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Studies of all Recreational Sports and University Unions buildings occurred from 2009 – 2010. Building A Better Michigan Student Coalition and the Division of Student Affairs shared results and educated the campus about needs during 2011.
Student Life Pioneers

Recreational Sports
- Created the nation’s first collegiate recreational sports (1913)
- First intramural sports building in the nation (1928)
- The sport *Paddleball* was invented at U-M
- Funded by Athletics proceeds to create “Athletics for All” (1924)
- Supervision transferred to Division of Student Affairs (2009)

University Unions
- Created Association of College Unions International (1914)
- Michigan Union 3rd oldest student union in nation (1919)
- Michigan League only student union built by and for women students (1929)
- Supervision of Pierpont (1988) and League (1992) transferred to Division of Student Affairs
Recreational Sports Portfolio

*U-M Recreational Sports is one of the largest and most comprehensive organizations of its type in the nation*

- **Competitive Club Sports** (33 U-M teams compete against other universities)
- **Intramural Sports** (2,300 U-M teams complete against each other)
- **Outdoor Leadership** (ropes challenge course, adventure trips, equipment rental)
- **Drop-In Personal Activity** (basketball, racquetball, weight lifting, aquatics, etc.)
**University Unions Portfolio**

*U-M University Unions is one of the largest and most comprehensive organizations of its type in the nation*

- **Student Involvement Support** (office space, programming space, advising)
- **Student Services** (bookstore, campus information centers, study space)
- **Hospitality** (restaurants and catering, hotel, meeting rooms and event planning)
- **Student Affairs** (primary locations for DSA offices, support, and programs)
“…address concerns that the growing needs for [recreational] activity support on this campus are not being met via existing programs and facilities”

Recreational Sports Task Force, January 2009

“…all three buildings, Pierpont Commons, the Michigan Union and the Michigan League, are in poor condition.”

IDS Infrastructure Report, 2008
Challenges & Assumptions

**Challenges**

- Most peers have a single recreation or union facility; U-M has three of each
- U-M recreation and union facilities are older and more costly to renovate than most peers’
- Current economic constraints temper scale and pace of restoration
- U-M does not have recent history of implementing student fees for facility improvements
- Rec Sports facilities have not had major renovations since 1976, and University Unions have not had major renovations since 1996

**Assumptions**

- Student life facilities are places for learning, community, interaction, and engagement
- Improving Unions and Recreational Sports facilities *together* is a comprehensive commitment to the total student experience
- A student fee for capital improvements is common elsewhere and needed at U-M
- U-M will not abandon its existing facilities, especially those that are historically and architecturally distinctive
- Multi-year phasing is required to mitigate pressure on debt capacity and student cost of attendance
Recreational Sports

- Repair infrastructure deficiencies, and restore architectural heritage (IMSB)
- Facilities and fields already in ideal locations
- Add air conditioning, improved lighting, interior transparency, and welcoming ambiance
- Facilities undersized for enrollment
- Primary needs are for cardiovascular, strength and conditioning, group fitness and multipurpose spaces
- Add synthetic turf to outdoor fields; add bathrooms, lighting, storage, security
- Improve transportation to all facilities (e.g. North Campus fields)

University Unions

- Repair infrastructure deficiencies, and restore architectural heritage (Union, League)
- Honor and restore historic roles as iconic places for defining U-M experiences
- Pierpont Commons undersized and poorly designed for North Campus population and goals
- Create more flexible student spaces for collaboration, programming, and inter-group work
- Increase and improve student organization offices and support space
- Improve internal zoning and circulation
- Update revenue generating (auxiliary) spaces (e.g. dining, meeting, retail)
1. Diverse student needs and interests are served by a variety of facilities; a plan to improve both Unions and Recreational Sports facilities best serves the University’s educational goals

2. Positive health, stress reduction, and overall wellbeing, are supported by these projects

3. Facility conditions are poor and do not meet current codes (e.g. ADA); building systems are failing or non-existent (e.g. air conditioning)

4. The iconic U-M experience is embodied within its architecturally distinctive facilities

5. Facilities are undersized for current enrollment, and facility modifications are needed to serve contemporary needs and objectives (e.g. collaboration, engagement)

6. Recreational Sports and University Unions facilities serve all members of the Ann Arbor Campus: students, faculty, and staff
Student Life Facilities: Comprehensive Together

The diversity of needs is comprehensively served by all student life facilities. Some individuals participate in sport and others in student organizations.

- Housing / Living Learning
- Physical / Mental Health
- Facility Support
- Special Population (e.g. Trotter, Ginsberg)
- Academic / Learning Spaces
- Recreation / Physical Activity
- Unions / Student Involvement

Recreational Sports and University Unions facilities are used by everyone:
- Students
- Faculty
- Staff
**The U-M environment is stressful. We know how to mitigate stress and improve student success.**

### Barriers to Success

- Anxiety & Depression
- Stress
- Sleep difficulties
- Cold/flu/sore throat
- Anxiety
- Internet use/computer games
- Extracurricular activities
- Depression
- Work
- Concern for family/friend
- Relationship difficulties

### Responses to Stress

*Causas of Self-Reported Impairment of Academic Performance Ranked by Prevalence*

Source: 2010 National College Health Assessment of Undergraduates
UMHS Health Promotions and Community Relations, February 2010

*Social Ecological Model of College Student Stress*
(Hochman & Kernan, 2010)
U-M students are highly involved through Recreational Sports and University Unions programs, services, and facilities.
### Use by the U-M community is also very high.

**Recreational Sports**
- 1,100,000 buildings visits per year
- 20,000 intramural sports student participants per year
- 1,800 club sports student athletes per year
- 600 student employees
- 76% of students use Rec. Sports
- 3,700 faculty/staff/alumni members

through
- 3 major buildings + additional facilities (324,000 GSF)
- 38 acres of outdoor fields + tennis courts

**University Unions**
- 5,300,000 buildings visits per year
- 21,000 students involved in 1,300 student organizations per year
- 68,000 guests served at Information Desks per year
- 13,000 events hosted per year
- 600 student employees
- 96% of all students use Unions

through
- 3 major buildings (539,000 GSF)
Recreational Sports

“The dismal ambiance makes fitness a chore… for a university that is top quality.”

Vision:
• Prioritize student health, wellness, teamwork, competition, and involvement…
• …while still accommodating faculty and staff

Focus:
• Repair infrastructure and building systems
• Restore architectural heritage and details
• Add air conditioning
• Improve lighting and ambiance
• Increase number of fitness and activity multipurpose spaces
• Add cardio and weight equipment
• Add synthetic turf to outdoor fields to increase usability; add support facilities (bathrooms, lighting, security fencing, storage)
University Unions

“...the hardest part of being in a student organization should be doing things – not finding a space.”

Vision:
- (Re)position organization as center for student life, student leadership, & student involvement...
- …while still serving as a central gathering place for the entire U-M community

Focus:
- Repair infrastructure and building systems
- Restore architectural heritage and details
- Increase number of student organization spaces
- Expand spaces for student collaboration, student leadership, and campus community
- Create “organization for all students”
- Update service, retail and revenue producing (auxiliary) spaces that support the organization
5 Options Considered (○ = renovation / construction)

- **“All”**
  - Union
  - League
  - Pierpont
  - IMSB
  - CCRB
  - NCRB

- **“North Campus”**
  - Union
  - League
  - Pierpont
  - IMSB
  - CCRB
  - NCRB

- **“Central Campus”**
  - Union
  - League
  - Pierpont
  - IMSB
  - CCRB
  - NCRB

- **“Heritage Preservation”**
  - Union
  - League
  - Pierpont
  - IMSB
  - CCRB
  - NCRB

Plan descriptions:
- **Overly Aggressive**
- **Inconsistent with Survey Responses**
- **Not Enough Recreation Improvement**
Proposed Option: Phase 1

“Greatest Benefit & Value”

- Union (Partial)
- League
- Pierpont (Limited)
- IMSB (Partial)
- CCRB (Full)
- NCRB (Limited)
- Fields (Full)

Rationale
- Facility assets preserved and restored
- All populations served (students, faculty, staff)
- All campuses served (North, Central & South)
- Both indoor & outdoor spaces improved
- Congruent with Campus Master Plan
- Reasonable debt and student fee levels
- Consistent with survey results
Phasing Approach

Phase I: Greatest Campus Benefit
- CCRB Full Renovation & Expansion
- NCRB & Pierpont Minor Upgrades
- IMSB Repairs & Partial Renovation
- Outdoor Rec Field Improvements
- Michigan Union Partial Renovation

2014 - 2021

Phase II: Heritage Restoration
- IM Sports Building Renovation (remainder)
- Michigan League Renovation
- Coliseum & Elbel Field Support Facilities

2021 - TBD

Phase III: North Campus Revitalization
- New Hybrid Rec/Pierpont (conceptual)
- NCRB Renovation (e.g. gym, pool, locker rooms)

TBD

Funding Plan
Phase I Improvements (2014 – 2021)

CCRB
- Renovate entire existing 115,000 sq. ft. building (repair, restore, air conditioning)
- Add 26,000 sq. ft. new space (cardio, weights, group fitness)

IMSB
- Renovate portion of existing 106,000 sq. ft. building (repair, restore)
- Improve existing spaces (pool, racquetball, cardio, strength & conditioning)

NCRB
- Add 10,000 sq. ft. new space (cardio, strength & conditioning, interactive)

Mitchell Field
- Turf two existing grass soccer fields (Mitchell Field)
- Renovate entire existing 1,200 sq. ft. support building
- Add 1,800 sq. ft. new space (bathrooms, storage, lighting)
- Add new security fencing

Union
- Renovate partial existing 268,000 sq. ft. building (repair, restore)

Pierpont
- Renovate partial existing 9,000 sq. ft. cafeteria space (servery, lighting, seating)
Phase 1 Proposed Plans: **Main / Largest Buildings**

**Central Campus Rec. Bldg.**
- Repair all infrastructure (plumbing, electrical, heating, ventilation, roof, etc.)
- Add natural light (windows) for Bell Pool, Main Gym, Track
- Add air conditioning throughout facility
- Renovate all existing 115,000 gross sq. ft. (multipurpose/activity, strength and conditioning, locker rooms, gymasia)
- Renovate Bell Pool (ADA, replace pool “tank”)
- Construct additional 26,000 gross sq. ft. and increase strength and conditioning; cardiovascular; fitness training
- Installation of new fitness equipment throughout all spaces
- Add obvious / more attractive entries
- Improve internal circulation where possible
- (Does not include Dance Department Studios)

**Michigan Union**
- Repair all infrastructure (plumbing, electrical, heating, ventilation, air conditioning, roof, etc.)
- Restore heritage (architectural) details
- Connect floors 1 - 3 vertically and experientially; integrate student leadership and student involvement spaces
- (Ground) Refurbish Tap Room and MUG finishes
- (First) Renovate Art Lounge and Univ. Club for collaboration, interaction, and programming
- (Second) Create student governments Parliamentary Room; downsize Billiards Room; create dedicated Reflection Space(s)
- (Third) Move student organization, leadership, involvement, and support spaces from fourth to third floors; increase organization spaces; locate Central Student Government contiguous
- (Fourth) Relocate student support offices requiring privacy and confidentiality, such as Counseling & Psychological Services, to space already built for this use on fourth floor.
We attempt to make the best decisions possible…
By balancing responsibilities with aspirations and goals…
To determine project priorities

Aspirations
- Community
- Learning
- Involvement
- Engagement
- Wellbeing
- Diversity
- Convenience
- Preservation
- Sustainability

Balance
- Tuition & Fees Cost
- U-M Debt Capacity
- Program & Mission
- Asset Preservation
- Student Satisfaction

Priorities
- Housing
- Dining
- Recreation
- Unions
- Others
Funding Path

*Proposed Phase I projects are the result of balancing three key issues*

Phase I Projects
• **87%** report Rec. Sports and Unions improvements are a priority

• **67%** support a student fee of at least **$100** per semester to fund improvements

• **58%** support a student fee of **$150 - $200** per semester
  - On Campus (56%) / Off Campus (60%) support
  - Graduate (55%) / Undergraduate (66%) support
  - North Campus (55%) / Central Campus (58%) support

• 33% do not support a student fee for the following reasons:
  - Students should not pay fees (7%)
  - Cannot afford a fee (7%)
  - Believe it is not worth the price (6%)
  - Are satisfied with existing facilities (6%)
  - Would not use Recreational Sports facilities (4%)
  - Would not use University Unions facilities (3%)

**Funding Strategy** (1,537 responses / margin of error 2.5%)

**Funding Strategy (2% fee per year)**
Stu. Fee increase = 1% x 2 years
- (Yr. 1 fee: $140 = $140 per year)
- (Yr. 2 fee: $146 + $140 = $286 per year)
# Local student and non-student membership rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Area Location</th>
<th>Initiation Fee (one time)</th>
<th>Student Rate Annualized</th>
<th>Total Student Cost (Yr. 1)</th>
<th>Adult Rate Annualized</th>
<th>Total Adult Cost (Yr. 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Phase 1 (beginning FY14)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$286</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Rec. Ctr.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$165 ($240 non res)</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$220 ($325 non res)</td>
<td>$220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor YMCA * ²</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$395 ($35 init. fee)</td>
<td>$564</td>
<td>$664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross School Fitness Ctr. * (student members: 650 Bus / 220 Law)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$375 ($525 Law)</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>$375 ($525 Law)</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMHS M-Fit Fitness Ctr. (A2 Cube) *</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$415</td>
<td>$415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC Health &amp; Fitness Ctr. * ²</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>$744</td>
<td>$894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Wellness Center * ²</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td>$792</td>
<td>$992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Athletic Club</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$1800</td>
<td>$1176</td>
<td>$1,526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: All rates shown are “optional” membership fees, except Proposed Phase I mandatory student fee ($286)
* Includes some classes (all others classes extra charge)
² Student membership data unavailable
The Big 10 is repairing and improving student life facilities.

**Ohio State University** – Ohio Union
$118M: New construction (fee)
Opened: 2010

**Ohio State University** – Recreation & Physical Activity Center
$154M: New construction (fee)
Opened: 2007

**University of Iowa** – Memorial Union
$17M: Renovation (FEMA)
In Progress (Anticipated 2015)

**University of Iowa** – Campus Recreation & Wellness Center
$70M: New construction (fee)
Opened: 2011
Benchmarking

**University of Wisconsin** – Union South
$95M: New construction (fee)
Opened: April 2011

**University of Wisconsin** – Memorial Union
$98M: Renovation (fee)
In Progress (Anticipated 2016)

**University of Minnesota** – Coffman Union
$71M: Renovation (fee)
Opened: 2003

**University of Minnesota** – Recreation Center
$79M: Expansion and New construction (fee)
In Progress: (Anticipated 2013)
**Penn State University** – Hetzel Union Building
$24M: Addition (fee)
In Progress (Anticipated 2014)

**University of Illinois** – Activities & Recreation Center
$46M: Renovation (fee)
Opened: 2010

**University of Nebraska** – Recreation & Outdoor Center
$22M: Addition & new construction (fee)
In Progress (Anticipated 2014)

**Purdue University** – Student Fitness & Wellness Center
$98M: Renovation & new construction (fee)
In Progress (Anticipated 2013)

Benchmarking
Of all peers completing projects during the past 20 years, student fees have averaged $203 per student per year for Recreation projects, and $277 per student per year for Union projects.

**NOTES:**
*Student fee ranges are annualized (including fall and spring semesters)*  
**Fees vary based on enrollment size, facility phasing, financing variables, construction quality, location, etc.**  
***Most institutions have only one of each facility; U-M has three of each type, which increases capital and operating costs***
## Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter 2012</strong></td>
<td>• Review by / with Building A Better Michigan Student Coalition and University administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer, 2012</strong></td>
<td>• Revisions to scope, schedule, financial model&lt;br&gt;• Facility (re)programming and (re)estimating to align with revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Fall, 2012</strong></td>
<td>• Alignment with campus master plan&lt;br&gt;• Feedback / leadership from student leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Late Fall, 2012</strong></td>
<td>• Review by related student governance and leadership groups&lt;br&gt;• Review by University administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Late Winter, 2013</strong></td>
<td>• Formal proposal for project approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July 1, 2013 (FY14)</strong></td>
<td>• Project launch / financial plan implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For More Information

www.facebook.com/BuildingaBetterMichigan