

Meeting Notes

University Space & Facilities Advisory Committee

MEETING LOCATION: SBS_405

MEETING TIME: 1:00-2:30AM, Friday, May 24, 2019

PRESENT: Josh Callahan, TC Comet, Doug Dawes, Bella Gray, Mike Fisher, Holly Martel, Dave Nakamura, Jeanne Rynne, Dale Oliver, Steve St. Onge, Kristen Stegeman-Gould, Duncan Robins, Liz Whitchurch (notes), Jim Woglom

NOT PRESENT: Randy Davis, Genevieve Marchand

1. Meeting Minutes

a. May 3, 2019

1. Dale Oliver asked questions about Academic Project Science Building – How big will this building be? If we have donors, what amount of influence can they have on the building? Naming?
2. Naming Convention – There is a small group working at HSU on this. The CSU is contracting with some people to general guidelines relative to naming. HSU will take that as a basis. The timeline of this is not in Michael's control. If there is donor-ship, we can fast-track strategy. Frank would be a part of this.
3. Feasibility study – between now and September. Involves folks from campus. Trying to illustrate size/use of this potential new building. The problem is the timeline and getting in front of bond sale next year. Looking for something more open-ended for program use for that building. Feasibility is mostly about construction of a move versatile space. Need to demonstrate good-faith effort for feasibility in order to be in that queue. Does Dale Oliver need to do anything? Yes, but it's going to be initiated by Mike.
4. SAMO – Samoa Facility
5. Minutes approved.

2. AY1819 USFAC Details

a. Revisit Membership turnover

1. Good to stagger
2. Liz will update on the website the full range of the appointment for Doug to contact appointers to get feedback. Those in the middle of their appointments would be Jim, Dale, Duncan.

b. AY1920 USFAC scheduling requests?

1. Liz to schedule as we did last year, and go every other week from URPC

3. USFAC Subcommittees

a. **Landscape**

1. Meeting to review sites where trees need to be removed.
2. Suggestion made for the redwood – 10/12 foot section could be left and made into a redwood hedge once it's sprouts. This has been done in the past with redwoods.
3. When a tree is taken out, other vegetation will often replace the tree, but it depends on why the tree is removed. If it's because of disease of that tree, another tree could replace it, but maybe a different variety. If it's because the tree is causing infrastructure damage (roof, etc), another type of plant (shrub or ground cover) that meshes with the infrastructure will be chosen to replace it.
4. There will be more changes along Laurel Drive that are part of the capital project.

b. **Naming committee** – No additional work done in earnest yet. Waiting for CSU.

c. **Facilities Use Subcommittee**

1. Jeanne report from 5/23/19 meeting
2. Started discussion of prioritization guidelines for all-school lecture spaces. Outlined that campus access to classrooms is good for students and allows us to have increased utilizations.
3. Look to bring recommendations for about 6 space types to USFAC early this fall, which would ultimately go to URPC after that.

d. **Vacated space working group – No new news**

4. Space Management Issues

a. **Vacated Space**

1. Announcement on previous RFP is expected. Timeline unknown.
2. Lessons learned next time.

b. **Campus Key Policy – Building Coordinator update**

1. We have a draft for review.
2. There are some issues with current key policy
 - i. There are a lot of hard keys out there. Part of the purpose of the policy is to minimize the possibility that keys come back to Facilities.
 - ii. We want to increase electronic access across campus.
 - iii. There might be a way to collect fees.
 - iv. At this point, if faculty member loses a key, is there a process that determines when a lock is changed out? Will ask Joe/Randy.
3. Liz gave information about Building Coordinator changing to Building Liaison.
4. Doug would like the old policy for comparison – where is it? **Liz to send out.**
5. Holly argued for not charging for keys. She had oversight for a key policy in Housing.
 - i. CBA may not allow to charge something that should be available to them.
 - ii. Looking to change behavior, as well as create a revenue stream. Individuals could be held accountable for the loss of keys. Behavior change could be driven by managers.
 - iii. There was a lot of discussion around paying for keys.
6. Went through the draft policy as an overview.
 - i. Question about "Person of Interest" This is a peoplesoft term. **FM should talk more with HR about how we move forward with this?**
 - ii. Is it better to have UPD or FM let people into a space?

- a. As long as there are shared access controls, departments can let people into spaces. But are there people in the department that have keys? Perhaps the ASC could talk to FM to let people in. Need to make this clear in the policy. UPD has said in the past that they would not do it.
 - iii. Need to be clear about what a “department” is.
 - iv. Need to have clear “access” process posted somewhere? Could be in writing in a poster and/or online. Need information dissemination. Check online “here” to find out how to get a space unlocked.
 - v. Make sure to include that there is a hierarchy to access. If MBU is allocated space, then it should be accessible by that entity. Then let UPD know. Dean should be able to access faculty offices in their college.
 - vi. Defined term – rest of the document is initial cap. If you use the same language, you can use lower case or upper case.
 - vii. Need to be consistent access credential vs. credential
 - viii. No lead administrator for department – only MBU.
 - ix. Define office as private, semi-private. Need to coordinate with the secure space procedure. Scrape language from email – not private. Make it a specific item in the policy – secure spaces references!
 - x. Make “NONEMPLOYEE” first, then reference person of interest.
 - xi. Discuss Key Policy again next time.
- c. Classroom furniture issues – Next time.
- 1. Classroom furniture project for summer 2019
 - 2. Utilization Calculations (see attached Draft Building Space Report)
 - 3. Disappearing classroom furniture – USFAC role?

5. Physical master Plan

- a. Mike gave a quick summary. The 2004 Master Plan is geared an enrollment figure is 12,000 FTE. That is not today’s reality. Trajectory moving forward is most likely different. There are 2 major pillars – Academic Master Plan and Master Plan. We need to understand the academic mission and where investments will be made across programs. This will influence how the physical demand of campus rolls out.
- b. USFAC will be a key component of rolling this out. There will be steering committee to make sure Academic and Physical Master plans mesh together. We are “on-hold” for the moment. This will be something the President & Cabinet will be involved with. This will filter down to the whole university. It’s a lofty goal.
- c. It’s perfect timing – there is a lot of change happening right now. We are looking to create 5-10-20 year plan like master plan to memorialize these philosophies.
- d. Nothing to report on timeline. It’s something we really need to focus on this.
- e. Holly noted that the Provost started conversations with Senate in partnership to drive the Academic Master Plan forward. Academic Affairs has a retreat coming up next week to start the academic master plan. This will be a good start.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- IAPB – Review proposed process and discuss role of USFAC within that framework

ATTACHMENTS & LINKS

- Minutes from 5/3/19 USFAC Meetings (docx)
- Campus Key Policy Draft ([link](#))

REMINDER- Next USFAC meeting is planned for 6/21/19, 1:00-2:30pm, SBS_405