

UFFAB Meeting Minutes
Thursday 17 November 2011
Room 303, General Services Building

Members Present:	Tamla Blunt, Graduate School, Chair Laura Bishop, College of Vet. Med. & Bio. Med., Vice Chair Jesse Jankowski, College of Engineering Teresa Molello, College of Applied Human Sciences Chris Johnston, College of Business Vincent Crespin, College of Liberal Arts Jacob Medina, College of Natural Sciences
Members Not Present:	Lexi Evans, College of Natural Resources Jenna Muniz, ULC
Members at Large Not Present:	Justin Safady, College of Business
Associate Members Present:	Cody Stoltenburg, College of Applied Human Sciences Jessica Toney, College of Business
Associate Members Not Present:	Elan Alford, Graduate School
Ex – Officio Members Present:	Steve Hultin, Faculty Advisor Robert Harris, SFRB Liaison Toni Scofield, Staff Support Daphne Frey, Staff Support Lindsay Brown, Staff Support Steve Abt, Vice President of University Operations Facilities Advisor Kristi Buffington, Manager for Space and Information Management, Facilities Management Matt Wurst-Caligiari, IT Staff Support
Ex – Officio Members Not Present:	Patrick Burns, Ex – Officio Member

I. Call to Order

Meeting called to order.

II. Approval of Minutes from November 3, 2011

Cody Stolenberg commented that his name was spelled wrong on last week's minutes.

Tamla asked for approval of minutes to be approved by a show of hands. Approval of minutes from November 3, 2011 was unanimous.

III. Washington School: Jeff McCubbin, Dean, College of Applied Human Sciences; Lise Youngblade, Department Head, HDFS; Berry Willier, Project Manager, Facilities Management; Abbey Schneider, Graduate Student

Lise Youngblade, the department head of HDFS, introduced herself, Dean McCubbin, and Abbey Schneider, a graduate student in the program. She thanked The Board for letting them come and talk today.

Lise Youngblade explained that the Early Childhood Center is a key campus facility with a tri-fold mission. The Early Childhood Center is an education facility used for training students, a service facility, an outreach center with childcare and a research facility. She explained that the Early Childhood Center serves 400-500 students now in the Gifford building and will double that number with the new facility at Washington School. The new facility will be technology equipped with live streaming from the Early Childhood Center at Washington School back to CSU classrooms.

Lise Youngblade also explained that the Early Childhood Center has a strong commitment to serve CSU students. 40 % of children enrolled in the Early Childhood Center are children of CSU student parents and that funding helps to cut the cost of childcare for these parents.

Lise Youngblade went on to explain the value that the Early Childhood Center has for all CSU students. The Early Childhood Center at Washington School will improve CSU's reputation and CSU will also have one of the top child research labs.

Lise Youngblade then explained the project history to The Board. Washington School was purchased and the project was split into Phase 1 and Phase 2. Phase 1 was to start the program and get it running. Phase 2 was to fix the basement and other projects that could be worked on while children and staff are in the building.

Lise Youngblade stated that after getting the project started, there were changes to the original plan. She explained that like any old building there were surprises that were unknown for the scope of work that was predicted. It was discovered that the original drawings of square footage were inaccurate and this led to a budget change.

Lise Youngblade explained that the plan was to open in January and the Early Childhood Center was 97% enrolled at this point. But due to the setbacks and unexpected changes the opening date is now being delayed until August 2012.

Lise Youngblade told The Board the main reason for an increase in the budget for the Early Childhood Center was due to the results of lead testing where lead based paint was found throughout the building. She explained that the total revised cost would be \$4.6 million and the cost before was \$2.5 million.

Lise Youngblade explained that her staff has raised \$300,000 already and has \$200,000 pending that is looking positive to be granted to the project, but still need \$2.4 million.

Lise Youngblade asked The Board for \$2.4 million. She explained \$1,185,000 would be used for abatement and related costs, \$355,000 of the \$2.4 million is for the Phase 1 shortfall, \$260,000 would be for electrical upgrades and air conditioning throughout the building, \$150,000 for an elevator so there is inside access to the basement, and \$450,000 would be for the HVAC system.

Lise Youngblade then gave reasons for why UFFAB should support Washington School's request. Her first reason was for UFFAB's support was the timing. She explained that abatement is usually completed before people are in a building and it would be more expensive in the end if they didn't do the abatement now instead of trying to do it at another time. She also explained that it is challenging to get money for abatement because no one wants to put their name on a pipe that will be covered up. Her second reason for UFFAB's support is that the Early Childhood Center at Washington School is a great example of UFFAB's vision and what UFFAB stands for. The Early Childhood Center is all about students; it supports student learning, student research, and student parents. She explained that the new center will have cutting edge technology and resources which is rare for schools to have. She also explained that the Early Childhood Center affects many majors, not just one.

Lise Youngblade then asked Abbey Schneider to say a few words.

Abbey Schneider told The Board that she came into the Early Childhood Center as a graduate student. She proceeded to state that her graduate degree wouldn't have been the same without the lab program that CSU offers because she wouldn't have gotten that experience at other universities.

Lise Youngblade then asked Dean Jeff McCubbin to speak.

Dean Jeff McCubbin stated that the Early Childhood Center is a vital aspect for the major Human Development and Family Studies in the College of Applied Human Sciences. He

stated that the Early Childhood Center is very highly valued by the college and is critical for the College of Applied Human Sciences.

Lise Youngblade then asked if The Board had any questions.

Jesse Jankowski asked more specifically if asbestos abatement had or was preformed.

Berry Wilier responded by saying that the building is asbestos-free.

Tamla Blunt said when you buy a house you fill out forms. How did so many issues arise when CSU went through so much to acquire the building?

Steve Hultin responded by saying that the testing got delayed when Brian Chase left and Steve Hultin came in to take his place.

Tamla Blunt asked The Board if there were any more questions and there were none.

Lisa Youngblade thanked The Board again and invited The Board to come visit the facility once it was all finished.

Jesse Jankowski remembered he had one more question and asked if the old radiators were part of the old heating system?

Lisa Youngblade replied saying that they were.

IV. Design and Merchandising iDea Pod: Katharine Leigh, Interior Design Program Coordinator, Design and Merchandising

Hannah Truppo explained to The Board that the iDea Pod is designed to be a gallery and lounge space. The iDea Pod would include a coffee lounge and make the space adequate for creativity, collaboration, socializing, and area to create ideas between classes. Design and Merchandising would like this space to be a place students want to spend time in, which is not what they have now.

Hannah Truppo also explained the idea of making the iDea Pod a gallery space also. She explained that the space they have now is flat and cold, has no security, the windows are hidden, and there is nothing exciting in the space. Design and Merchandising would like a place to practice their work, make a lighted path to main campus, brighten up this area of campus, and celebrate the program as a program of excellence.

Hannah Truppo proceeded on to talk about the Post Occupancy Evaluation study. She explained that the study found the space to be serene and an adequate workspace, but 55% of students were dissatisfied with the functionality, location, and adjustability of

computer areas. Hannah Truppo stated that the study also found that 100% of surveyed people thought the lighting was poor.

Hannah Truppo concluded by saying the space seems bland, poor, and not fun. She stated that the current space lacks creativity and functionality.

Brittany Bushman introduced herself as the ASID student president as well as a student of Katherine Leigh's. She began by presenting sketches of the iDea Pod. She emphasized the importance of functionality in the space. Brittany commented that the coffee bar would not be staffed, but self-serviced. Brittany began presenting design number one. This design showed a coffee bar, along with a place to put student awards, storage and hanger system, and plenty of mixed seating all around.

Brittany proceeded to talk about design number two for the iDea Pod. She explained that this option is the more favored by the students. This design had a coffee bar with double access on each side, project areas with seating, stackable storage, collaboration space, and mixed seating that is very flexible. This design featured a media wall that plays through student work, announcements, presentations, and 3D animations.

Brittany then stated that the current lab was not a 24-hour lab, and the department would like one. There wouldn't be any amenities in these spaces, but it would help Design and Merchandising students be better students if everything was up to par.

She also explained that the lab wouldn't just be used by Design and Merchandising majors.

Katharine Leigh told The Board that 200 Design and Merchandising majors use the area and about 600 students in the department.

Katharine Leigh explained that the budget was \$85,000 with technology. She explained that the Design and Merchandising program is a program of excellence, but it is not known around campus. She claimed that Design and Merchandising is an accredited program without a facility for it. Katharine explained that the current building, Alyesworth Hall, hasn't changed since the program started, but the way the major now works has changed over time. She expressed her concern that coffee is not close to building, that there is no place to sit, and no gathering area for students.

Katharine continued and stated that paint is not needed for this project, when reflecting on previous money facilities awarded Design and Merchandising, furniture is what they really need. Katharine Leigh also mentioned that Design and Merchandising was promised new facilities this fall and never got them due to budget cuts of some sort. She noted that since she has been at CSU, Design and Merchandising has asked for the past 11 years for new furniture and they haven't gotten it.

Katharine Leigh then asked the board if they had any questions.

Tamla Blunt asked Katharine if the department took the money and furniture away?

Katharine Leigh explained that the department did not take it away; facilities did for whatever reason.

Jesse Jankowski then asked if Design and Merchandising receive less money then what they were asking for, would the project be dead or could it still be work with it?

Katharine Leigh explained that the project is set up into three passes. The department is looking at anyway they can get help. She emphasized again on the lack of proper lighting in the area. Katharine Leigh also explained to the board that Design and Merchandising is planning on to looking for money in other places and not solely relying on UFFAB.

V. Design and Merchandising Interior Design Gallery: Katharine Leigh, Interior Design Program Coordinator, Design and Merchandising

Emily Cooper introduced herself and explained to The Board that Design and Merchandising would like improve their current gallery space and make it more usable. She stated that the students have come up with three layouts for the gallery. They would like this space to be a place to showcase work, a space that is functional and has flexibility (meaning they need to be able to have computer technology in the space), and they would like a space that is transparent and clear.

Emily continued and explained case studies that have been done. She stated that the Design and Merchandising students would like to see big open windows and believe this location would be perfect to have these features. Design and Merchandising would also like to make this building enhance the lighting in the area and have the building be accessible at all hours. She told The Board that the Design and Merchandising students have looked around campus for creative ideas to make this gallery tie campus together. Emily specifically showed that the Behavioral Sciences Building was looked at.

Emily began with design number one for the gallery.

1. The first of the three designs was a space that focused mainly on trenchancy. Emily stated that it was important for this space to have availability to be seen twenty four hours a day, a place to display student work, windows on sides, and be a functional space. Emily then presented a virtual video of the gallery. The video showed that the walls would be made of glass, there would be space for posters of presentation, and have spaces of branding for the department or for donors to buy as an alternative from of raising money.

2. Jessica Wojtowicz introduced herself and presented option two which had a central theme of flexibility. She explained that the Design and Merchandising students used the Cube as an inspiration for this option. Jessica stated that this design would be an addition on to the current building. She also explained that the gallery would be eye-catching to bring students into the building, and be great for showing off artwork. This gallery would be two stories with offices on the second floor. It would have more calibration and natural lighting than the gallery has at this current time. Jessica stated that the Behavioral Sciences Building was also the inspiration for this design.
3. Carrie Zwisler presented the third option for the Design and Merchandising Gallery. This design focused on function over decoration. Carrie stated that the overall design is to have everything exposed. The gallery would be a presentation space and also an education space. Carrie explained that the floor would be striped to show polished concrete, a wall would be broken through to allow people to see into the gallery, the ceiling would be exposed, and there would be a lighting lab in the gallery to eliminate going off campus for this lab. She also stated that a central cube made of yarn would be used to showcase work; there would be floor to ceiling windows on one side with pivot doors, transparent panels would be used, and a cube like area as the front entrance to catch people's attention and make them want to come in. Carrie explained to The Board that everything would be very flexible with moveable seating and exposed structural elements. Design and Merchandising would also like to incorporate landscape design to the outside of the building, but that would be separate from the project they are asking The Board to fund.

Katharine Leigh explained to The Board that the projected budget cost is \$400,000 – \$32,000 for the design fee.

Tamla Blunt asked Katharine Leigh if this number was for all three of the proposed designs.

Katharine Leigh responded by stating that this amount was only for the last option with would also be the most expensive.

Katharine Leigh explained to The Board that the current lighting center is located off campus as stated earlier. She also explained that Design and Merchandising receives a grant from the Nuckolls fund for \$24,000 to be used for advanced lighting. She told The Board they would use the gallery as teaching space and would incorporate a lighting lab into the gallery so the students no longer had to go off campus for this class.

Katharine Leigh concluded the presentation with a summary of the proposal. She stated that there were three solutions for the gallery and branding opportunities for the

space. She added that the gallery would be visible to campus, would enhance the diversity of academic culture, has functional objectives, and would benefit both CSU students and the public. She ended by stating that the exterior landscaping is excluded and a bonus to the gallery.

Katharine Leigh asked The Board if there were any questions she could answer?

Tamla Blunt asked Katharine Leigh if there was a budget for design one and two?

Katharine Leigh responded to Tamla Blunt's question by stating they did not have a budget for number one and two for whatever reason. She explained to The Board that there is no air conditioning in the building, it is filled with disgusting tile and carpeting, and the furniture is breaking. She also stated that the learning space is very poor quality compared to the rest of campus and almost everyone in the program is embarrassment about the spaces they have. Katharine Leigh explained that the building is very odd and that the changes they are proposing won't add to the janitor load. She concluded by stating that the Design and Merchandising program at CSU is the only graduate program in the Rockies region and the only public program offered in the west.

VI. Legitimacy Vote on Projects Presented at This Meeting

Tamla Blunt started the discussion with Washington School.

Jesse Jankowski made a motion to legitimize Washington School. Laura Bishop made a motion to second.

Discussion:

Jesse Jankowski stated that he wondered how the records for Washington School were not clear.

Laura Bishop stated that she believed The Board needed to support this proposal because if The Board didn't Washington School would be left hanging and The Board owes it to them to see it through.

Cody Stolenberg asked what the minimum cost would be to get Washington School though?

Tamla Blunt explained that \$1.82 million would be the minimum cost but Washington School is asking for \$2.4 million because they don't want to have to come back again.

Jesse Jankowski asked if Washington School could do without the basement?

Tamla Blunt answered Jesse's questing by stating that Washington School needs the basement to function and they are also planning on taking out the heaters that are currently there.

Alexandria Schultz asked The Board why Washington School needed an elevator system? She questioned why there was a problem if they have a functional ramp?

Tamla Blunt explained that during the winter time issues would most likely arise with the current ramp system since accessibility may become an issue due to snow or ice. Tamla Blunt added that students with disability have a harder time going outside as well.

Motion to legitimize was seconded by Laura.

Tamla Blunt asked all of those in favor of legitimizing Washington School to raise their hand. The vote in favor of legitimizing Washington School was unanimous.

Tamla Blunt began the discussion on the IDEa Pod for \$85,000.

Discussion:

Jesse Jankowski asked what happened with Design and Merchandising when they come before The Board two years ago?

Tamla Blunt explained that no one knew they had money given to them and The Board gave them money for new paint. The funds sat there and it became a big miscommunication at the time. After this all happened, Tamla suggested to Katharine Leigh that they submit a full proposal.

Jacob Medina commented that the IDEa Pod seemed to be simply a chill out space and a place to relax

Tamla Blunt suggested that The Board not legitimize the IDEa pod, but legitimize the gallery designs one and two.

Motion to not legitimize the IDEa Pod made by Vincent Crespin. Motion to not legitimize was seconded by Laura. The IDEa Pod was not legitimized by a unanimous vote.

Tamla Blunt then began the discussion on the gallery for \$400,000.

Discussion:

Jesse Jankowski questioned if they had talked about knocking down the walls in the space?

Tamla Blunt responded to the question by explaining that the walls would stay and Design and Merchandising wanted The Board to fund them so they could mostly purchase furniture.

Laura Bishop commented that if The Board approves the gallery it would cover both a sitting and a looking space.

Tamla Blunt stated that Design and Merchandising had presented three different designs for the gallery space.

Vincent Crespín noted that he believed there were parts of all three ideas that were beneficial, but other parts they include were not necessary.

Many Board members nodded their heads in agreement.

Alexandria Schultz asked Vincent Crespín what he believes were aspects that are over the top?

Vincent Crespín responded by saying he believes the coffee bar over the top and the yarn presentation cube is not all that necessary.

Laura Bishop stated that everyone has to walk to get coffee not just the Design and Merchandising students.

Jesse Jankowski asked Steve Hultin what the master plan of the University was looking like for the future? Jesse stated his concerns that Alyesworth Hall may not even be there in a few years.

Steve Hultin responded by explaining that Amy Parsons asked Facilities for a mechanical make over of Alyesworth Hall. She asked Facilities to add air-conditioning, add an elevator costing around a half million dollars, along with a few other elements. Steve mentioned that the building is likely to get air-conditioning approved and that The Board needs to take into account that this building got Amy's attention.

Kristi Buffington added that there are no plans to remove Alyesworth Hall within the next ten years.

Tamla Blunt stated that she liked the gallery idea, and that The Board needs to remember that everyone has gotten a lot of money except for Design and Merchandising.

Vincent Crespín stated that he liked that this gallery would light the area because this part of campus is very dark at the current moment. He also added that he likes that

Design and Merchandising is trying to find other funding, such as the grants, and not just sitting waiting for The Board's money.

Tamla Blunt stated that the Design and Merchandising department has money for these projects also, but in the end it depends on The Board's decision. Tamla also commented that she thought designs one and two were very nice, but there was no budget cost for them.

Jacob Medina commented on Tamla's statement by saying that he felt like the Design and Merchandising students didn't know what they wanted and he would like to see them come in and tell The Board exactly what they want and exactly what they need.

Tamla Blunt then asked for a motion to legitimize the gallery for \$400,000.

Vincent Crespin made a motion to legitimize the gallery. Cody Stolenberg seconded the motion. The vote in favor of legitimizing the gallery was unanimous.

VII. Next Meeting: December 1, 2011 @ 5pm in 303 General Services Building

VIII. Adjourn

Motion made to adjourn meeting. Meeting adjourned.