

UFFAB Meeting Minutes
Thursday 1 December 2011
Room 303, General Services Building

Members Present: Tamla Blunt, Graduate School, Chair
Laura Bishop, College of Vet. Med. & Bio. Med., Vice Chair
Teresa Molello, College of Applied Human Sciences
Vincent Crespin, College of Liberal Arts
Chris Johnston, College of Business
Jacob Medina, College of Natural Sciences
Jesse Jankowski, College of Engineering
Jenna Muniz, ULC
Jesse Ellgren for Lexi Evans, Warner College of Natural Resources

Members Not Present: Representative, College of Agricultural Sciences
Lexi Evans, Warner College of Natural Resources

Members at Not Large Present: Justin Safady, College of Business

Associate Members Present: Jessica Toney, College of Business
Cody Stolenberg, College of Applied Human Sciences
Alexandria Schultz, College of Liberal Arts

Associate Members Not Present: Elan Alford, Graduate School

Ex – Officio Members Present: Steve Hultin, Faculty Advisor
Robert Harris, SFRB Liaison
Lindsay Brown, Staff Support
Daphne Frey, Staff Support
Patrick Burns, Ex – Officio Member
Kristi Buffington, Manager for Space and Information Management, Facilities Management
Steve Abt, Vice President of University Operations Facilities Advisor
Per Hogestad, Facilities Design Consultant

Ex – Officio Members Not Present: Toni Scofield, Staff Support

I. Call to Order

Meeting called to order.

II. Approval of Minutes from 17 November 2011

Motion made to approve minutes by Laura Bishop. Chris Johnston made second to the motion.

Minutes approved.

III. EMEC Program Update Presentation of Large Remodel in Engineering Basement (UFFAB approved funding \$162,169.24 Spring 2011)

Mark Ritschard introduced himself as the Assistant Dean for the College of Engineering and stated that he would be filling in for Jesse Parker who was supposed to present. Mark stated that he was coming before The Board to request an additional \$24,244.13 for the previously UFFAB funded project known as the Mechanical Instruction Lab (MIL).

Mark stated that there was an updated cost quote from Facilities as opposed to a previous budget opinion. Mark showed a map of the B-wing basement that demonstrated different construction zones. He stated that zone one is the existing MIL. The funding included the entire basement space. Construction included a lot of wall demolition and electrical changes. The last wall was planned to be demolished in December after students leave for Winter Break.

However, a change of scope, which involves zones two and three, includes a misunderstanding by the proposal writer in assuming that room B1 was a classroom. However, it was later determined that room is a graduate student lab.

Mark Ritschard stated that \$8,000 was saved because of construction equipment that was not needed. However, after talking to Tony Flores the Facilities project manager for the project there was an increased scope of work. The cost quote is now updated to \$186,513.37. A heating vent price went from \$9,500 to \$18,000. Mark stated that the rest of the difference in the budget is approximately \$5,000 of electrical work. He stated that the two main changes in the scope of work are HVAC and electrical.

The \$24,344.13 is the amount the Engineering is asking UFFAB to fund to finish the rest of the project.

Tamla Blunt asked what would happen when room B1 becomes available.

Mark Ritschard stated that room B1 will become part of the renovation plan again in Summer 2013 after Engineering II Building opens and the graduate work area

moves there. He stated that construction still includes the stairway to room B1, which is elevated, in anticipation for the future.

Tamla Blunt asked what the plans for room B3 are now, if the same technology and the seating assignment would be left in the room.

Mark Ritschard stated that the technology is up to date, however, there will be new furnishings, paint and carpet.

Cody Stolenberg asked why the electrical cost more.

Mark Ritschard responded that he stated that Tony Flores said the electrical service would have to be updated because the currently electricity units would not be able to handle the electricity demands of the equipment in the lab.

Jesse Ellgren asked how this lab benefits students.

Steve Johnson stated that all freshman/sophomore Mechanical Engineering students work on projects in the lab. He stated that the MIL is always very full of both equipment and students and the tight space is a safety concern.

Tamla Blunt asked for further questions from The Board and thanked Mark for coming. Mark stated that Engineering and Tony Flores were wondering when the money would be received if it was approved. Tam replied that if it is legitimized tonight then a final vote will take place in January at the next meeting, unless The Board chooses to suspend the bylaws for tonight and make a final vote at this meeting.

IV. Review UFFAB Cash-Flow Sheet and Final Vote on Projects Presented to UFFAB Fall 2011

Engineering II- MIL Legitimization

Tamla Blunt opened discussion on the Engineering II proposal.

Jenna Muniz stated that she does not necessarily think that the proposal should not be funded but she wonders why Engineering knew that the machines and equipment was in the room however, they did not anticipate the electric needs.

Steve Hultin stated that the budget that Facilities personnel create are simple because there are often times people who ask for budget opinions with no immediate intent to fund projects or colleges cannot afford to fund projects. Therefore, it is not worth wasting the time and money to go in with an architect and engineering to get a very detailed budget unless the project is concrete. The Engineering budget opinion was only 15% off. He also reminded The Board that original funding was based on a budget opinion not a budget quote.

Alexandria Schultz asked what would happen if the project was not funded.

Tamla Blunt stated that Engineering would either have to cut back on the scope of work somewhere or that the department would have to raise the remaining funds.

Laura Bishop stated that she was under the impression that not doing the classroom B1 would be saving money that may be returned to Engineering as presented by Sue James.

Tamla Blunt stated that she thought the same thing.

Chris Johnston questioned when Sue James told The Board there may be money saved how much money exactly could be saved.

Tamla Blunt stated that Sue did not give an exact number, which is why Mechanical Engineering was asked to return with an exact proposal.

Steve Johnson stated that if the project is not funded to increase the electricity that there would be a very expensive machine (in the 10's of thousands range) that would be going unused.

Tamla Blunt stated that there are two scenarios that The Board can choose from regarding the proposal. The first is to vote to legitimize, and then vote to suspend the bylaws, and then make a final vote at this meeting. Or The Board could legitimize this proposal tonight and then make a final vote on the project at the next meeting in January 2012.

Jesse Ellgren mentioned that the project appeared stressed for time because there was mention of doing the demolition in December. Steve Johnson affirmed this.

Tamla Blunt stated that in terms of construction things are much easier to accomplish when students are gone because workers do not have to work around the students.

Laura Bishop asked if The Board waited until January to finalize funding if that meant the money would be coming out of the spring budget.

Lindsay Brown asked if that meant that the money would not be funded until May after the final votes for spring proposals.

Tamla Blunt stated that technically funding would not occur until May however, because the final vote took place in January the project could be funded sooner.

Jenna Muniz made a motion to legitimize for \$24,344.13 for Engineering. Jesse Jankowski made a second to the motion.

Jacob Medina suggested that The Board legitimize the projects and then move on to discuss all the remaining legitimized projects and come back to the Engineering funding after The Board has determined what else they will fund.

Eight out of nine votes to approve. Vincent Crespino opposed however the motion still carries and the proposal is finalized.

Cash Flow Discussion and Proposal Review

Tamla Blunt opened discussion about the cash flow stating that there were currently over \$3,570,344.00 for UFFAB to fund projects with. The breakdown of proposals is as follows:

Washington School: \$2.4 million
Visual Arts: 1.2 million
Resources for Disabled Students: \$295,246
Occupational Therapy: \$266,025
Engineering MIL: \$24,344.13

Tamla Blunt stated that her recommendation for the Design and Merchandising proposal is to table the final vote until Spring Semester, requesting that Design and Merchandising comes back to The Board with a specific dollar cost and specific design scenario. She stated that they have not talked to a Facilities project manager or design team and in the event they knock out a wall in Aylesworth that proposal will first need to go to the Physical Development Committee.

Alexandria Schultz asked why this is Tamla's recommendation.

Tamla stated that it was for the reasons she previously listed as well as her belief that the \$400,000 amount is a low range for everything that was included in even the simplest proposal.

Jesse Jankowski stated that the proposal did not include exact numbers and was not itemized and the cost does not seem reasonable for the scope of work proposed.

Cody Stolenberg asked what the difference between a budget opinion and a budget quote was.

Tamla stated that an opinion is when Facilities goes to the site and does a simple cost evaluation based on observational knowledge of the proposed site. A budget quote is when the requesting Department or College pays money to have a more concrete price estimation and a project manager and design team from Facilities is assigned to the project.

Alexandria Schultz asked if the proposal was not passed tonight, when would Design and Merchandising get the requested money.

Tamla stated that if Design and Merchandising gets a cost quote and comes back to The Board and the proposal is approved that the department may receive funding in May.

Cody Stolenberg stated that it seems like a lot of previously funded projects are coming back to The Board asking for more money and is wondering why this keeps happening.

Tamla Blunt stated that when the economy was bad the costs of things were lower so most of the time UFFAB funding was higher than the actual project cost and money was coming back to The Board. However, since the economy is improving, costs of projects are increasing, therefore budget opinions are not as accurate.

Alexandria Schultz suggested that The Board required a cost quote for every proposal for the future.

Pat Burns stated that he felt this was an excellent idea.

Steve Hultin stated that cost quotes cost a lot of money however they really allow for design exploration.

Steve Hultin stated two potential options to discuss. Either proposals can include cost opinions and if approved that amount is all that The Board will fund or if the proposers choose to invest in a cost quote then they can come back to The Board for more money. However, they must choose one of the options and this will give The Board a better number to work with.

Chris Johnston expressed concern about this rule allowing proposers to set the amounts for proposals higher than needed.

Steve Hultin stated that this was a good idea and as professional estimators Facilities workers have ethical guidelines they follow however, the amount of money Departments ask for is their choice and sometimes there are times when professional estimators look at preliminary estimates and add to those knowing information that may have been overlooked originally.

Tamla Blunt stated that a cost opinion also does not have the incremental detail of a cost quote.

Alexandria Schultz asked where any left over money goes.

Tamla Blunt stated that any extra money that remains after projects finish is returned to The Board.

Steve Hultin also mentioned that there are many people who look over change orders during construction and that this helps monitor creep on scope unless The Board chooses to micromanage this aspect.

Tamla Blunt suggested that The Board discuss this at a different time because proposals that have already been legitimized cannot be postponed, but this should be discussed at the next meeting in January.

Cody Stolenberg questioned which of the existing legitimized proposals have cost quotes.

Tamla Blunt replied that only Washington School has a cost quote but that was changed due to the issues with abatement, which was not found until workers gutted the building, but every other proposal is only a cost opinion. However, Resources for Disabled Students has been working with Kristi Buffington so their cost opinion is probably fairly accurate. Tamla suggested that The Board could finalize votes for all of these projects with the contingency that the funding is based on the budget opinions and UFFAB will not be responsible for any creep in scope.

Vincent Crespin asked what all is included in the Visual Arts Addition.

Alexandria Schultz asked why it is a priority of Rick Miranda's.

Tamla Blunt stated that the goal of the proposal is to add an addition to the Fine Arts Department by creating a new concentration in electronic graphic arts. The addition essentially is taking a courtyard and adding an exterior fourth wall, a roof, and exterior and interior doors to make the space an arts classroom/studio.

Jacob Medina stated that the reason that this was a priority of Rick Miranda's was because the program is currently denying students admission to the arts program because work space is limited and an addition would increase the school program offerings as well as admissions and the building is currently being underfunded.

Alexandria Schultz asked for an explanation of the concentration.

Teresa Molello described it as the aesthetic design for websites and other online databases.

Tamla Blunt stated that the goal is to increase enrollment in the university and this would happen because Colorado State University would be one of less than fifty schools that offer similar programs making CSU very desirable.

Cody Stolenberg referred to Justin Safady's previous comment about funding the expansion of the programs with concerns of budget cuts eliminating or decreasing the current arts program.

Laura Bishop stated that if it were a priority of Rick Miranda and Amy Parsons' then they would most likely fight to keep the program and expand it.

Tamla Blunt stated that it is highly unlikely that the Visual Arts program would ever get pulled at CSU.

Pat Burns commented that since Rick Miranda and Amy Parsons first met with The Board, Washington School has now become the Universities number one priority and Visual Arts is the second highest priority.

Cody Stolenberg reminded The Board that with over a million dollars in funding there is a greater risk of fluctuations from the cost opinion to the actual scope of work.

Alexandria Schultz asked if the project needed to be approved this semester.

Tamla Blunt replied that she was not sure of the timeline.

Pat Burns stated that the most time critical projects are Washington School and Resources for Disabled Students.

Jesse Jankowski brought up that he believed that the Department was hoping to open the program for enrollment for Fall 2012.

Tamla Blunt suggested The Board look at one project at a time and discuss and vote on each individually before moving to the next. It was noted that at a future meeting a discussion would be held regarding cost quotes with proposal.

Design and Merchandising

Tamla Blunt opened discussion for the Design and Merchandising proposal stating that she recommends The Board postpone the final vote for this and have them come back to The Board with a more concrete cost quote and a decision of which option the department would like to see funded or perhaps cost quotes for all three options.

Steve Hultin stated that there needs to be some contact with Facilities before this proposal moves on such as a cost quote because there are a great deal of requirements that Facilities needs to follow in regards to moving on with projects.

Jesse Jankowski also brought up The Board being previously concerned with the number of students that this project would benefit.

Jacob Medina made a motion to postpone the final vote for Design and Merchandising on the contingency that they make a decision about which option to

move forward with and work with Facilities to get a more concrete cost quote for that option. Jenna Muniz made a second to the motion.

All in favor. Motion carried.

Resources for Disabled Students

Jesse Jankowski proposed discussion for the Resources for Disabled Students proposal.

Tamla Blunt stated that this was legitimized and the proposal would include taking over a book storage warehouse in the basement of the General Service Building and remodeling it to include more testing rooms and a conference room.

Vincent Crespín stated that he has talked with many students from the College of Liberal Arts that have disabilities and utilize the Resources for Disabled Students services, and those students have stated that the program is very crowded and sometimes students need to inform RDS of test months in advanced to secure a spot for testing.

Teresa Molello asked for clarification about previous discussion about RDS being moved to the Lory Student Center.

Tamla stated that there was talk of that in the past however, the LSC renovations are not even scheduled to start until 2013 and she reminded The Board that RDS was going to move into an addition to the Music Building which UFFAB previously did not fund.

Pat Burns also mentioned that the Lory Student Center charges rent for space.

Jesse Jankowski made a motion to approve funding for the Resources for Disabled Students expansion. Laura Bishop seconded the motion.

All in favor. No one opposed. Motion approved.

UFFAB Cash Flow Review

Steve Hultin brought up the cash flow looking into the future. He took the time to look over numbers in regards to the proposed lecture hall. He stated that at the end of the fiscal year there would be \$5,000,000 cash in the budget and reminded The Board that cash is not taken out of the account until construction starts. This being said he brought up the lecture hall and stated that it is estimated at \$9,000,000 and building it out of UFFAB cash funds the balance would go negative for a couple of years and it would not go positive again until the fiscal year 2017.

Tamla Blunt asked if all the money could go out at the same time.

Steve Hultin replied that it is true but even then at fiscal year 2015 all money would be expensed and still be negative. He was not entirely sure of the bylaws on this subject but believed that The Board's funds were not allowed to go negative.

Pat Burns stated that nothing can be bonded for 27 or more years and he would make the assumption that The Board cannot have a negative account balance.

Steve Hultin stated that there is potential for The Board to only be negative for one year for \$1,000,000 and perhaps UFFAB could go to the Rick and Amy and propose to be negative for a year.

Cody Stolenberg asked what the last project bonded was.

Tamla Blunt stated that two years ago UFFAB bonded the Library Remodel, The Cube, classroom remodels, Forestry, Engineering II and Animal Sciences.

Pat Burns stated that the bylaws say that UFFAB cannot bond more than 80% of revenue.

Tamla Blunt corrected this by stating that 80% of the first \$10 is bonded and 20% is in cash reserve and the last \$5 is all bonded. So basically there are no more funds to bond.

Steve Hultin stated that in regards to the lecture hall it could be phased.

Per Hogestad stated that if this was the case it could not be a double story building. It would either have to be a one-story building that was one lecture hall for \$5,000,000 now then add on later. Or shell out one of the lecture halls if it was a stacked design. However, he did not feel that the money saved from shelling out a lecture hall would be enough to really make it cost effective.

Pat Burns stated that the point is that if UFFAB burns through all the cash now then they potentially lose all prospects of building the lecture hall.

Steve Hultin stated that there is an accumulation of \$1,700,000 a year currently but the fee proposal has flat growth taking into consideration low growth of the student population. He mentioned that the numbers he presented were a conservative way of looking at things.

Jacob Medina brought up the fact that as the student population grows the desire for the lecture hall may also grow significantly.

Tamla Blunt stated that this was a good thought, but that it could probably be put off for a couple years. She referenced Pat Burn's reviews of classroom space on campus and stated that there is quite a bit of classroom space, but prime teaching

hours are 9:00am-2:00pm and there is not enough capacity of classrooms to accommodate the capacity of that desired time frame.

Alexandria Schultz stated that just because that is the time most desired it does not mean that faculty should get that time. She feels with this outlook it is a waste to spend \$9,000,000 to build a new lecture hall.

Pat Burns stated that classrooms could better accommodate demand if times of teaching were spread out but that interferes with classes that are required for graduation as well as student work hours. He stated that there is a lot more capacity for smaller classrooms however, there are less large classrooms and they are more in demand.

Alexandria Schultz asked for Pat's recommendation on the subject.

Pat Burns stated that he feels that The Board should probably be looking three to four years out.

Per Hogestad reminded The Board that the design and construction process would probably be at least a year and a half on top of how many years it takes to finalize funding for the building, making The Boards decision sooner than they may anticipate.

Cody Stolenberg brought up that he knew the Engineering II Building was going to have a large lecture hall. He asked whether it would be cheaper to just pass these lecture halls to already existing buildings.

Per Hogestad replied that he could not give a definite answer but mentioned that there are a lot of unknowns with existing buildings and he would opt for a new building. He added that he is not sure there are a lot of buildings that could accommodate the large footprint such as a lecture hall would require.

Vincent Crespin stated that lots of projects in the past that have been remodels have come back for more money because of problematic unknowns which is proof that it is not necessarily cheaper to just add onto a new building.

Jesse Ellgren asked where the proposed location is. Jesse Jankowski replied that it is north of Hartshorn Health Center. Tamla Blunt showed a map of all possible locations.

Steve Hultin mentioned that Animal Sciences would like to extend south and Warner College of Natural Sciences would like to extend north taking two potential places for the lecture hall.

Tamla Blunt stated that also depending on what The Board approves tonight, they can decide to start saving money per quarter or semester that does not go to small projects.

Steve Hultin also suggested that The Board could go to Administration for joint funding or loans.

Tamla Blunt stated that The Board could possibly potentially get permission to go into the negative for a short period of time.

Pat Burns suggested The Board sit down with Rick Miranda and Amy Parsons to propose going negative for this purpose.

Cody Stolenberg asked if there are statistics on how the classrooms are being used that has been presented to The Board.

Tamla Blunt stated that Pat Burns did a study that concluded that there were not enough large classrooms to meet the demand.

Pat Burns will come to The Board with his Classroom Use Review statistics in the Spring semester.

Tamla Blunt suggested that the lecture hall has not even gone to The Board for approval so it is still in the discussion stage and she suggested that The Board concentrate on finalizing the rest of the projects for this meeting.

Washington School (Early Childhood Center)

Tamla Blunt proposed discussion for Washington School by stating that this is the only proposal with a definite cost and a project manager has been assigned. The total is \$2.4 million listed in a priority order.

Lead Based Paint Abatement: \$1.2 million

Budget Shortfall: 355,000

HVAC: 260,000

Interior Elevator: 150,000

New Building Heating System: 450,000

Current heating system has a boiler system and radiators that would require hazards because they are a burn hazard for children.

Steve Hultin brought up that during the abatement the walls would be entirely gutted as would the building heating system so it would be difficult to eliminate this as an individual component of the proposal.

Chris Johnston asked if the electrical update was mandatory which Steve Hultin replied that it was and it must be brought up to city and state codes.

Vincent Crespin confirmed that not approving heating with the whole presentation was not an option.

Steve Johnson from Adult Learners and Veteran Services, stated that the adult learners expressed a great need for expanded childcare. This would reduce costs for parents and in truth, The University is losing student parents each year. This helps to benefit more than just the school but will also benefit the non-traditional student retention.

Teresa Molello stated that Washington School was originally supposed to open in January 2012, however, now it will open in August 2012 and Lopez Elementary has offered the program three classrooms for use because there are already contracts with parents established. She also mentioned that 40% of the spots in the program are reserved for student parents.

Laura Bishop stated that she believes that Washington School differs from the MIL in that Washington School has always been very upfront about costs that arise, and the problems they face are not simply over sight like MIL is facing. However, she feels that in order to maintain integrity, The Board should approve the MIL if they approve Washington School, but she feels they owe it to Washington School and not as much to Engineering.

Teresa Molello mentioned that Washington School also supports lots of students not just for childcare but also students who will do internships with Washington School especially HDFS majors, Nutrition, and OT students.

Vincent Crespin wondered if the \$2,400,000 included the technology?

It was clarified that the technology for broadcasting of children in play environments is not included in the budget.

Teresa Molello made a motion to approve \$2.4 million for Washington School. Jesse Jankowski made a motion to second.

All in favor. Motion approved unanimously.

Visual Arts

Tamla Blunt opened discussion on the Visual Arts proposal.

Chris Johnston asked if there was a minimum for the proposal.

Per Hogestad stated that the proposed amount is the minimum amount to get the construction done.

It was mentioned that the program is expected to have 50 students the first year and that was to double after the first year.

Vincent Crespin stated that there is potential to postpone this proposal because The Board has already given out so much money that it is hard to give out that much for this project.

Tamla Blunt recommended that Visual Arts could also come back with a cost quote.

Jenna Muniz stated that because the amount is so high the potential fluctuation is also great.

Per Hogestad mentioned that the concept design is based on square footage at this time and that the cost is an opinion not a quote.

Vincent made a motion to table the final vote with the contingency that Visual Arts will present a cost quote to The Board. Jesse Ellgren made a second to this motion.

All in favor. Motion Approved unanimously.

Occupational Therapy

Tamla Blunt proposed discussion for the Occupational Therapy remodel stated that the remodel is really an aesthetic facelift that will make the building easier to navigate and make more efficient use of the space. She mentioned that they have already come up with \$90,000 of their own money and are willing to do a cost share which she emphasized is rare for colleges to do.

Jacob Medina mentioned that this was also to improve the efficiency of the building.

Jenna Muniz stated that this is one of the least important things The Board has been presented with.

Alexandria Schultz mentioned that she felt that this was the same as Design and Merchandising in terms of just making things more aesthetically appealing.

Teresa Molello mentioned that the program only has graduate students, however, it really supports the whole community because the whole community benefits from the services offered.

Jesse Jankowski mentioned that there are some buildings that really need modernizing and this is one of them.

Tamla Blunt clarified for The Board that the Facilities fiscal year 2013 started in July 1, 2012 for funding purposes.

Jacob Medina made a motion to approve Occupational Therapy for funding. Teresa Molello made a second to the motion.

Eight in favor of approval. Jenna Muniz opposed. Motion approved.

Engineering II- MIL- Suspend Bylaws and Final Vote

Tamla Blunt suggested a motion be made to suspend the bylaws for this meeting for Engineering II.

Pat Burns mentioned that for a suspension of bylaws there needs to be two-thirds majority.

Jenna Muniz made a motion to suspend the bylaws. Jesse Ellgren made a motion to second. Seven in favor of suspending the bylaws for this one project. Chris Johnston and Vincent Crespin opposed. Motion approved.

Vincent stated that this is a safety concern because there are some pathways that are supposed to be four feet but are only two feet because the room is so crowded.

Steve Johnson stated that there are between 165 and 200 students who use the MIL Lab per day.

Laura Bishop stated that she was not opposed to approving tonight, but she would most likely not approve again in the future for Engineering.

Jesse Jankowski made a motion for a final vote to approve funding for Engineering MIL. Jenna Muniz made a second to the motion. All in favor. None opposed. Motion approved to fund additional \$24, 344.13.

Meeting Conclusions

UFFAB's total fund balance for Fall 2011: \$3,570,344

UFFAB Fall 2011 Proposal Amounts:

Washington School	\$2,400,000
Visual Arts	\$1,020,000
Resources for Disables Students	\$295,246.07
Occupational Therapy	\$266,025.00

Design and Merchandising \$400,000.00

UFFAB Fall 2011 Final Decisions:

Project Name	Legitimized	Final Approval	\$3,570,344.00
Washington School	\$2,400,000.00	Approved	1,170,344.00
Visual Arts	1,020,000.00	Tabled-cost quote	---
RDS	295,246.07	Approved	875,097.93
OT	266,025.00	Approved	609,072.93
Design & Merch	400,000.00	Tabled-cost quote	---
Eng – MEL	24,344.13	Approved	584,728.80

UFAB Fall 2011 left over budget: \$584,728.80

V. Next Meeting: January 26, 2011 @ 5pm in 303 General Services Building

VI. Adjourn

Motion made to adjourn meeting. Meeting adjourned.