Council on Campus Planning and Usage
Minutes
November 2, 2012

Present: Brett Eberhardt, Jeff Laurent (Recorder), Dana Lindemann (Chair), Eric Ribbens (ex officio, Landscape Liaison), Paul Schlag
Guest: Carina Kapraun (Physical Plant)

1. Update on the Project to Renovate the University Union

Kapraun, project manager for the Union renovation, presented an overview of the plan for the renovation. Student fees support the renovation, so it is more likely to move forward in a timely fashion relative to capital projects funded by the state. Highlights of the presentation:

- Project goals:
  - provide a “second” home for students;
  - provide better food options;
  - provide a vibrant building with easy access;
  - improve the flow for food vendors

- Projected budget: $10M

- Process: programming study/building assessment; schematic design; design development (current stage)

- Phases
  - Phase 1
    - Mechanicals
  - Phase 2
    - Basement level: open 24 hours a day; OSA offices; rec space
    - Ground level: new campus store; better connectivity
    - First floor: new meeting rooms and lounge space; new hot box entrance on Murray Street; Grand Ballroom renovation.

Currently, there is no plan to upgrade the University Union Hotel.

Lindemann asked that CCPU be included on the list for future invitations to open forums.

2. Updates from the Physical Plant and Landscaping Liaisons

Coker was unable to attend the meeting. Ribbens reported no particular campus landscaping updates at this time.

3. Follow-Up Discussion re: Morgan Hall Petition

The Faculty Senate forwarded a petition to CCPU from faculty members in Morgan Hall regarding concerns about the cooling system during final exam week in Spring ’12. This was discussed at two previous CCPU meetings this semester. Ribben attended the Faculty Senate on October 26, 2012 as a representative of CCPU. He reported that the Faculty Senate was unclear about the current policy/procedure, especially in light of annual complaints about hot classrooms during finals week. The Faculty Senate would like Coker to meet with them to explain the policy/procedure. A secondary issue that may or may not be
discussed is the role of building representatives. It seems communication between faculty, building representatives, and Physical Plant can be an issue.

Action: Coker will present to the Faculty Senate re: policy/procedure for cooling buildings.

4. Follow-Up Discussion re: Designated Intentional Spaces on Campus
   The Faculty Senate requested that CCPU discuss the issue of designated intentional spaces on campus. Senator Thompson clarified this request at the last CCPU meeting. Put succinctly: Should there be spaces on campus for people to have privacy? If yes, what is the recommendation of CCPU regarding this?

   The council discussed “intentional” spaces versus general/multi-purpose/use spaces. Also discussed was possible implementation via using an “occupied” sign versus individuals sign-up to use space. After discussion, the CCPU agreed that designated intentional spaces could serve a purpose. The next step would be to contact the appropriate person in certain buildings (i.e., University Union, Malpass Library, etc.) to see whether there are general use spaces that might serve as intentional use spaces with a “do not disturb” or “occupied” sign.

   Action: Lindemann will draft a memo for the Faculty Senate Executive Council encouraging them to contact building representatives to identify general use spaces. It was decided that, if identified, implementation of intentional space be left to the department/building where the space exists.

5. Update re: Master Plan visit from SmithGroup JJR
   SmithGroup JJR made another visit to campus earlier this week to further refine the vision for the Master Plan. Schlag and Laurent were able to attend the Monday, October 29, 2012 meeting. They shared their impressions of the discussion at that meeting.

   Schlag pointed out at the meeting that ancillary facilities like Horn Field, the University farm, and the golf course were not mentioned. Consultants noted this and plan to include these in the future. It is clear that the consultants are aware of the funding situation. Their final plan will reflect improvements that can be made in the short- (e.g., bus cutouts, entrance markers, etc.) and long-term (e.g., new science building, parking structures, etc.).

   The Master Plan is intended as a communication aid and guide for future development. It sounded like the consultants plan to complete their portion of the project by the end of 2012. They have solicited input throughout the process. CCPU has attended several of the sessions to provide feedback. The consultants have been responsive to and incorporated feedback. The next step is to solicit support from constituencies on campus for their vision of the Master Plan.