Memorial Union Reinvestment
Design Committee Meeting #11
Meeting Minutes 2010-2011
Winkler Lounge – Memorial Union

Members

Patrick Callan, Union President  X  John Staley, UW Faculty/Staff Rep  X
Paul Davidsaver, Student Project Manager  X  Mark Haebig, UW Alumni Rep (MUBA)  X
Stephanie Phillips, Student Appointee  X  Tom Smith, UW Alumni Rep (MUBA)  X
Brittney Rathsack, Student Appointee  X  Kiley Grose, ASM Chair Designee  X
John Skic, Student Appointee  X  Jennifer Limbach, ASM Appointee  X
Mark Guthier, Union Director  X  Kelsey Gergen, ASM Appointee  X
Hank Walter, Union Associate Director  X  Brian Borkovec, ASM Appointee  X
John Sharpless, UW Faculty/Staff Rep  X  Ted Crabb, Emeritus Director, Ex-Officio  X

Guests: Wendy von Below, Project Manager, Del Wilson, Design Principal – Uihlein Wilson, Jake Immel, Office Assistant, Director’s Office, Dierk Polzin, College of Letters and Science, Jay Ekleberry, Minicourse/Craftshop Director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call to Order</td>
<td>Mr. Davidsaver called the meeting to order at 6:03p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Minutes</td>
<td>Mr. Davidsaver asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Committee Meeting #10, whereas Mr. Smith spoke up stating that the minutes reflect his abstention for the vote regarding approval of the progression of schematic design. Mr. Smith made aware that he did not abstain his vote, rather voting in favor of the design progression and the change was made. The amended minutes were APPROVED.</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Forum</td>
<td>Mr. Dierk Polzin expressed concern over the changes at the Lakefront on Langdon and the terrace. Additional concern with the amount of student usage space, wanting to keep the terrace as functional as possible. The current design is much more respectful for its purpose and its effect on the current and future generations. Mr. Polzin made a point to convey that there is no public place on campus that people congregate at more than the Memorial Union and especially the terrace. The views of the lake should be preserved including the views of Picnic Point and the Capitol building. Mr. Jay Ekleberry urged support for a viable studio arts facility at the Union. An inspiring history of how the Craftshop came to exist – 80 years ago a student presented the need for the campus community which has been met by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Craftshop, to build a community around art and persevering despite the location and lack of visibility as a vibrant operation of the Union. The department is concerned that space designation will cause the Craftshop to be used as a scapegoat of viable space as it is looking to be moved and current area replaced by Administration Offices. Budget troubles show a concern with the space usage to stay true to what the Union represents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Team Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Walter reported that the Executive Team spent January 26 in Milwaukee at the Milwaukee Arts Center in meetings with the architecture team. Historically, the building and area was Schlitz Brewery, but has been transformed into a performing arts and rehearsal/meeting space facility. Some interesting architecture aspects included back-of-house work for storage purposes and two-level balcony construction and design. A tour of Red Arrow Park was led in downtown. The area has a small ice rink, run by the City of Milwaukee Parks that is very popular for recreational and figure skating practice and has a Starbucks coffee house located off the rink. The facility was a $7 million project and utilizes space well. Mr. Davidsaver stated that we cannot make an artificial ice rink or add one to design due to cost but found the idea and maintenance information relevant for an ice rink setup on the lake. Mr. Wilson referenced the student survey mentioned more usage of the terrace during the winter months and called for more winter activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Forum Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Gergen gave a description on the public architects meeting that took place last week. There were about 80 people in attendance. The architects spoke on the various drafts of schematic design for Memorial Union. A lot of interest was shown and many questions were asked. The architects did a great job of addressing the questions as they went through the building, floor by floor, and made the information relative and logical for the public. The greatest concern related to ideas and designs for the theater gathering and lobby space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theater Lounge Discussion &amp; Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Wilson reported on an extensive study that is being conducted. Schematic designs are being drawn up and reviewed and will conclude in April. The areas are being looked at piece-by-piece to give detail and properly identify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
functional space, gain feedback, and continue. Lot 1/Alumni Park, the turntable, and play circle are examples of area. The time has come to evaluate and give reason to why certain decisions will be made. Direction from the Design Committee is desired to maintain focus and stay on task—a tour will take place afterward to examine the area and discuss afterward.

Mr. Wilson presented an Executive Summary for each floor/space as it exists in schematic design. Problem areas were defined and potential changes were noted, which include:

- Theater Lobby space has insufficient area to accommodate pre-function crowds.
  - ~4,000 sq. feet short. Where should it be added?
  - Add space north or east.

This is a historical neighborhood; therefore Historical Society has final say on proposals. The process of adding on to historic structures, deciding on contrasting styles of addition versus taking down a portion of the structure and adding back later. The design cannot be exactly the same as the original building but same materials/proportions/etc. can be used in construction.

Three alternatives were discussed and reduced to two.

**Discounted Alternative:**

- Moving Hoofers out of Memorial Union to another location in order to make a pre-function space where Hoofers is currently designated.

**Alternative 1:**

- Expansion (of the lounge) to the north by 3,200 sq. feet.
- 1,700 sq. feet of flat space will be lost.
- Reduces existing Upper Terrace.
- Recreate Wisconsin Theater East steps
- Create new Upper Terrace East of Theater
  - Table and chair seating.
- Has a focused view of Lake Mendota.
- Provides accessibility from Lake Street and convenience via the service elevator.
- Maintains historic structure.

**Alternative 2:**

- Expansion to the east by 2,400 sq. feet.
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- 3,700 sq. feet of flat space will be lost.
- Edge of the lobby pushes east into the terrace, impacting the east face of the building.
  - Reduces Terrace seating.
- Retains Upper Terrace, maintains isolation.
- Retains steps around Theater.
- Has a focused view of Terrace.

The net difference between the two options is ~$30,000.
Mr. Wilson went through the design view and displayed the views of the two considered alternatives. A blueprint design of the alternatives was layered on one another to show the comparison of area affected by each. The main difference is the Upper Terrace aspect in Alternative 1 as opposed to invading into the Terrace in Alternative 2. A sun-study was also presented with comparing the sunset (on June 21) of each design as it is viewed from the terrace.

Mr. Wilson presented advantages and disadvantages of the alternatives being considered:

**North Advantages:**
- Larger floor plate can allow more people at events separately from the main corridor.
  - Existing lobby is divided from corridor for entry direction and organization.
- Space allows clear patron access.
- Service elevator to pre-function space serves Hoofers and gives access to Park Street.
- Minimal impact on lower Terrace seating.
- Does not obscure east façade

**North Disadvantages:**
- Reduces “Hoofers Deck” area.
- Slightly conceals Theater’s north façade (historic front).
- More isolated from Union’s main area/street.
- Greater travel/transport length for catering.
- Partially hides west lake view from a portion of the Terrace.
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**East Advantages:**
- No hidden part of north façade.
- No decrease in “Hoofers Deck.”
- Closer to Union’s main area/street.
- Less travel/transport distance for catering.
- Creates pedestrian activity from Langdon Street to Theater lobby.
- Sheltered environment exposure/
  - Expected less energy usage.

**East Disadvantages:**
- Limitation of footprint.
- Smaller floor plate.
- Not separate from main corridor.
- Alignment off-set from Theater/unclear patron access “around corner.”
- No benefit to Hoofers and service elevator will not connect to Park Street.
- Larger extension into main Terrace.

Mr. Davidsaver and Ms. Von Below called for a break to take the tour of the current Theater Lobby and discuss the two proposed locations of the Theater Lounge Space. The meeting was called back to order at 7:35 p.m.

Mr. Davidsaver introduced Mr. Russo and Mr. Sharpless whom requested time to speak on the Theater Lounge Space topic. Each was given five minutes to speak.

Mr. Russo began by stating that theater audiences desire a full-evening experience. Socializing before, during, and after events is important to event attendees and has become a norm for many modern-day productions. The current capacity at the Union Theater can provide this aspect but only in part. Sufficient space is lacking and often event attendees are sent to other locations in the Union to socialize which is also limited to space and availability. The small space currently does not allow for comfortable socialization. A Theater Lounge would not only benefit the Performing Arts (committee) but orchestra/jazz/dance/etc. rehearsals and performances. Concession sales are an essential part of a modern theater business model. A desire exists to add this aspect along with
catering opportunities as additional revenue sources. Recent problems with crowd space at functions showed at the recent ‘Naturally 7’ concert on February 5. Safety issues arise when people arrive early for events and have to cram into the entry space. Ticket lines form and spread down the Theater Gallery down to the first floor and as far as to the Union front doors near the Essentials desk. The hallway takes up a lot of unused space and is very under-utilized and repositioning it as lounge space is a good use of resources and provides more social space. Mr. Russo finished by stating that much of the year poses a time frame where the terrace is unusable due to weather. The lounge would utilize the space and provide usage for the area.

Mr. Sharpless began by agreeing of the over crowdedness described by Mr. Russo and the need for more space. The main argument brought across was the glass structure designed violates the architectural integrity of Memorial Union. While there is a need for outside/additional sources of income, frequent use from students does not seem likely. Realistically, how often will students get to use the second floor terrace? Mr. Sharpless stated he is not convinced that $1.5 million will be the final tabulation. Turning to the public, alumni, or students for additional funding should not be necessary. Taking up terrace space, the most valuable commodity and prideful spot at the Union will make the area smaller and more confined no matter which plan is accepted.

Mr. Davidsaver opened the floor for discussion.

Mr. Staley made a nod in keeping the pre-function space scope in mind and questioned if the area could be addressed in the current building confines. Mr. Staley expressed his opposition to the East/Alternative 2 but interest in the North/Alternative 1. Alternative 1 levels out the space even though it slightly moves into the terrace. What should be considered is the idea of no addition to the theater. The north addition levels out the space even though it slightly goes into the terrace. Student usage of the upper level could be a problem but possible if truly desired and made available. The idea of using it as an indoor/outdoor space during appropriate times of the year as part of the terrace could be considered and possibly a prerequisite for the area.
design. The service elevator is a good idea to assist Hoofers. Mr. Staley asked why the actual terrace line was not followed and instead the plan is to expand outward. Mr. Wilson explained the reason behind the design, stating that exploring a shape of symmetry to the original building was the idea. The curve was designed to do this with a purpose to not have a squared-edge addition. Either design would have an “adverse effect” (the Historical Society defines this as the item in question needs to find a negotiated answer and make the right decision in order to reflect the project) to a historic building, in fact, the group could decide to do nothing if they so choose.

Mr. Borkovec asked for clarification on Mr. Sharpless’s comment that the north leveling off of the terrace would be happening in either or only one of the alternative theater designs. Mr. Wilson resolved by saying it would occur in either alternative.

Mr. Borkovec also reiterated from Mr. Sharpless’s comments the hallway space should be included in the pre-function space in both of the designs. If expanding east, some space would be captured if using this area. It would support a smaller scare (similar-shaped) design if constructed. Mr. Borkovec asked the size of the design and clarification that it will be about the size of Tripp Commons. This was confirmed by Mr. David saver where the suggested space spans 3,100 sq. feet (without the back-of-house would be less) and Tripp Commons contains 3,500 sq. feet. Mr. Borkovec also mentioned this addition and its potential to make the Union Theater a performing arts destination. Mr. Russo replied by saying opinions reflect a need for a campus home for the performing arts. Patrons are too accustomed to the luxury of the Overture Center and if the Union Theater wants to stay competitive, the pre-function space needs to stay relevant.

Mr. Sharpless asked about the existing seasonality of performances, where Mr. Russo answered primarily during the academic year with an interest to expand summer activity.

Ms. Grose stated the east side alternative is not advantageous. Performing Arts events have warranted need for space. Recently a Latin Dance event expected ~50
students in attendance and ended up totaling over 200. Stage space was extremely limited and a space would support student outreach.

Mr. Guthier reminded the concept of the space has existed since the referendum in 2006, where it was imposed as a student space like the rest of the Union. Union Council and the Design Committee have already approved the program and if the Design Committee chooses neither option to progress in design the process must begin again because the Theater needs the space. The theater program must gain a functional area somewhere and redesign would set the project. Mr. Guthier’s opinion of interest lies with the north alternative to progress further in design.

Mr. Crabb commented the area will be referred to and used as a student space. A larger space for people going to the theater and pre/during/post-function space. Results from the survey also noted that a desire and need exists for additional space. Mr. Crabb noted favor of a combination of the north/east alternatives for expansion. Although the idea would not follow the original referendum commitment, but it would respond to the theater’s need for space. Mr. Crabb raised the question if a third alternative could be drafted of an expansion of the north/south corridor following the Hoofers expansion line. It would give additional overflow space as well as a corridor for a main entrance to the theater. Mr. Davidsaver replied that the final design is not being approved tonight, but confirmed additional discussion and design will take place before it is finalized and approved and noted Mr. Crabb’s comments fell in favor of the east alternative as verified by Mr. Crabb.

Mr. Walter observed the impact on the theater without the space. Decisions on productions brought in include revenue potential in order to cover production costs. Currently there is no tabulation for revenue gain, but this function space needs to be located at and around the theater. Der Rathskeller and other locations are not viable. If a combination could work, it could strengthen the terrace and play on a “levels attract” theme of allowing patrons to locate themselves on different levels of the terrace (via chairs, steps, second-level of the terrace). Mr. Walter stated that the
north option works better and strengthens the east side of the building (theater wing) whereas the east option weakens that portion and the building and the terrace

Mr. Callan stated support for the north option. The Union’s student leadership makes priorities for students all the time as one of their main focuses. Mr. Callan noted views on the area not being used often in the summer but more during the academic term, and as pre/post-function area for the theater. There is potential for hurting the terrace, but the benefits would outweigh the drawbacks.

Ms. Gergen displayed interest with a ‘wrapping’ design that would better designate space. Mr. Wilson commented that this has already been discussed and it would have an adverse effect as an addition to a historic building and would not be the best possibility. Ms. Gergen asked if the gallery space being removed could be moved to another location. Mr. Davidsaver answered that it will not. The art interest group did not show interest in replacing it.

Ms. Limbach conveyed interest in the north option and desire to not take out of Hoofers space, but a space issue can be worked out. There is opportunity to develop winter activities that could utilize the frozen lake and sees use for the pre-function space and its need.

Mr. Sharpless questioned if the function space could be used as a warming house for lake activities in the winter, where Mr. Davidsaver responded the possibility exists but has not been looked into much.

Ms. Von Below clarified in the diagrams pertaining to the concessions area is a ‘place-holder.’ In the north expansion, the opportunity would allow for daylight to be brought into the Hoofers offices which is not yet solved in the east option.

Mr. Skic gave his support to the north expansion. Looking to the east during the tour seemed as though an expansion at that point would narrow the terrace. There is no other relevant area where the addition could be located.

Mr. Davidsaver added that it appeared that structural support can be reduced to two columns in open areas. Four can be
put into walls already in place and two more that fall in the middle for six total columns.

Mr. Davidsaver closed discussion on the Theater Lounge discussion. Mr. Staley made a MOTION to adopt the north addition of pre-function space to the Theater for further study as SECONDED by Mr. Callan. Mr. Davidsaver opened discussion on the motion, being none he CALLED THE QUESTION. The MOTION PASSED by a 10:2 vote (plus Mr. Crabb as ex-officio). Mr. Davidsaver abstained from voting procedure.

Mr. Davidsaver adjourned for a short break at 8:23p.m and reconvened at 8:27p.m.

Mr. Davidsaver and Ms. Von Below briefed the Design Committee on the updated design schematics.

First Floor:
- Moving the connector piece between the west wing and the central floor to even the levels.
- Gray color displayed on the design is area dependent upon the campuses decision on support for the loading dock.
- Theater layout is continuing study.
- A proposal exists to connect the bus stop lounge with the Paul Bunyan Room to create further seating space. No historic murals would be disturbed.

Basement:
- Loading dock has no update.
- The art collection is moved away from water.
- Mechanical pits will provide storage for much of the equipment needed to maintain the building. Location of the additions is flexible and the possibility of running into utilities exists, but can be addressed and fixed.
- Retain mechanical space near Hoofers/kitchen.
  - Expand area near the games room addition on the first floor.
- Possible to put the Craftshop down here so that it is more visible and in a more highly trafficked area.
  - Would require theater offices to move to a higher
Possibility exists to eliminate the woodshop and black room.

- Hoofers update: Bradley Lounge fireplace-wall maintained with the Bradley Canoe on the opposing wall. The idea is to create a “welcome to Hoofers” feel upon arrival via the hallway.

Mr. Davidsaver continued by stating that a better/more appropriate design of the basement/first floor will be presented and discussed at the next architect meeting.

Second Floor:
- Art Gallery is still displayed on this floor.
  - Ms. Gergen reported from the Art Committee concern regarding the addition of doorways to the outside (and windows). Traffic through a gallery from the outside is not supported. It increases the chance for art to be stolen. Flattening out the walls in Porter Butts would be a good idea too. Ms. Von Below added the committee’s concerns of where to store the ladder. The idea of a hidden door would provide storage for a ladder.
  - Servery and production storage (table/chair storage for Tripp Commons) for Tripp Commons, Inn Wisconsin, and Profile Room is shown.
  - Service elevator will be moved back here and exploration of an accessibility lift.
  - CRO is planning to stay on this floor.
    - Addition of a conference headquarters to use the Annex Room as restrooms.
  - Play Circle area is moving ahead with Scheme G. The Theater Interest group really likes this design as well. Emergency stairs will be moved back and the dressing rooms with be relocated with stairway.
  - Theater offices will be moved from the basement to just outside of the Play Circle (third floor).
    - Seating balcony was cut giving room for a tech mezzanine with a lighting alcove and storage needs
    - 200 total seats.

Mr. Smith showed concern for the theater corridor (currently too cold, poor placement) and asked of a solution. Ms. Von
Below responded that energy codes will need to be met and will be further developed.

Ms. Grose asked what the pink area near the Play Circle represented, and Mr. Davidsaver answered it needs to maintain a high level of stage access.

Third Floor:
- Theater offices moved here as well. They are not shown well in this design.
- Information Systems moved here too with access to the elevator.
- Attempting to keep meeting rooms in the mezzanine area. Splitting the Board Room into two smaller rooms from a former larger design which acquired space from current storage.

Fourth Floor:
- Maintain the hotel rooms and bring them up to code.
- Light blue area is currently designated as a meeting room. But the desire is to move AV or telecom here.
- A waiting area/breakfast bar nook is also a possibility.
- Reception room has been reduced to increase serving area to Great Hall. Further study is taking place as many feel there is too much of a reduction.
- TheArchitects are proposing on replacing the current lift near Great Hall, restore a previous column, and relocate the lift adjacent the stairway to form an integration look.
- A meeting room was added where the Women's Center is located which can double as a pre-function space.
- A ramp was replaced with a ramp and was possible instead of a stairway. Ms. Von Below responded by stating it has been considered but is not possible.
- Mr. Smith inquired if a ramp was possible instead of a stairway. In reference to space designation, Mr. Stic noted the hotel guests might notice if a meeting/event was taking place nearby as well.
### Fifth Floor:

- A proposal removing storage and making unisex restroom.
- Mendota Room could be WUD Officer’s Suite and current workroom would become a copy center/office/project work/break room.
  - Creating a conference room (labeled ‘work room’ in design) for WUD is an idea to restore the Mendota Room’s purpose. WUD seems happy with the layout and design.
  - Architects are double-checking the additional terraces usability.

Mr. Guthier reported on the Historical Society’s feedback to the architects. The meeting yielded:

- Approval the connector piece in the theater wing.
- Langdon Street façade should be retained and reused in the restructure.
  - Bus stop lounge was pushed back.
- North side of connector piece to have the same stone finish, but not concerned with appearance.
- Additional connector piece feedback:
  - Reuse the bronze handrails.
  - Space can be altered but reusing the material noted by the Historical Society.
- The Theater loading dock was approved as long as a canopy is not created.
- Underground mechanical clearance was approved.
- Play Circle was in need of further discussion. This will be addressed in a future meeting.

Mr. Davidsaver noted there was no feedback on the east side, but the Historical Society feels it has less adversity in its effect. Mr. Guthier also noted the stone should not look the same but like an addition has been made.

Mr. Davidsaver opened the floor for discussion.

Ms. Rathsack submitted a statement as reported by Ms. Von Below regarding the Craftshop:

“..."
Mr. Borkovec asked if the group is going to consider moving the Craftshop, discussion needs to continue before a decision is made too quickly. Mr. Sharpless requested clarification on the dark room situation. Mr. Davidsaver said the room is too big. A smaller room would be desired, but due to the Memorial Union budget (for the following year), the woodshop and dark room are ceasing to help aid the budget gap. Funding has disappeared over time and the question has developed into if a reason to keep the two areas exists.

Mr. Walter continued by clarifying the space designated to the Craftshop is too small for the programming that the area and staff have requested. Mr. Davidsaver worked with the campus Survey Research Center to design a survey that went out to all students, faculty/staff, and email subscribed members. One question inquired about service/area usage, and the Craftshop showed low awareness, usability by survey takers. The numbers that stated more frequent usage if knowledge of the Craftshop was available was also low. This led design executives and staff to believe if there is no demand, there is no reason to keep it. It is believed that the Craftshop’s dark room is the only publicly accessible one left in Madison. There has been a push by the architects to find a visible space, but no demand showed on the survey. Once the state budget issue arose, a reassessment led to a multipurpose space (known as a “dirty room”) idea. Talks of placing the Craftshop near the rehearsal room addressed the visibility and marketability opportunity.

Mr. Sharpless asked if dark rooms are outdated. Ms. Gergen stated that they are used frequently and it is still a highly demanded/popular art form. Mr. Staley inquired if the DoIT space is a large enough accommodation. There is potential to move the entry door directly across from the stairway. Mr. Davidsaver clarified that the Craftshop needs 2,100 sq. feet to accommodate current programs. The current design shows 1,300 sq. feet.
Discussions with the architects need to continue, but recently an idea arose for DoIT to become an area for office functions and further storage. About 200 sq. feet was requested by the Craftshop for storage, which does not have to be located in the Craftshop itself. A meeting within the next week will determine the official amount needed by the Craftshop and continue talking about the space distribution for this area.

Mr. Staley brought up the question of placement for Accounting. Mr. Davidsaver responded the department will stay where it is currently located or possibly move to the Administration Suite (Second or third floor—see above design breakdown).

Mr. Crabb asked for further word on the loading dock discussion. Mr Guthier replied that there has not been advancement. The idea is a decision for campus officials as the Union cannot afford the full project ($9 million). One option is to tie it into the Alumni Park project or as a campus priority as the wait for the release of the state budget continues.

Mr. Davidsaver followed by giving a schedule briefing, explaining that the west wing needs to be open for the Wisconsin Alumni Association 75th Anniversary. The loading dock is hampering the entire schedule and the Design Committee is working with the state architect to present a schematic design excluding the first floor area until a decision can be reached. Therefore the west wing can be given attention and once a decision is reached on the loading dock, that area can be put into focus. This path will not affect overall design plans as there is enough time before design development begins for the loading dock space (in a few years). Then the architects would not be reimbursed for that space until the decision is made as well.

Mr. Davidsaver ended discussion on the design update.

Mr. Callan made a **MOTION** to approve the direction of schematic design, as **SECONDED** by Mr. Smith. Mr. Davidsaver **CALLED THE QUESTION**. The **MOTION PASSED** with no objection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schematic Design Approval, Interest Group Meetings, Upcoming Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Davidsaver stated that Union Council will look to approve schematic design at the meeting taking place during the week of March 31. This approval might exclude the loading dock design/related area stated earlier. The Design Committee meeting will take place on Monday, March 28. A doodle will be sent via email to decipher date and time availability for Design Committee to meet before Union Council in order to approve the design before Union Council as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is full Interest Group meeting on Monday, March 21 in Great Hall 5-6:30p.m. with a separate group breakout session and final decision/recommendations will be made regarding space designation and need (see the save-the-date handout soon to be sent via email from Mr. Davidsaver for upcoming meetings, dates/times/locations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Davidsaver also took a poll for a benchmark tour of WID/MIR given by Mr. Wilson on Tuesday, February 22, at 3:30p.m. There was a lot of interest by the committee to make this happen. Another date can be made available if interest exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Callan brought forth an idea to form a new Events Sub-Committee in order to focus on publicizing events that pertain to MUR. The group’s direction would be given from Mr. Davidsaver and Mr. Callan. The group will work with creating a fun atmosphere at events and building anticipation and excitement and different ways of becoming more informed and expressing opinions to further tell the story of MUR (like NUGO—New Union Grand Opening) and to extend outreach capabilities. Ms. Rathsack has volunteered to chair the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Davidsaver asked for volunteers. Ms. Phillips stated interest in the group and came forth to assist Ms. Rathsack. Additional interest and request for membership can be forwarded to Mr. Davidsaver and Mr. Callan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Davidsaver adjourned the meeting at 9:52p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION PASSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events Sub-Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjournment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>