

**University Facility Fee Advisory Board Meeting**  
Thursday, February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2015 - 5:00-6:00 pm  
303 GSB

**Members present:** Ashley Cypress- Chair  
Sam Laffey- Vice Chair  
Jessica Boyd - College of Engineering  
Grace Fenske – College of Business  
Clayton King – College of Liberal Arts  
Rachel Largay- Warner College of Natural Resources  
Annalis Norman- CVMBS  
Brady Rink – College of Agricultural Sciences

**Associate Members present:** Liz Danke – CVMBS  
Garrett Stockton - College of Health and Human Sciences  
Nicole Ramo – Graduate College

**Members at Large present:** Jeff Seligman- CVMBS

**Ex-Officio**

**Members Present:** Pat Burns – Ex-Officio  
Becca Wren- Staff Support  
Savanna Bunnell- Staff Support

**Presenters:** Stacey Baumgarn – Facilities Management  
Carmelo Manino – Net Impact Student Group  
Dr. Jeff Collet – Atmospheric Sciences

**I. Call to order at 5:00 PM**

- a. Meeting was called to order.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

- a. Jeff Cook moved to approve the minutes from February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2015.
- b. Sam seconded.
- c. All approved, none opposed, none abstained.
- d. Minutes approved.

**III. Presentation – Water Bottle Filling Stations – Stacey Baumgarn and Carmelo Manino**

- a. Funding Request for Water Bottle Filling Stations: **\$105,000** (Unit cost of station = \$4,200)
- b. Many of the current water fountains on campus are not compatible with the various sizes of water bottles and there is no way to track how much water is being used.
- c. Current water fountains are also wasteful and inefficient and many of them have built-up calcification.
- d. Benefits of the filling stations include easy filling, modern technology and look, convenience, money saving, and trackable metrics.
- e. There are currently 34 stations on campus including 7 in the LSC, some in the Rockwell and Rockwell West, and 4 in the Library.

- f. Benefits to students -
  - i. Convenience and consistence of filling station locations.
  - ii. Increases in health of students, i.e. Keeping hydrated helps digestion, lessens fatigue, headaches, joint pain, and dizziness.
  - iii. Feeling engaged with metrics of filling station.
  - iv. Students will save money but bringing a refillable water bottle and using a filling station, rather than buying plastic water bottles.
  - v. Net Impact student group will benefit from researching these stations.
- g. The location of the filling stations are prioritized based on number of general assignment classrooms.
- h. This project is a scalable project. Any funding will go a long way. This board can decide how many stations will be installed.
- i. The stations will be installed and maintained by CSU Facilities Management.
- j. CSU is gold in a sustainability assessment called STARS, and
  - i. Increasing the number of filling stations would help CSU's score.
- k. In general, CSU students have been polled in favor of a ban on plastic on campus, so this initiative would excite many students.

#### Questions -

- a. Are filling stations required in newly constructed buildings?
  - i. At this point, filling stations are not required in new construction, though they are included in construction standards. Filling stations are often removed from building plans because of budget constraints. However, it is much cheaper to install them new rather than retrofit them later, as installation is about \$1,000.
- a. How will old porcelain water fountains be removed and disposed of?
  - i. Most of the porcelain water fountains can be recycled. Some of the porcelain fountains might not be well-suited for a filling station depending on the clearance in the hallways.
- a. Have you considered cheaper alternatives like goosenecks (smaller spigots on water fountains)?
  - i. Yes, goosenecks have been considered but they aren't as durable as filling stations and do not provide metrics. Some fountains would not be able to include a gooseneck due to the configuration of the fountain.
- a. What is the life expectancy of a filling station?
  - i. The newest filling stations have a 20-year lifespan. The stations require a battery for the counter which would be the main maintenance item but is not very expensive.
- a. We have funding rules and one of them is that the project enhances academic or research environments for students. Can you elaborate on how this project would do so?
  - i. The student group Net Impact will be researching the metrics and use of the filling station as part of several student projects. Also, the filling stations are a direct example of sustainability on campus, which can be used as an inspiration for other projects. Lastly, a professor in the College of Agriculture Sciences has interest in dedicating part of her curriculum to filling stations, which would translate to many students.

#### **IV. Presentation – Atmospheric Teaching Lab Remodel and Furniture**

- a. Original Funding Request - \$159,176 – Revised Request - **\$44,251**
- b. This request is for funding to create a teaching lab from an existing space on the Foothills Campus for the Department of Atmospheric Sciences.
- c. Currently, the Department of Atmospheric Sciences serves graduate and Ph.D. students but an expansion of space may allow for undergraduate students to start taking classes in the building.
  - i. Currently, the program has 48 Ph.D. students, 37 Masters students, and 19 faculty members.
  - ii. All students are funded by grants and fellowships.
- d. The program is nationally ranked as the second best Ph.D. program for Atmospheric Sciences and it is a very, very competitive program.
  - i. 160-175 people apply every year for only 15 slots.
- e. The Foothills Campus is very different from Main Campus. UFFAB has never funded a project on Foothills Campus or a project directly for graduate students.
- f. The project would renovate an underutilized library space for lab instruction.
- g. The department has revised its funding request understanding the limitations facing UFFAB. The department will cost share as much of the project as possible.
- h. The project will be completed in three phases –
  - 1. Phase 1 - **\$44,251** (Request to UFFAB)
    - i. Remodel of the space, walls, carpet, “shell and finish”, etc.
  - 2. Phase 2 - **\$116,000** (NOT requested of UFFAB)
    - i. Case work, sink, fume hood
  - 3. Phase 3 - **\$40,00-\$60,000** (NOT requested of UFFAB)
    - i. Equipment and other furnishings
- i. Students in the program still pay the facility fee but rarely come to Main Campus to see where the fee goes.
  - i. The department estimates that their students pay ~\$31,500/year in the facility fee.
- j. Several colleges will benefit from this lab because it can be used for many different courses.

#### **Questions -**

- a. Would a new teaching lab make the program even more competitive?
  - i. Anything to improve the learning environment for students and for research will help increase the competitiveness of the program.
  
- a. Do you expect an increase in enrollment with this new lab?
  - i. The capacity of the room now is very small and only 5 students use the room at a time. The remodel will allow 15-25 students so the department can begin to accept more students.
  
- a. Are any of the courses in the room mandatory for students to get their degree? Is the lack of space causing delays in graduation?
  - i. These classes are not required but they are critical for students studying air pollution. A student will not be successful in the program without taking these courses.
  
- a. What if there are costs you did not anticipate?

- i. The department will find a way to cover unanticipated costs but they do not foresee a cost overrun. A similar project was completed a few years ago and the estimate for that project was taken into consideration for this request.

**V. Legitimacy Vote:**

**Water Bottle Filling Stations**

- a. Clayton said he thought this project is a bit of a stretch to fit in accordance with Funding Rule #2 as the academic and research benefits to students aren't very obvious. However, he also said this is a project that at the day of the vote, if there is \$5,000 left over, it should go to fund a filling station.
- b. Sam was concerned about the fact that the research part of the stations would only benefit a small group of professors and students. There are already 34 existing station that could be researched.
- c. Ashley reminded the group that this filling station project was legitimized last year, though that does not mean it will be legitimized again.
- d. Annalis mentioned that the project last year was only barely legitimized, as many UFFAB members struggled with the academic benefits.
- e. Brady argued that the project would qualify as an enhancement to the student experience on campus.
- f. Nicole agreed and added that the mention of the Mayo Clinic's statistics about hydration and academic performance was compelling.
- g. Clayton reminded the Board that the project is only in consideration for legitimization, not for funding. The funding argument will come later. He also suggested that the Board might not be the appropriate funder of the project. Perhaps another group on campus could provide funding.
- h. Jeff Seligman's class had a student project focused on the filling station and there is potential for more projects.
- i. Clayton said the gooseneck additions to water fountains might be a less expensive solution for the group to consider.
- j. Garrett said that considering the other projects and greater needs on campus, the UFFAB's limited resources should be dedicated elsewhere.
- k. Annalis agreed and also said that there is not a shortage of water on campus and that students can make do with the fountains that already exist.
- l. Brady moved to legitimize the Water Bottle Filling Stations project.
  - i. Grace seconded
  - ii. All those in favor: 6
  - iii. All those opposed: 4
  - iv. Abstentions: 0
  - v. Motion passes, Water Bottle Filling Stations project is legitimate.

**Atmospheric Science Teaching Lab Remodel**

- a. Sam said the academic benefits of this project were clear and obvious.
- b. Jeff Seligman moved to legitimize the Atmospheric Science Teaching Lab Remodel project.
  - i. Sam seconded
  - ii. All those in favor: 10
  - iii. All those opposed: 0
  - iv. Abstentions: 0

- v. Motion passes, Atmospheric Science Teaching Lab Remodel project is legitimate.

**Next Meeting – Thursday, February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2015 – 5:00-6:00 pm, 303 GSB**

**VI. Adjorn**