Recreation Board Meeting Agenda
January 20th, 2015

I. Call to Order
   5:36

II. Roll Call
   Patty McConnell, Nan Lu, Lee Silbert, Aleia Amaya, James Bradbury, Richard Bateman, Chelsea Canada, Spencer Murphy, Alec Parkin, Ellesse Spaeth, George Hoey, Pauline Olivas, Dan Rummel, Tim Jorgensen

III. Public Forum (15 minutes)

IV. 5 Minute Talks About Program Areas

V. Reading & Approval of Minutes (12-2 and 1-13)
   • Total of non-deductibles are $213,236
     Nan recapped that total non-deductibles after an increase in revenue will be $133,869
   • Edit names from minutes on 12-2

VI. Changes/Approval of Agenda Items
    No changes

VII. Old Business
    Recruitment: Alec recommends a high representation of Rec Board students at the recruitment fair in the UMC Glen Miller Ballroom.
    A table will need to be reserved. Banner should be requested from Annie Mulvany, saying either “Rec Services” or “Rec Board”.

VIII. CUSG Report
Old Business: A bill for the student group funding board and student group applications in the form of events and funding is for current over spending in that sector.

New Business: Bill to require legislative council president to require diversity training. Pauline stated the Rec Center will be modeling the UMC for training student employees in diversity.

Next Tuesday: Sexual assault town hall meeting. (Due to student confusion) Q: Who is responsible for faculty conduct? A: Not known at this time.

Q: Spencer needs to be ratified to be a voting member. A: Next week this will be complete.

IX. New Business

a. Final Reading of Budget

- No changes in numbers from previous week’s meeting, just a complete copy distributed. Page 6: Summary of numbers to show perspective of fees. Projection since headcounts will change how the numbers turn out. Looking at moving forward with 8181 to 8176, and both of which are under 3% which CUSG hopes to keep fee increases under.

Q: Fee per semester: only increases 3 dollars? A: Correct, assuming we use the same headcount

Q: What is the 11 mil then? A: Total student fees

Q: 11 mil is total and this is the breakdown? A: Yes.

- Cut Scenarios on page 5: Tim Jorgenson: 1 and 2 percent cut, always an option where cuts generate more revenue. Change the Intramural fee from current structure to per person charge rather than it being the responsibility of the team captain. Unlimited team access per semester will generate $60,078 additional revenue. This change should
not impact Intramurals much and may increase participation.

2nd: Cut marketing expenses by roughly $1000.

Q: So the $20 gets you a pass for sessions 1 and 2? A: Yes, you can even play multiple sports. Nan: But note that we do not increase the scale of offering (all those paying can’t play infinitely). Instead of unique individuals, look at play spots. Each play spot costs 40% more now.

Q: Is there a max on how many teams can participate in one session? Wouldn’t you make less since there would be less unique members? A: Bryan has seen this model at multiple other universities, students have other obligations and thus there is saturation. There isn’t enough time in the day to do it all.

Q: Is there any data on what the saturation point is? A: No, but the participation numbers are fixed due to the scale of operation, we will go on first come first served basis.

Basketball is where the problem is, we don’t have the gym space to grow.

Q: If saturation is reached, do you have strategies to market other sports? A: Hopefully, we increase participation by supporting other sports, there is information out there showing that this model will work.

Q: What do students think with the jump from $7 to $20, how will they feel? A: It’s a mixed bag, but you also get more opportunities. There is a chance some won’t like it, but many are repeats; if they play in one session, they play all four sessions. Hopefully with the financial incentive they will try other sports.
Q: Alternatively, could you cap the basketball participation by fee? A: If we get the 1 percent cut scenario, it is something we could look into more.

- 2 percent cut: Since the climbing wall is so popular, the current price $50 is generating much revenue and the proposal is to cut it in half, 50%. If we keep the current cost we will make an additional $37,500. This cut is a very viable scenario.

- Nan: Observations: These cuts if taken transfer to participants in fees in intramurals and climbing wall. The marketing expense cut is doable. Tim: Historically, intramurals are the bread and butter in that it is a team sport program mostly and we try to keep cater to most student interests. Most universities try to keep the cost low to participate. Gary: It is a self-fulfilling prophecy. There is great desire to keep the fees as low as possible since it is the root of recreation. “I suspect that nationally intramural fees will go up” plus the higher the subsidies in intramurals, the more those who don’t use the service have to pay for it. Nan: Intramurals will claim that it should have low barriers for entry since any skill level can compete.

- Discussion: The scenarios are reasonable; I would be more interested in changing the intramural fee. Nan: this is the direction Danielle and Bryan are moving towards but we don’t have to increase to $20, we can also propose $15 per/person fee. Even if we don’t have to look into this option, it could be a profitable plan regardless of what our budget looks like.

- Q: It looks like the base cut of 1% is easy to explain and doable and the third cut would be fine for a year, but would
not be a solution for the future, is that an overview? If needed, we can take it this year, but we cannot take it year after year. A: It isn't a one-time thing, next year we start at that base.

Q: Do you see that being a problem? A: I think that every budget can take a 1% cut, just not every year.

Q: That isn't something we advertise correct, we don't tell them we can handle this? A: You are right. If they bring it up, tell them the repercussions of the decision. If you keep doing it across the board, all you do is make your programs mediocre, if you look at real programs and real cuts then they work.

- Approval of the cuts and the budget: Motion made on 1 and 2 percent cut scenarios on page 5, second.
- Approval of budget for 2015-2016: Motion made.

Q: If we approve the base budget is that a 2% increase? A: Yes, In the motion could you work in the 2% increase in fees instead of the 3%? To work the percentage increase in the motion, I want to do that to show that we are below the consumer price index. Motion made, Vote: 4 yay 0 nay, 0 abstain. (Discussion of proxy voting)

X. Chair’s Report

- Pool tile money: Overview: The pool tile deck was value engineered out of Buff up the Rec, so Rec Board asked SOAR for funding for this project totaling $784,000, but didn’t need that much so reduced the request to $410,000. We are in the process of rebidding the project which will be completed in summer of 2015 and we approved the tile design last week.

Q: When do you anticipate the project would begin? A: May 8 and the dive well and comp pool will be closed.
Rec Board is in need of new members, so participating in the fair will hopefully generate new interest and possibly new members.

Q: Tabling at the Rec Center, did you get a good turnout? A: Mixed, some yes, some no. When we table again, we should change our priorities and let people know who we are and secondly if they are interested. You want input before you want recruitment.

Pictures of Rec Board members should go up preferably as soon as possible at the main entrance under interlocking CU.

Q: Student employees cannot serve on the board? A: Correct.

Recruiting in the morning did not draw much interest and I noticed there was much success when you had things to give away. Suggested that we use popcorn machines and candy to give away. Some dollars in the marketing budget to purchase. Can’t have a raffle because it is considered gambling, must be called a give-away. The candy worked for Spencer. Most won’t stop by a booth if there is nothing to give away. Suggested idea is to have each student member talk to two people who are interested and maybe interested in the job, word of mouth is the most effective. Meeting likely next week at 4:30 with the topics of general updates.

- Gary: Met with the campus controller on the policy regarding outside accounts and they would like more information. Don Misch did confirm that he did talk to the director of internal audits and there will be an audit of the club sports area. Also, Bryan, Tim and Gary are reviewing the club sports policy manual for necessary changes due to the new audit. There will likely be new items coming back to vote as we move forward. Secondly, Carlson Gym is being designed for repurposing as academic space. We are about a year to year and a half out from losing that space. They say they will come talk to us but the Regents have approved the proposal and the design, so we need to start looking for alternative spaces since we will be losing intramural gym space for volleyball, dodgeball, soccer, and events. It is a general
fund building and we must concede that. We have $300,000 in the contingency of the project so we need to look at the add-alternative list that was reviewed one year ago. We need to assemble and evaluate what is reasonable with what we want to accomplish.

Q: Is this pressing? A: No, we can do it anytime you want. It's not critical but it would be better to start soon. We can bring this topic to next Tuesday's meeting.

XI. Chair's Report

XII. Executive Team Reports

- Nan: Has nothing
- Patty: has nothing new other than lockers are renting like "gangbusters."
- Q: how come utilities went up so much? A: Gary stated it’s the mechanical system; what they gave us has no forgiveness and it doesn’t work. We are the third project on campus where it hasn’t worked like they said it would.
  Q: The efficiencies we were hoping for won’t even happen? A: We are tweaking the system and it could be up to a year before everything is balanced. It should improve but we won’t see the numbers they projected. You are going to lose efficiency simply because it is a new product. We are looking at 12%-15% increase in utilities since construction with a 30 percent increase in square footage. What we were hoping for is less usage but we don’t know if that will happen.
  Q: Has anybody on your staff talked with the City of Boulder about the energy consumption and savings? A: I don’t think that has happened.
- Tim: New staff training and marketing are firing up across the board. We are hoping to include maps and murals. It is a slow process and we are finally making progress.
• Dan Rummel: Thermo pool cover will arrive tomorrow. Far ahead of schedule.

Q: I haven’t noticed anything with out of order signs in the restrooms. A: We are just trying to stay on top of it; all the faucets contain batteries and sensors that need to be changed periodically.

XIII. Announcements
• Next meeting is Tuesday, January 27 at 4:30.

XIV. Executive Session

XV. Adjournment