The following notes summarize meetings between Sasaki and USM during a two-day Work Session that took place July 11 – 12, 2013.

**Greek Community Leadership Team**

- Considering the commitment to place a dining venue in Asbury Hall, additional dining options should be provided by Aramark relative to their strategic plan.
- “Row house” carries a negative connotation. Use “town house” instead.
- Need to represent outlying land holdings in illustrative master plan
  - Lake Thoreau Center https://www.usm.edu/biological-sciences/lake-thoreau-center

**Dr. Scott Blackwell, Director of Residence Life**

- Residence life master plan must factor into space planning effort
- Cedar Brook Apartments (37th Street) to remain as swing space during Pine Haven decommissioning
- The Quad will accommodate housing phase III
  - Jones, Wilber, and possibly Roberts will remain. Bolton and Pulley will be decommissioned
- Hillcrest will remain for a while. It serves as “incubator” for women en route to sorority housing
- Looking for input on successful upperclassman housing
  - Apartment style housing with full kitchens may not be an option
Under consideration: no more than two students share a bathroom, bigger beds
- testing “pod” model, a.k.a. “country club”: clusters of 2BR suites with common bath
- Wilbur experiment has proved popular. Former sorority chapter rooms converted to 6BR units
- Coed housing is illegal in state of Mississippi
  - CP South will separate the sexes by floor with card-controlled elevators
- ~75% of freshmen live on campus. Remainder is typically Hattiesburg residents

Space Planning Committee (Cynthia Easterling, Chair)

- The goal is to have a holistic vision for the university through the work of the Space Planning Committee and Sasaki. The Space Planning Committee will submit recommendations to the Executive Cabinet for review with final decisions being made by the President.
- Space Planning Committee wants Sasaki to provide space planning services. Submit proposal by July 19th.
- Need to develop process for filtering space information and requests through the Space Planning Committee. However, Space Planning Committee is advisory: makes recommendations to the Executive Cabinet.
- See Space Planning Committee’s evaluation criteria for space requests
- The members of the Executive Cabinet should make decisions regarding space for each of their divisions and subsequently for the University as a whole. Need to move decision-making above level of directors, supervisors and deans; above short-term needs of individuals.
- More information will be requested from the Executive Committee members who will collect the information from their divisions, then analyze and prioritize it for the Space Planning Committee and Sasaki. Sasaki will assist with developing a new survey template to be used to gather additional, more consistent information and will sit in on the interviews with each of the members of Executive Cabinet.
- During the process not only consider those who need space but also review the campus as a whole. Are there areas/units/departments that would function better if located closer to other similar/same units or if they were simply moved to a different area of campus?
- Technology in the classroom should be addressed.
  - Projector and HD video screen in every classroom?
  - Classrooms should be equipped with appropriate technology for distance learning
- University classroom space vs. department-allocated space, remember the need for neutral classroom space that is not controlled by specific departments.
- Multiple scales of analysis:
  - Campus land use districts or zones (including mixed use)
  - Schools and colleges, as well as non-academic units and divisions
  - Individual buildings
- Need to consider existing space patterns by division
  - Reveal scattered pattern of classrooms
  - Note time/distance between class periods, ability to get to next class
Convenience and consolidation of service points for students
Convenience and consolidation of other functional units

See information and documents submitted by the Space Planning Committee:
1. Chart of vacant/soon-to-be vacated space
2. Scheduling and utilization assessment of classrooms
3. Color-coded maps by college
4. Color-coded maps by divisions
5. 5 years of enrollment trends
6. Evaluation criteria
7. 1st round of space feedback from all divisions (in raw form and chart form)

Charrette: Greek Community Vision Plan

Overall notes:

“Crescent” scheme was the universally-preferred scheme, but several concerns were voiced:
- NPHC representation wanted better integration on the crescent
- NPHC representation wants plots incorporated into Spirit Park (not in the Greek Village)
- Concern over parking-in-rear model. Will students use front walks? Driving culture may prevail such that rear lots/yards are used de facto as front yards

‘Soft Touch’

- CPC:
  - Suggested putting common laundry into Town Center
  - Prefer apartment complexes to be managed by a third party
  - Concern over personal safety of female students
- NPHC:
  - Liked position of cottages and built-in unity of ‘Crescent’
- IFC #1:
  - Didn’t like routing of traffic from north coming into Greek Village
  - Didn’t like potential overflow traffic coming from coliseum
- IFC #2:
  - Didn’t like road routing, and view to backyards from new road
  - Town Center located in good spot
  - Good buffer adjacency to existing day care
  - Good variety of house sizes
  - More rec fields needed
  - Recommended closing off vehicular access from north

‘Crescent’

- CPC:
  - Liked location of apartments
Town Center should include a cafeteria, with ‘Seymour’s’-style late night venue at NW corner of Village as separate venue
- Concern about traffic with parking access to fraternities being adjacent to sororities’ front doors
- Liked idea of shifting meeting rooms/Greek offices, etc. to Town Center at east end of existing fraternity row.
- Liked idea of locating Greek life center closer to campus
- Suggested indoor recreation in venue near rec fields

NPHC:
- Liked this option best
- Suggested flipping front door of fraternities to face onto front door of sororities.
- Liked mix of cottages/townhouses and moving these closer to the core, to be more imbedded in the Village

IFC #1:
- Loved this scheme
- Suggested flipping front door of fraternities to face sororities
- Suggested cul-de-sacs at ends of east and west access points that feed the new outer loop road.
- Liked Town Center at top of crescent
- Liked apartments at NW corner of Village, allowing them choice in their level of engagement with the Greek community
- Suggested adding basketball courts

IFC #2:
- Liked green spaces
- Suggested flipping front doors to face sororities
- Suggested limiting road access into Village
- Didn’t like going through sorority row to access fraternity parking
- Liked houses and apartments sharing open green space
- Need to consider acoustical issues with location of amphitheater
- For apartments, suggested back doors becoming front doors
- Suggested cul-de-sacs at end of access into Village
- Good buffer adjacency to existing day care
- Good variety of house sizes
- More rec fields needed
- Recommended closing off vehicular access from north

The Bowl

CPC:
- Didn’t like un-regulated apartments integrated with community. Suggested pushing apartments to outside the limits of the community, and adding more houses.
- Worried about encroachment on daycare

NPHC:
- Didn’t like isolated/separate location for cottages

IFC #1:
- Didn’t like secluded/separated cottages
- Didn’t like thru-drives for cars: option is too inviting for those outside community
Suggested considering gate for vehicular access to community

- **IFC #2:**
  - Didn’t like vehicular loop through community
  - Found opening access to 37th Street questionable, unless it was converted to pedestrian access?
  - Concern about flooding potential of option
  - Liked idea of centralized parking or using parking as buffer to adjacent neighborhoods
  - Prefer front doors facing away from sororities

‘The Grid’

- **CPC:**
  - Too many apartment buildings
  - Need to add more houses
  - Suggested shifting rec fields to 37th Street side, with fraternity houses shifted to core, to keep houses located together
  - Putting fields at perimeter would be better from parking standpoint
  - Liked locating Town Center on route to campus

- **NPHC:**
  - Emphatically did not like this scheme...period

- **IFC #1:**
  - Didn’t like access to and from coliseum. Coliseum should be isolated from community
  - Having lighted fields in middle of community bad idea

- **IFC #2:**
  - Agreed with CPC comments
  - Scheme should be less dense
  - Grid pattern is ok
  - Liked amphitheater
  - Liked moving Town Center on route to campus, but set back a little from Montague

**Master Planning Review Task Force (Sid Gonsoulin and Cynthia Easterling, Co-Chairs)**

- All Greek Village concepts are isolated from campus. Integrate!
- Outdoor performance venue (with electrical hookup) needed
- Master plan should consider/address specifically the needs of commuter students
  - Many bring bike on back of car for “last mile” connection
- Needed rec fields (see rec field white paper) likely to be built at “The Garden”
- USM attempted a bike share program, but it failed due to theft issues
- Tree canopy task force looking into trees on campus
- USM is a signatory of the President’s Climate Commitment
  - Document GHG inventory with an infographic?
Next steps:

Sasaki will continue making progress on the Master Plan update and Greek Community Vision Plan as per the scope of work. The next on-site meeting, Work Session III, will take place in September or October. Pending approval of additional services requested by USM, the agenda for Work Session III will include:

- Review of the Draft Greek Community Vision Plan
- Interviews with Executive Cabinet members regarding space planning
- Wayfinding study kickoff
- Site tour and reconnaissance

The information above will stand as recorded unless Sasaki receives written comments within five days of the distribution date from a recipient requesting an amendment.