaukee, appeared representing the Riverside Community Council. He commented that the properties in the proposed expansion area of University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee would experience economic blight and deterioration of property values as a result of the plans of the University to acquire property in that area. He contended that the University should take its chances in acquiring needed property just as any private individual would have to take. He suggested that an outside independent group be employed to develop a plan for the expansion needs for University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee.

Mr. George Aleksejevs, 3216 North Cambridge Avenue, Milwaukee, appeared as a resident of the proposed expansion area. He recalled his experiences in Europe during World War II prior to his coming to this country. He contended that he had been able to find employment here and had acquired a home in the proposed expansion area. He contended that plans of the University to expand in that area would be depriving him of his civil rights.

Mr. Spiro Mehail, 3048 North Bartlett, Milwaukee, appeared, representing the Riverside Community Council. He distributed a copy of his statement, which is attached as EXHIBIT B.

Mr. Michael Barron, a member of the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors, appeared. He reported on conferences he had had with members of the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee administration; and stated that he was pleased to find out that the University does not intend to condemn any properties for expansion at this time. He noted the possibility of property values declining in the area when University expansion does take place.

The next appearance was by Thomas Phillipson, 2910 North Oakland Avenue, Milwaukee, who had a considerable number of charts containing data with reference to enrollments, etc. He indicated that he had attempted to obtain pertinent data from the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee staff, but that his requests were not

answered. His principal argument was not whether the expansion of the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee campus should be to the east or to the west, but whether it was necessary at all. Mr. Phillipson spent all of his allotted time in presenting data and charts covering enrollment estimates in higher education institutions in Wisconsin, and ran out of time before he had an opportunity to present his conclusions. President DeBardleben informed him that he could submit a statement covering the balance of his planned presentation.

Mr. Stewart Hommel, Administrator of Columbia Hospital, reported on the experiences of Columbia Hospital in acquiring property in the area for its expansion program. He contended that the property owners should not be concerned about declining property values, since the experience of property owners with the acquisition of property by Columbia Hospital had turned out to be quite satisfactory and they were all friends of Columbia Hospital today. He also reported that Chancellor Klotsche and members of the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee staff had been very helpful and understanding regarding the problems of Columbia Hospital; and stated that the relationships with the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee have been very pleasant.

Mr. Walter Memler, who reported that he had had many years of experience as an architect and eleven years as a member of the Zoning Board, stated that he also was very familiar with transportation problems. He contended that the transportation arteries in Milwaukee were such that the present site of the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee Campus was entirely unsuitable for expansion purposes; and suggested that other areas should be considered for that purpose.

Mr. William J. Kartsch, stated that he had been a resident of the proposed expansion area for over fifty years, having lived all his life on North Cambridge Avenue. He stated that other members of his family also lived in that area; and he emphatically stated that the University would not take their property away from them because they would not permit it.

Mr. Patrick Fass, 3029 North Murray Avenue, Milwaukee, stated that he had no charts nor articles to present to the Regents, but that he came from the area of displaced persons in the proposed University expansion area. He suggested that the Regents give careful consideration to the data and materials submitted by the individuals appearing at this hearing; and commended the Regents for permitting this opportunity for people to express their view points on this subject.

Mr. William Ewig, a student at the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee made a brief statement. He stated that he did not own a house in the area and was not concerned with the decline in property values. He suggested however, that the University should have some kind of report by outside consultants who did not have any interest in this situation.

Mr. Lawrence Baldus, 2929 North Prospect Avenue, Milwaukee, expressed the opinion that this whole problem needed a great deal more study. He stated that it was entirely unreasonable to consider building athletic fields in the proposed expansion area. He suggested that the entire matter be re-examined promptly; and

he expressed the opinion that the University would not be able to obtain the necessary funds for such an expansion program.

On behalf of the Regents, President DeBardleben thanked each of the individuals for being present at this hearing and particularly those who had presented their views to the Regents.

Upon motion by Regent Werner, seconded by Regent Rohde, it was VOTED, that the meeting be adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 P.M.

Clarke Smith, Secretary

SECRETARY'S NOTE:

(Although President DeBardleben had suggested to the persons appearing at the hearing who had not had time within the allotted time to complete their presentations, that they could submit additional statements which would be given careful consideration by the Regents, no such additional statements had been received up to the time of the compilation of the above minutes, which was deferred for approximately one month to permit the submission of such additional statements.)

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM J. WILLIS

PRESIDENT, LAKESIDE COMMUNITY COUNCIL

May 5, 1965

Since the announcement of UWM's 1965 Campus Plan, there has not been an opportunity to bring together the more than 400 members of the Lakeside Community Council to consider and take formal action on the Plan. While our Board of Directors has likewise not taken formal action, the Board and its UWM Liaison Committee has met on several occasions to consider the Plan, and has authorized me to make a statement as President reflecting the views which were developed in our discussions. These views should not be interpreted either as endorsement or rejection of the proposed Plan by our Council.

The only formal action taken by our organization with respect to UWM expansion is the policy statement adopted last spring at the annual meeting of our membership after an extended period of research, discussion and debate. This statement, which has previously been circulated to the Regents, remains as the official judgment of our membership unless and until a new policy is adopted. It is not necessarily expected to express a policy to be adhered to for all time. On the contrary, it should be reconsidered by our membership from time to time in the light of changing circumstances and developments. But since no new policy has yet been adopted by our membership, I must look to our 1964 statement as my starting point.

First of all, let me say that I am delighted that in many respects, the 1965 Plan, as well as other recent actions of the University, are consistent with our 1964 policy statement. Our very first proposal was that the University reveal its expansion plans and policies, and that a dialogue be developed between University and neighbors, to the end that the benefit of both groups be served. I am delighted that during the past year, frequent discussions have taken place between members of our liaison committee and Board, and representatives of UWM's administration to discuss problems of mutual concern. The hearing today is evidence of this continuing dialogue. It is not expected that the University and neighborhood will agree on all issues, but frank discussion of any differences should be encouraged.

We are likewise pleased that the 1965 Plan, in effect, adopts our recommendation that there be no development by UWM east of Downer Avenue.

There is, however, one key paragraph of our 1964 policy statement with which the 1965 Plan is not consistent. I refer to this as a key paragraph since it was the most controversial, the most debated and the most revised section of our entire policy statement. It evolved from an original proposal within our organization to demand that UWM be limited to an enrollment of 15,000 students. After extensive debate and amendment, the paragraph as finally adopted read as follows:

EXHIBIT A

"A proposal to recommend a limit on the enrollment at the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee presents difficult questions which may involve a conflict of interests between local residents and the broader objectives of the State in providing opportunities for higher education in Wisconsin. The Lakeside Community Council does urge the University to control the rate of growth of enrollment and to calculate the ultimate size of the Kenwood campus with a view toward minimizing the impact of the University's growth on the local community. Although no precise limit on student enrollment at U.W.M. is considered feasible at this time, the Council believes that the University should not expand into any residential neighborhood. If U.W.M. needs more land in the Lakeside area, such land should be non-residential."

This paragraph raises in our minds several questions with respect to the 1965 Campus Plan.

First, there is the important question of the ultimate size of UWM. Last year many of our members felt that our group should suggest a limit to UWM enrollment, but the prevailing view was that we did not have sufficient expert knowledge and advise to seek an enrollment limit of a specific number. We are in no better position to do so this year. However, we do believe certain facts are self-evident. Forecasts of population growth for this area would seem to indicate that if an open enrollment policy is maintained, and if sufficient alternative state-supported campuses in the area are not provided, even the prediction of 40,000 students by the year 2000 is unrealistically low. We believe that strictly from the educational point of view, there is an optimum limit to the enrollment on this campus. We believe from the neighborhood point of view, there is very definitely a limit to the number of students who can be absorbed without completely engulfing and destroying the neighborhood. We believe from the planning point of view, it is almost impossible to make adequate plans for such facilities as a library, a heating plant and a student union, without knowing the number of students which these facilities must ultimately serve.

I would therefore urge that UWM undertake a study of population trends, educational policies, impact on the neighborhood, and any other relevant matters, and based upon this study, determine the maximum optimum enrollment for this campus. I would then urge that enrollment at this campus not be permitted to exceed such number, and that those responsible for higher education in this state begin immediately a program of planning and developing additional state-supported institutions of higher learning to provide educational opportunities for all who will need them.

Second, our organization is concerned with the impact on the neighborhood of the 1965 Campus Plan. As of this date, we do not feel that the University has adequately demonstrated the absence of a substantially adverse impact by reason of the Plan. We have not seen evidence of sufficient communication and cooperation for the purpose of minimizing impact between University planners and those responsible for municipal planning, including not only the Department of City Planning, but those

public officials responsible for such municipal services as street construction, traffic control, water and sewer service, fire protection, public schools and public parks.

Let me illustrate with a few examples. The University has indicated that it wants to acquire the Hartford Avenue School property, and from many points of view, acquisition of this school by the University is perhaps a logical and desirable step, so long as adequate facilities are provided in its place. Yet, within the last two weeks, we were advised by the Superintendent of Schools that the University had not made an official approach to the Milwaukee school system on this subject. In a matter as important as primary education, it is vital that the University's impact be studied, and that cooperative planning with the local school system be undertaken.

A second example is the matter of traffic control. I personally have difficulty conceiving how this neighborhood could handle the traffic and parking which would be generated by 40,000 students, plus faculty and service personnel, on top of growing municipal traffic, particularly with the University spanning both Maryland and Oakland Avenues. But this impact on traffic can only be measured by study and consultation with the appropriate municipal officials in the City of Milwaukee, Village of Shorewood and County Expressway Commission, so that the plans of these bodies with respect to street construction and traffic control can be co-ordinated with University planning.

We ask these other questions. Has consideration been given to future zoning of the small corner of Milwaukee north of Newport and west of Maryland, which is outside the 1965 Plan? Will this small island become an isolated slum? Where will its children attend school, particularly if Hartford Avenue School is relocated to the south? Can more definitive solutions to the parking problem be incorporated into the Plan? Does the Plan contemplate development of the residential area to the west, prior to full development of the old Downer campus? Is any program contemplated to prevent deterioration of private property immediately surrounding the campus?

I raise these questions not as condemnations of the 1965 Plan but as examples of the types of questions dealing with neighborhood impact which I would urge be considered and the answers communicated to the neighborhood before any plan is made final and before ultimate optimum enrollment can be determined.

I would like to comment briefly with respect to implementation of any plans which may be approved for University acquisition of residential property in Lakeside. There is, of course, the extreme hazard that properties in an area slated for purchase will be permitted to deteriorate to the detriment of the entire neighborhood. If property is to be acquired, the University's announced plan of acquiring property on a long range basis when it comes on the market is indeed a desirable approach, since it will assure a market for properties which need to be sold, yet will not require sale of other properties until actually needed. Once any plan is approved,

I would support the immediate appropriation of funds for this important purpose. Moreover, if we are to expect people to maintain properties in the interim, I think it is extremely important that a timetable be clearly published to the parties concerned. It would be tragic for a homeowner to refrain from painting his house because the University intends to acquire it, if in fact the University has no such intention for a period of 10 or 15 years. A reasonably accurate timetable is important to any acquisition program.

The Lakeside Community Council is anxious to continue its liaison with the University and its planning staff. We hope to be a catalyst for bringing together the University and the municipal agencies responsible for planning in our area. We will exert our influence in every way possible to influence University planning in a direction which will minimize its impact on our community.

Riverside Community Council
3048 N. Bartlett Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53211

Released by:
Spiro Mehail,
Telephone: Home: 332-2339
Bus.: 271-4341

To: The Board of Regents
University of Wisconsin

Gentlemen:

Last month, the Riverside Community Council was organized to question and challenge the concepts of planning involved in the expansion of U.W.M. A few days later the Board of Regents convened and made two decisions that will affect Milwaukee for many decades to come. The first decision agreed in principle to the expansion of U.W.M. to facilitate 40,000 students. The second decision asked that today's meeting be held in order that interested citizens voice their opinions concerning the method and direction of expansion of U.W.M.

We appreciate the fact that this has been a turbulent year for education. The direction that education is going to take in Wisconsin has not as yet been fully resolved. Will emphasis be on two year associate degree programs in general and technical education? Will there be a deemphasis of 4-year institutions in favor of 2-year institutions? Has it yet been resolved as to what kind of a university we are going to have locally?

The Coordinating Committee on Higher Education noted in its recent Annual Report that enrollments in the public universities in Wisconsin will more than double in the next decade, enrollments in Vocational-Technical Schools will more than triple, if the state makes adequate provision for all of its young people who have the qualifications and desire to attend.

Under the procedure developed by the Committee, building priorities are established by the respective Boards of Regents and these priorities are reviewed and integrated into a single list by the Coordinating Committee.

In the Committee's action, the primary factor considered is the relative present and future need of the proposed buildings in order that the institution may perform adequately its assigned tasks in instruction, research, and public service. The degree of need for any particular building is determined by the relationships existing between the load which the institution is expected to carry and the facilities which have been made available for its use.

The Coordinating Committee has asked the Boards of Regents to increase their efforts to make better use of present facilities during the academic year through improvements in the weekly schedule and the encouragement of students to take advantage of Summer Sessions offerings. The Committee has under continuing study the longer school year concept, and, with Committee approval, Wisconsin State University - Oshkosh, and The University of Wisconsin in Madison offer experimental 12-week summer terms to supplement the traditional eight-week sessions offered throughout the systems.

EXHIBIT B

With the aforementioned planning guidance of the Coordinating Committees on Higher Education in mind, let us examine and determine if a need really exists to expand beyond the present land use capacity of 25,000 students at U.W.M.

The report that the Board of Regents heard at its first meeting in Milwaukee on April 9, 1965 indicated that projected enrollment figures were based upon student registration increases of ten percent for each of the past two years. It was then logically assumed, without the aid of a hybrid computer, that a linear increase of ten percent would occur for each of the following eight years. Gentlemen these statistics are deceiving in light of what is currently happening in the periphery of our immediate area of interest.

Let us examine the map of Wisconsin and investigate why there will be a leveling of enrollment in the Milwaukee area.

In accordance with established policy, the Coordinating Committee on Higher Education has authorized new University of Wisconsin Centers in Rock and Waukesha Counties and the first Wisconsin State University Branch Campus in Rice Lake, all to be opened in the 1965-67 biennium. And it has sketched out future Center and Branch Campus developments in areas where the criteria for their establishment is likely to be met in the foreseeable future.

The Coordinating Committee also has recommended that a sequence of four years of educational opportunity be provided in the Fox Valley area by the establishment of an additional institution to open in 1969, and the provision of four years of educational opportunity in the Racine-Kenosha area by the establishment of an additional institution to open in the 1971 biennium.

Locally, the county map of Milwaukee has a few indicators also. The University of Marquette through urban renewal has acquired a sizeable area in the heart of Milwaukee which will make it the largest Jesuit university in the world. The Milwaukee Institute of Technology with its two year terminal applied science degree for technicians has doubled its enrollment in two years to 7,500 and attracted still more students who were turned away because of lack of space. What of the downtown campus of the U.W.M.? Is there an intent to expand upon the U.W.M. downtown facilities? How would downtown expansion affect planning at the central campus? The aforementioned factors seem to have been entirely ignored concerning not only the projected enrollment figures of U.W.M., but its plan for orderly expansion as well.

With this background information at hand is it not considered reasonable to question expansion beyond the present boundaries of the university which is equipped to comfortably support 14,000 more than its present enrollment of 11,000? We say it is questionable and a great injustice is being done to more than one thousand concerned families who are presently living under a cloud of uncertainty that has been cast upon their future by ill-timed, improperly conceived, badly publicized plans that will further burden them with depreciated home values because of the questionable procedures involved. We say that expansion plans should not have been revealed until a thorough review was made concerning all interested organizations. This includes the city of Milwaukee and the county of Milwaukee. It is inconceivable to create plans to expand a university without consulting city planners. However, such is the case at hand.

We request that the Board of Regents resolve the question of expansion based upon the facts presented.

It is further requested that a thorough review be again made on the proper direction of expansion of U.W.M. not in terms of local interest groups but in terms of the actual needs of the university to develop as a true lake shore university. It is further requested that the planning director of U.W.M. restudy the geography of the university area without imposed restrictions as to geographic movement. Land acquisition requirements should be determined only when an honest study is made concerning what is logical, orderly and purposeful expansion.

If after a careful restudy is made and the Board of Regents still feels that expansion is feasible for the accommodation of 40,000 students then we respectfully submit a positive plan of action for your consideration.

Milwaukee needs and deserves a break concerning the proper use of land. What you gentlemen decide as far as the direction of movement is concerned will affect Milwaukee for centuries to come. Gentlemen, I ask that you search your hearts and do what is first in the best interests of the university and secondly what is in the best interests for the people of greater Milwaukee and Wisconsin. The plan I am about to unfold constitutes the second course of action available to you. The first proposed expansion to the west. The second course of action encompasses the territory to the east. Let us study expansion in the light of reality and known factual information.

Expansion to the west is considered for the following reasons:

1. It is alleged to be cheaper to expand westward.
2. It is alleged that expansion is in an already institutionalized area.
3. It is insisted that the preservation of the character of the university neighborhood is of paramount importance.

Let us examine the consequences of a move westward by referring to the land use map purchased from the Planning Commission of the City of Milwaukee. Westward expansion has some obvious disadvantages; these are:

1. The campus will be divided by a hodge-podge grouping of buildings in scattered areas.
2. It will invade an area that contains no churches, schools or institutions - thus it is not an institutionalized area.
3. It will displace 1062 families.
4. It will affect local and federal planning and the consequent funding involved since the area bounded by East Locust Street to the south, East Newport Avenue to the North, the Milwaukee River to the west and Oakland Avenue to the east involves the territory ear-marked as a rehabilitation area considered worthy of preservation under the Urban Renewal Program.
5. It will be more costly to expand westward by approximately \$35,000 per acre.
6. The image and pride of a great Lake Shore University would be forever blighted by a campus deliberately built on the banks of the polluted Milwaukee River.

What of the preservation of the character at neighborhood to the east?

The following information was gathered concerning the characteristics of the neighborhood immediately east of the Downer Campus from the Milwaukee Health Department's Housing and Sanitation Division:

1. Present rooming house licenses (involving three or more roomers) equal 35.
2. It is estimated that there are approximately 150 additional homes that have roomers. (City ordinances decree that a license is not necessary for less than three boarders).
3. During the past five years 60 separate residences have been investigated because of complaints that an illegal number of boarders were being housed.
4. Zoning changes are generally opposed by the illicit operators since they fear competition.
5. It is the opinion of the director of the Housing & Sanitation Department that illicit rooming houses will grow in number in the area upon expansion of the U.W.M. campus to Downer Woods. This will force zoning changes to allow more rooming houses in the area.
6. It will force a deterioration of the neighborhood east of the Downer Campus.
7. A sampling was taken with the cooperation of the city Building Inspector's Department as to the average age of homes in the east sector. It appears that builders were active prior to the time that Teddy Roosevelt's Rough Riders were storming up San Juan Hill and the Civil War Veterans were still the main attraction in parades down Grand Avenue.

The 16 room multi-bath homes soon began to dot the landscape and by the turn of the century and a few years there after had taken most of the lots in the then highly fashionable east side. Three wars later find that most of the buildings have survived but the true character of the past has long vanished. Preservation of a past image seems folly in light of the advantages that can be achieved by the university and all of the community by the construction of a Lake Shore University.

The eastward movement plan:

The acquisition of land to the east encompasses the same amount of territory involved in phases 2, 3a and 3b. The land use map shows us a territory that forms another L shape paralleling the present campus. The base of the "L" is bounded on the east by Lake Michigan and to the west by Downer Avenue. The neck of the "L" is bounded by Lake Drive to the west, Lake Michigan to the east and extends north midway between Newport and Edgewood Avenues.

Why move east?

1. The image of a great university requires natural physical assets that compliment the campus. The slogan "Lake Shore University" must not be abandoned.
2. University literature must reflect the pride and wishes of a greater Milwaukee. The literature must advertise the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee on the shores of Lake Michigan not the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee on the banks of the Milwaukee River. The image of the University must not be compromised.
3. A university that has the opportunity of abutting the natural beauty of a lake at a lower cost and has the additional advantages of nearby park facilities cannot be idly ignored. These great assets must not be lost. The people of Milwaukee and Wisconsin need and deserve them.

What are the advantages of eastward expansion?

1. Advantages previously mentioned of the image of a great Lake Shore University which would be an asset to Milwaukee today and for its future heirs.
2. Lower land cost acquisition - approximately \$120,000 per acre - a saving of \$35,000 per acre.
3. A low family displacement. Only 25% of that involved in the westward expansion plan. There would be 247 families displaced in comparison to 1062 to the west.
4. Less tax loss to the city of Milwaukee.
5. It would not interfere with an already established preservation area of rehabilitation already approved by the Federal Government.

In summary there are two courses of action available:

Course of Action I - westward expansion in three phases -

Disadvantages:

1. Higher land cost - \$155,000 per acre -
2. Displacement of 1062 families compared to 247 families eastward.
3. Interferes with local and federal Rehabilitation Project.
4. It creates a bad image for Milwaukee and its heirs of a river front university bordering a polluted stream.
5. Slower and more costly acquisition.

Course of Action II - eastward expansion in one phase

Advantages:

1. Faster acquisition
2. Lower cost to tax payers - \$120,000 per acre - a saving of \$35,000 per acre.
3. Low family displacement - only 25% of that to the west - 247 families.
4. Gaining prestige and image of a Lake Shore University - good for Milwaukee, Wisconsin and its heirs.
5. Would not involve rehabilitation area.

After a study is made of all factors concerned and your decision deems it necessary to expand, we respectfully request that the new boundaries of the movement plan be announced and that funds be allocated for immediate acquisition of the properties involved. This will help alleviate misunderstanding and hardships to home owners. It will further help preserve the dignity of the neighborhood by preventing self-imposed deterioration to take place because of property neglect. It would further be appreciated if your decision and plans to resolve the questions at hand be forwarded to our committee in order that the information be made available to members of the Riverside Community Organization.

Respectfully submitted,

Spiro Mehail,
Representative
Riverside Community Organization

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Spiro Mehail
Telephone:
Home: 332-2339
Bus.: 271-4341

APPENDIX I

Gentlemen, I have proposed a positive plan of action which I am going to distribute for your scrutiny. Regardless of your decision of direction, I am sure the Lakeshore and Riverside groups will agree that UWM not become a privileged sanctuary in that a freeze be placed upon an area for an undetermined length of time.

The property owner must not be deprived of income from his investment based upon vague acquisition time tables. UWM should not become a part of a scheme that will bring immediate blight into the affected area. UWM should not be privileged at the expense of the private homeowner and the city of Milwaukee by announcing areas of acquisitional intent if they do not have the money or authority to carry them out.

UWM should not be part of a plot that imposes a freeze on an area that prevents future development and deprives the owners and investors freedom of action. If the University wants land - be it east, west, north, south, up or down. It must provide money for immediate acquisition.

A policy that freezes an area from future development is unrealistic; it is arrogant; it is selfish; it is cruel to the home owner. The homeowner in the affected areas does not understand the consequences. It is fundamental that the consequences will lead to blight and the eventual establishment of ghettos. However, as learned gentlemen, I am sure you do not want to take part in bilking the naive citizenry and a local planning commission in accepting the imposition of an indefinite freeze on an area. A maneuver of this kind is designed to benefit the University at the expense of the homeowner. How does this work? The University announces intent - not knowing how fast they will expand.

When will the last segments of phase three be reached? In 1970? or 2000? Who here, today can accurately predict in what year phase three will be completed? Yet you have helped impose a freeze on an area that will stop rezoning and development with the consequent result of blight, confusion, and disruption of family living.

What homeowner will put money in property that has had the Kiss of Death? Would you? Gentlemen, we must be reasonable. Allow the freeze to be lifted - allow things to develop in their normal course of events. The homeowner and the city are the only losers. Do not impose a system upon us that is unjust.

The University should not be any more privileged than the private investor. If the private investors want to build apartments, let them build apartments. If the private homeowner wants to improve or even maintain his property, give him the incentive to do so.

If the University wants to purchase land, it must be purchased at the fair market value during the month and year in which budget funds have been provided for land acquisition.

The University must not intentionally or unintentionally manipulate and influence property values now to induce blight in the affected neighborhoods so a "killing" can be made in the future. Action of that kind is unfair and unethical.

Gentlemen, what you decide to do with the University is your privilege. However, let us play the game fairly. Remember we are on your side We too are proud Wisconsinites, and most important of all we too are Americans, so treat us as fellow Americans not as vanquished peasants under an army of occupation.

We therefore humbly and sincerely request that -

1. An honest restudy be made of University expansion with city planners and consultants experienced in Urban University planning.
2. Ask the city to lift the freeze from affected neighborhoods.
3. Provide funds for immediate acquisition of property.
4. Provide new boundaries.