

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

Facilities Management

DATE: February 21, 2017

TO: Volga Koval, Rock Braithwaite, Tom Trepiaak, Dave Nakamura, Jan Henry, Steve St. Onge, Izabella Gray, Tony Silvaggio

FROM: Traci Ferdolage

CC: Tallchief Comet, Margaret Griggs, Kelly Kime, Kimberly Comet

RE: Summary of February 8, 2017 Meeting

Following, you will find a summary of discussion which occurred at our meeting on February 8, 2017:

Attendees

Members: Volga Koval, Dave Nakamura, Rock Braithwaite, Traci Ferdolage, Tom Trepiaak, Jan Henry, Tony Silvaggio, Izabella Gray

Staff: Tallchief Comet, Kim Moon, Kelly Kime

AGENDA

1. Review of Meeting Notes

- Meeting notes were approved as issued

2. Reports & Updates

- **Group Charge & Membership Document:** Traci indicated the recommended changes were reviewed and approved by the University Space & Facilities Committee. The document has now been forwarded to the University Senate Executive Committee for consideration. Traci also reported additional efforts are underway to secure a student representative for the Committee (current vacancy).
- **Redwood Bowl Track Replacement Project:** Traci provided an update to the group indicating the design consultant request for proposals had been issued with proposals received, reviewed and a contract awarded; the same has occurred with regard to the required site survey. Traci indicated the design team is Cameron McCarthy (based in Eugene) and that they have a lot of experience with Pacific Northwest facilities; the design effort is off to a good start with a site visit being expected soon. Traci also indicated the survey effort was primarily completed over the winter break and that initial survey documents had been received. Group discussion centered on review of the schematic design and programmatic objectives along with additional discussion concerning the project budget and likelihood that lower priority objectives will not likely be implemented due to financial constraints.

3. Discuss Indoor Scheduling Guidelines

- Volga introduced the topic and reviewed the current scheduling guideline and comments received to date and how such was incorporated into the current draft. Spirited discussion followed with topics focused on the challenges and issues associated with how scheduling is currently conducted, those that might arise if scheduling were centralized, and those that might arise out of a hybrid system. Overall the group expressed value in ensuring the departments affected by scheduling and tasked with stewardship within the building be involved as they often better understand the “day to day life of the building”. The group also expressed continued support for efforts to ensure schedules are fully visible for both the reservation request process and to enable better overall usage, security, safety and ability to schedule maintenance efficiently. Deep discussion took place regarding the use of Schedule25 with opinions varying widely; this culminated in an agreement to look more deeply into Schedule25 so as to understand the challenges/issues associated with using such at the department level. The group also agreed that experiences with Schedule25 associated with the UC’s implementation of such for room reservations will be a good point of information to consider. Volga requested the group focus efforts on considering how the scheduling priority (Section 3b) might be defined and be prepared for in-depth discussion on that topic alone at the next meeting. The group agreed and acknowledged the investigation into Schedule 25 could take place in parallel with ongoing guideline development.

4. Set Next Meeting Date

- The group agreed another meeting should take place by the end of February or early March. The only topic for discussion at that time will be the indoor scheduling guidelines.