**Campus Recreation Advisory Board Meeting**

**Friday, February 19, 2016**

**Attendance:** Leigh Mizvesky (CREC), Tom St John (CREC), Julia Tomasello (Fitness Representative), Chris Anguita (CREC), Dean Bowen (CREC), Jay Souza (CREC), Shi Fil (GSO), James Vassello (CSA), Tajmin Begum (CREC), Durron Newman (CREC), Mouri Matin (USG)

**Meeting** called to order at 12:00 pm.

1. **Welcome!**
	1. Jay asked everyone to introduce themselves since we had several new representatives.
2. **Recreation Updates**
	1. **Field Conditions and Planning**

Field B is primarily by rugby. The field is offline until July for rehab to reseed and fix any unsafe areas.

* 1. **Field C Light Proposal**

We are looking at putting lights on Field C. The installation was never complete. These lights would result in expanded programming opportunities, therefore more clubs can practice later. It will be approximately $250,000 to complete. It will benefit students and also reduce pressure on Field B to keep it in better condition. The student representatives voted, and it was a unanimous vote (5 of 5).

1. **Discussion**
	1. **Broad Based Fee Review and Preliminary Proposal**
2. Current fee: $82/semester
3. Proposed 5%= $4.10= $86.10/semester
4. We did not have an update in time for this meeting and will discuss this in our March meeting.
	1. **Affiliate Memberships**

The Campus Recreation Center is one of the largest student employers on campus. With minimum wage being increased, it has had a profound effect on the budget. All students receive scaled up rates. The student payroll line will be over $1 million after 2021 and we need to find ways to manage budget while maintaining payroll. We need to look at other membership options. Jay gave a report on current memberships, including the alumni and partner/spouse members. GSO provides a subsidized rate of up to $50 or 25% per year until it runs out. Alumni and partner/spouse memberships will continue to grow. Jay proposes offering memberships for affiliates. It would be the same rate as a faculty/staff membership. We have not been meeting building capacity, only about 2,500/day, and the building can hold 4,000 patrons. The usage patterns are different for each membership. For example, faculty/staff would be here in the mornings and right after work, so this usage is also something to consider.

Feedback:

1. Based on feedback, everyone feels offering an affiliate membership is a good idea and a way to generate money. A question about whether a partner/spouse membership would be offered to this new membership group. Jay feels the Department of Campus Recreation Pro Staff are going to assess the impact of affiliates before offering a partner/spouse affiliate membership. It could be looked into for the future. Memberships will not be offered to the community at this point, it will take away from institutional use. Affiliates, however, would be a way to increase members from the faculty/staff side. Affiliates should have same access as other faculty/staff person on campus. Some affiliates are not here for a long time, so after they are no longer affiliated, their membership would most likely expire and they would be unable to renew it. Initially, 4/5 voted for the implementation of affiliate memberships. One student expressed concern about the management of facility with increased capacity. From the perspective of risk management, we are able to identify people due to the ability to see them in our software system. Fusions has the ability to ‘speak’ to Peoplesoft, so our information is updated daily. This student changed his vote after discussion, resulting in a 5/5 unanimous vote.
2. Guest passes: Do we need to have a sponsoring membership? This question was posed to Jay. He stated it is unlikely that we would offer guest passes without sponsoring member. The aim is to not displace the students and if too many outsiders came in, this might happen. The thought is that they would buy a one-day pass, but not need a current member to purchase it. They will not be able to participate in IMs and related events. Our safety measures will remain the same, including taking their information down. There would not be a lot of people. Can they buy more than one? Durron sees a lot of people that bring several people and we currently only allow one at a time. As the discussion continued, the benefits to this became clearer. It’s doubtful there is a significant impact on usage. It is also a way to generate more money and have many satisfied users. They would still need to buy it in person and would have to interact with staff to complete purchase process. Parking will be a challenge, but they will have to wait until after hours or pay for metered parking. They change on sponsorship rule on guest passes was a unanimous vote (5/5).
3. **Other**
4. **Facility Utilization**: Weight room continues to be packed and we need more space. Jay wants to look at area utilization to see how the impact is. Right now, counts are done every 30 minutes in Google Doc. Durron and his staff are looking into different apps that allow people to check to see what building usage is. This way, if someone wants to come use the weight room and see the area is maxed out, they can come at a slower time. Dean suggest Durron and his staff attend the UPACE conference call on Monday because this program has the ability to do exactly what we want, among other things.
5. **Restricted Membership:** Dean brought up the idea of selling a restricted access membership. This would be for just a group fitness membership or specific hours like lunch and right after work. If they try to use it at another time, access will be denied. Individuals would pay a reduced price, so this enables them to come in only during their given times and attend fitness classes. How could we regulate that or their use of other equipment in facility? We could mirror same policy for IMs where they can only come in on evenings that IMs are held to play. This way this could boost grad IM participation, which tends to be low because grads have to buy memberships to play any IM sport that is scheduled inside the facility. One concern is that it would be tough to enforce if they also used other parts of the facility, so how much would this impact usage? IMs tend to be six weeks long, so people then have to buy two months even if they do not use it. Voting members agree this is a good idea and do not feel those who purchase such a membership would abuse it. The price point would be lower, but we don’t have rates yet. We wanted feedback from the Advisory Board before we move further. Jay asked for a vote and it was unanimous (4/4- one student had to leave).
6. **The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, March 25 at 12:00 pm. Lunch will be served.**