

East Carolina University 26472.j00 04.08.2009 04.24.2009
 PROJECT PROJECT NO. MEETING DATE ISSUE DATE

Willis Building Steering Committee Summary Meeting
 MEETING LOCATION MEETING PURPOSE

Clare Jagenow
 ISSUED BY SIGNATURE

PARTICIPANT	COMPANY/TITLE
Chris Brasier	SmithGroup-Principal
Mark Potter	SmithGroup- Project Manager
Neal Kessler	JJR- Principal, Campus Planner
Clare Jagenow	JJR- Site Designer, Project Manager
Sub-consultant Team	Brailsford & Dunlavey
Sub-consultant Team	Kurt Salmon & Associates
Sub-consultant Team	Martin Alexiou Bryson
Sub-consultant Team	Protection Engineering Group
Kemal Atkins	Vice Provost for Student Affairs
Nick Floyd	Associate Athletic Director
Dr. Glen Gilbert	Dean Health and Human Performance
Kevin Seitz	Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance
Mark Tipton	Board of Trustees Member
Dr. Jan Tovey	Chair of Faculty Senate
William Bagnell	Assoc. Vice Chancellor, Campus Operations
Bill Koch	Assoc. Vice Chancellor, Environmental
Ron Newton	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Administration & Finance

MEETING NOTES

The purpose of this meeting was to summarize the discussions of the working committee and focus group meetings that occurred on April 6, 7, and 8.

Eva Klein and Associates

Strategic Academic and Research Planning

Summary

- Review of project overview
- Roles of committee and EKA
- Detailed plan of strategic revision
- Assignments for document requests
- Definition of interview groups
- Tentative visit May 4-6

Brailsford & Dunlavey

Recreation, Athletics, Student Housing, Student Life

Summary-Recreation

- Current facility is 12 years old and is still a state-of-the-art facility.
- Approximately 70,000 additional square feet could be needed (specifically for drop-in basketball and group exercise use)
- Willing to evaluate synergies with H&HP to develop a plan for potential expansion.
- Currently developing the North Recreational Complex

Summary-Athletics

- The majority of ECU athletic facility planning is focused on the upcoming 5 years. In this time period, the southern portion of campus will be transformed, updated, and consolidated with the creation of an Olympic Sports Complex.
- Phase 1 - The addition of a softball complex is planned to turn the ECU campus into a complete athletic site. This is a critical complement to the Clark-LeClair Baseball Stadium, opened in 2004.
- Phase 2 - The soccer field will be removed from its current location inside the track & field facility, and both sports will have new, individual facilities.
- A stand-alone office building housing coaches and athletic administration will also be constructed in the complex.
- The majority of ECU athletic facility planning is focused on the upcoming 5 years. In this time period, the southern portion of campus will be transformed, updated, and consolidated with the creation of an Olympic Sports Complex.
- Phase 1 - The addition of a softball complex is planned to turn the ECU campus into a complete athletic site. This is a critical complement to the Clark-LeClair Baseball Stadium, opened in 2004.
- Phase 2 - The soccer field will be removed from its current location inside the track & field facility, and both sports will have new, individual facilities.
- A stand-alone office building housing coaches and athletic administration will also be constructed in the complex.
- There are some unresolved development issues regarding tennis and an auxiliary gym to serve as a practice and possible competitive venue for basketball and volleyball. The current tennis courts provide the location for the proposed auxiliary gym, allowing for easy access to the locker rooms. This leads to questions regarding facilities for the tennis program, for which there are several proposals, including the purchase of a privately owned local indoor/outdoor tennis facility.
- The new softball, track & field, and soccer facilities will be student fee funded. The student fee of \$70 annually from the development of Minges Coliseum has remained in effect to cover the debt service on the \$20 million project.
- There are three main expansion plans for the football stadium. First off, the open end of the stadium is planned to be filled in with a deck of approximately 7,000 seats. Thirty-two luxury suites and a press box are planned to be developed as well, possibly with academic space below. Finally, a third phase will involve the potential

development of an additional deck of seating above the sky boxes. Incremental athletic revenues and donor gifts will provide funding for the \$16 million project.

- Parking and storage were both concerns brought up in the conversations, particularly in the sense that discussion participants noted the need to better integrate the two into athletic facilities, as well as campus as a whole. In total, 111 parking spots will be added in Phase 2.
- B&D toured the athletic facilities on the ECU campus. These interactions provided a great base of information on which to build, and they helped frame the upcoming work and questions to be asked regarding location, consolidation, prioritization, and development for further athletic facility planning

Summary-Housing

- One new development in 2006. Prior to the 2006 project, the first new development was in the late 1960s.
- Over ten “cash cows.” These older buildings produce high levels of NOI with low debt service, but require extensive maintenance and redevelopment to meet codes and safety standards.
- A ten-year plan has been developed to renovate the existing “cash cow” buildings.
- In order to meet the requirements for a “residential campus,” ECU must continue to house 25% of the student population in University-sponsored housing. As enrollment continues to grow in the mid- to long-term, additional beds need to be acquired or developed.

Summary-Student Life

- Mendenhall does not currently have sufficient student organization spaces, meeting spaces, or the retail / food service space to drive student traffic into the building.
- A student fee was passed to raze and rebuild Mendenhall, but the fee was not significant enough to support the final program, so the project is idle and student fees are not being collected.
- Alternate locations are being considered for a student union.
- A potential student union could include drivers such as the bookstore, a bank, a ballroom, etc.
- West Campus: There are currently no “quality of life” facilities on the West Campus. The development of these facilities will be considered in the student survey and focus groups which will take place over the course of the next month.

Martin Alexiou Bryson

Pedestrian, Transit, Traffic, Parking

Summary

- Wayfinding – no bus stop signs, no integration
- Wayfinding and visitor parking
- Auto oriented campus
- Commuter campus
- Greenville – not a bike friendly community
- Pedestrian Safety – vehicle traffic & criminal activity (perception)

- Campus surrounded by main arteries
- Create Pedestrian Transition nodes
- Pedestrians first
- Campus Connectivity – easiest to use cars
- Closing internal streets to reduce conflicts
- Sidewalks – lacking continuity, amenities, create pleasant trip
- One of the largest transit systems in NC with no plans

Kurt Salmon & Associates

Health Services Demand

Summary

- West Campus is unique / distinct
- Infrastructure: Campus Union, housing, recreation, student services
- Common classrooms

Protection Engineering Group

Campus Security

Summary

Highlights

- Emergency notification system
- Police Department (community outreach programs)
- Threat Management Committee
- Openness & supportiveness of staff
- Enterprise Risk Management
- Network infrastructure

Areas of Interest

- Role, responsibilities & organization
- Centralized electronic security management and monitoring
- Police Station (Facility)
- Security Design Criteria and Standards
- Facility upgrades
- CPTED campus wide
- Crime to north and west with future expansion

Our Next Steps

- Think Strategic
- Campus Survey
- Walk the campus
- Stakeholder interviews
- Review of documentation
- Strategic Security Plan

SmithGroup/JJR

Land Planning

- Density – ideal model is mall
- Traffic flow – pedestrian corridors / movement plan
- Parking density – shared use by city & university

- Parking decks wrapped by office space
- Economy of scale – efficiency
- Integration of research & community
- Sustainability – protection of our environment
- Need to “think outside of the box”
- Maintain warm, inviting campus

SmithGroup/JJR

Design Guidelines

- Benchmarks
- East – West – South campus standards
- Need to build within context of campus fabric – no more Brody
- Sustainable features are important
- Do not want super-specific material guidelines
- Unity of buildings through campus landscape

If this report does not agree with your records or understanding of this meeting, or if there are any questions, please advise the writer immediately in writing; otherwise, we will assume the comments to be correct.

P:\26472\00AdminMeetings\Kick-Off_2009-04-06\MeetingMinutes\2009-04-08_SG-JJR_SteeringCommitteeSummary.docx

Distribution: DRAFT INTERNAL ONLY