

University Facility Fee Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, April 14th, 2016

303 GSB

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Members Present: | Clayton King | Chair |
| | Tristian Syron | Vice-Chair |
| | Grace Clark-Rabinowitz | College of Natural Science |
| | Rachel Largay | Warner College of Natural Resources |
| | Annalis Norman | CVMBS |
| | Noah Taherkhani | College of Engineering |
| | Jeff Cook | Graduate College |
| | Landon Wright | College of Liberal Arts |
| | Kalyn Blach | College of Agriculture |
| Luke Yeager | College of Business | |
| Associate Members Present: | Liz Danke | CVMBS |
| | Madison Tolan | CVMBS |
| | Alex Meersman | College of Natural Sciences. |
| | Ben Wheatly | Graduate School |
| Other Members Present: | Becca Wren | Staff Support |
| | Sandy Sheahan | Advisor |
| | Tom Satterly | Associate Vice President |
| | Pat Burns | Ex-Officio |
| | Kristi Buffington | Facilities Management |
| | Tamla Blunt | Ex-Officio |
| | Dan Kozlowski | Facilities Management |
| Savanna Bunnell | Staff Support | |
- I. Update of the Anatomy Zoology addition from Mike Rush**
- Since the last presentation, the A/Z gross anatomy lab project has developed into a better strategy to leverage the \$1 million that UFFAB has committed.
 - Originally, the addition to the AZ building for a gross anatomy lab was going to be located above the existing lab space on the west side of the building.
 - When looking at the project in fuller detail and evaluating the logistics of building an addition in that particular location, it was discovered that entire existing building would need to be renovated in order to be up to code. Also, the addition would require the installation of support pillars and some demolition of current space in the building. It wasn't impossible but the cost would increase substantially.
 - Instead, the planning and design team developed an alternative plan to move the addition to the east side of the building, which would be an addition only and would require no demolition.
 - This space will allow the department to build two to four floors, which maximizes space efficiency.
 - In thinking about the future and expansion on campus, Facilities has been focused on building upward as opposed to outward because campus has a limited footprint to work within.
 - The exterior of the building will look similar to the BSB and the Chemistry and Biology building that will be coming online in the near future. This design is intentional, because the team is trying to create a sense of continuity across campus.
 - Much like the buildings surrounding it, the AZ addition will have windows to allow for a lot of natural day light.

- g. The building sits on what will be a revitalized greenspace on campus. It will join the science mall on campus.
- h. The third and fourth floor will hold the labs and will be the spaces in which UFFAB's money is used.
 - i. The labs need to be on the top floors of the building because they require ventilation to go directly to the roof.
- i. The third floor is slated to have a neuro-lab as well as a virtual lab.
- j. The fourth floor would be where human anatomy lab would be held. It will be designed to specifically for cadaver use. There will be 39 tables equipped to hold cadavers during labs. There would also be space for case work around the outside of the lab.
- k. This is not the most sustainable project because of the extensive ventilation that has to occur for student's safety. The team will install reheat coils that go around the ducts to try and capture some heat and resupply it to the building.
- l. The design includes a freight elevator and appropriate cooling units in the lab so there will be no issues transporting and storing the human cadavers.
- m. There will also be showers and laundry available for students who spend long hours in the lab handling the materials.
- n. The total budget is about \$23.3 million dollars. UFFAB has contributed \$1 million for the fourth floor lab.
- o. The total schedule for the project will be about 2 years before occupancy.

Questions:

- i. Will the animal anatomy lab stay in the existing A/Z building?
 - 1. Yes, only the human anatomy lab will move to the new addition.
- ii. Has the department secured the rest of the funding for this project?
 - 1. Yes, the state of Colorado issued certificate of participation bonds which was a continuance of a lodging and tourism tax which was approved in November. That made available about \$200 million dollars for CSU to distribute. Most of that money will go towards the development of the National Western Center in Denver. About \$50 million will be spent on the Fort Collins campus, with \$22 million spent on this facility. The biggest difficulty we have right now is that those dollars are not actually available until 2019, so the team is trying to find a bridge loan.
- iii. Given that this addition is separate from the area of A/Z we saw in the original proposal, will there be any renovating of those labs to help with the transportation and storage of cadavers?
 - 1. About \$1.6 million will go towards the existing building and lab space, including the animal cadaver labs.

II. Construction on Campus Update

- a. Aggie Village will be ready for occupancy starting in June of 2016. Leasing will be done in phases.
 - i. The houses on Whitcomb will eventually be deconstructed to allow for more space for traffic coming on to campus and some more parking.
- b. The stadium is about 39% complete, it is on schedule to open in July of 2017.
 - i. Most of the casting of construction materials is done off campus and transported on to campus to be assembled.
 - ii. The stadium will include a new alumni center, a student advising center, as well as about ten new classrooms.
- c. The Pitkin and College parking garage is about 76% complete, and will be open June of this year.
 - i. The roof is built to accommodate solar panels in the future.
- d. The Medical Center is about 21% complete and scheduled to open in May 2017.
- e. The Biology building is 31% complete, scheduled to open in July 2017.
- f. The Chemistry building is 16% complete, scheduled to open in July 2017.

- g. The Prospect underpass is 61% complete, scheduled to open August of 2016.
- h. All current projects are on schedule and under budget.

III. Bylaw Review

- a. Article III, Section 2 suggested edit removal “last meeting of the fall semester” and replacement with “first meeting of the fall semester.”
 - i. Pat Burns pointed out that originally both UTFAB and UFFAB were supposed to have their representatives appointed by the first meeting in Fall, but it became difficult because that is the start of the year when councils are appointing new members and it gets really busy and difficult. It was more practical to try and get the representation lined up in the spring semester.
 - ii. Pat also pointed out that the bylaws say new members are encouraged to work with ongoing members to aide in the transition, which would be difficult if appointments happen in the fall.
 - iii. Jeff suggested changing the language from “shall” to “should” would better reflect what the board does, which is try to appoint someone in the spring but ultimately secure a representative in the fall.
 - iv. Pat Burns suggested changing the phrase to “Each college council should endeavor to appoint one student member from their respective college prior to the last meeting of the spring semester and such member must be appointed by the first meeting of the fall semester.”
 - v. Jeff Cook moved to replace the suggested amendment to the language suggested by Pat Burns.
 - 1. Kalya seconded.
 - 2. All those in favor: 8
 - 3. All those opposed: 0
 - 4. All those abstained: 1
 - 5. Motion passes: the amendment to Article III, Section 2 is as follows: “Each college council should endeavor to appoint one student member from their respective college prior to the last meeting of the spring semester and such member must be appointed by the first meeting of the fall semester.”
- b. Article IX, Section 2 suggested addition of “members who were absent for a given presentation must abstain from all votes regarding said proposal.”
 - i. Anthony articulated that missing the presentation does not mean someone does not have the ability to become adequately informed enough on a project to vote. An absence does not make a member incapable of understanding a project.
 - ii. Clayton pointed out that the purpose of this addition would be to encourage attendance. It would not exclude an absent member from discussion, it would only ban them from voting. He suggested that the language could be change to include something about requiring efforts to become familiar with the proposal they missed.
 - iii. Jeff said it makes sense to say something along the lines of “members who were absent for a presentation should make a personal site visit to the location of the area in the proposal before voting.”
 - 1. Pat pointed out that no one else on the board is required to make a site visit, and furthermore it is sometime impossible to make a site visit.
 - iv. Tamla said that Article III, Section 4 already outlines punishment for members having 2 or more unexcused absences.
 - 1. Jeff said that unexcused absences are different from excused absences and as the bylaws are written now, if you have an excused absence you do not have to review any proposals you missed in order to vote. He felt there is value in adding something that encourages reviewing miss proposals.
 - v. Jeff Cook made a motion to reject the suggested amendment.
 - 1. Landon seconded.

2. Pat encouraged the Board to exclude encouragement of site visits because they are not always practical or possible.
 3. Landon added that he felt there was enough in the bylaws to encourage attendance.
 4. Anthony expressed that he has a high opinion of the members on the board and is confident that even if a clause isn't included in the bylaws, members will be responsible enough to make an informed vote.
 5. Rachel also added that the amendment as it stands now would include excused and unexcused absences.
 6. All those in favor: 8
 7. All those opposed: 0
 8. All those abstained: 1
 9. Motion passes: amendment is rejected.
- vi. Landon said he would support and statement that encourages absent Board members to familiarize themselves with the missed presentation by reviewing the proposal and talking to presenters.
1. Jeff felt it was unnecessary to talk to the presenters.
 2. Clayton added that he felt it would be beneficial to include language that says if a member fails to do so, they must abstain from voting.
- vii. Jeff made a motion to include the language "a member who was absent from a given presentation, who did not have an associate member present in their absence, is encouraged to conduct a site visit of said presentation and review the presentation materials."
1. Liz seconded
 2. Pat reiterated that including site visits is problematic because it is sometimes not possible or practical, and the other voting members on the Board are not required to make any site visits.
 3. Jeff amended his statement to read "a member who was absent from a given presentation, who did not have an associate member present in their absence, is encouraged to become fully informed about said presentation by reviewing the presentation materials including, if possible, a site visit."
 4. All those in favor: 7
 5. All those opposed: 1
 6. All those abstained: 1
 7. Motion passes: the amendment to Article IX, Section 2 will now read as follows: "A member who was absent from a given presentation, who did not have an associate member present in their absence, is encouraged to become fully informed about said presentation by reviewing the presentation materials including, if possible, a site visit."
- c. Article X, section 3 suggested addition of: "All possible amendments must be distributed to the Board one (1) week prior to the Bylaw review to allow preparation for further deliberation."
- i. Jeff asked if this amendment would mean that the previous amendment just made by the Board would be impossible, because it is different than the language that was submitted beforehand.
 - ii. Clayton said the reason he suggested this amendment was to encourage members to deliberate before the meeting to help facilitate debate and discussion during the language.
 - iii. Jeff asked if we could just change the language from must to should.
 - a. Landon felt the language should say must so that board members are really forced to think of amendments beforehand.
 - iv. Anthony echoed Jeff's concern, saying that discussion and dialogue often produce new edits and amendments that cannot be produced far in advance.

- v. Jeff mentioned that even without the addition of this amendment, the Board is always encouraged to submit suggestions early and that is a tradition that should continue. However, it is not something that needs to be limiting us in our bylaws.
- vi. Grace asked if we could add something that states changes to amendments can be added by present members during deliberation.
 - 1. Pat Burns mentioned that Robert's Rules of Order allows for amendments to already suggested edits.
- vii. Jeff made a motion to reject Article X, section 3.
 - 1. Kalya seconded
 - 2. All those in favor: 2
 - 3. All those opposed: 5
 - 4. All those abstaining: 2
 - 5. Motion failed.
- viii. Landon made a motion in add "said amendments may be further amended by the Board during the bylaw review session."
 - 1. Rachel seconded.
 - 2. All those in favor: 5
 - 3. All those in opposed: 1
 - 4. All those abstaining: 3
 - 5. Article IX, Section 3 will now read: "All possible amendments must be distributed to the Board one (1) week prior to the bylaw review to allow preparation for further deliberation. Said amendments may be further amended by the Board during the bylaw review session."