

University Facility Fee Advisory Board

Minutes

Thursday, March 5, 2020

5:00-6:30 pm

303 GSB

Members present

Dillon Donaghy	Vice Chair
Mauri Richards	Secretary
Courtland Kelly	Graduate School
Westin Musser	Natural Sciences
Natalie Miller	CVMBS
Logan Johnson	Warner
Deven Shields	Engineering
Alison Kuderka	College of Agricultural Sciences
Leah Karels	College of Health and Human Sciences
Marie Cusick	College of Liberal Arts

Associate Members present

Zach Scott	Engineering
Kevin Clausen	College of Agricultural Sciences
Lauren Compton	CVMBS
Noah Munson	Warner
Adrien Hernandez	Engineering

Members at Large present

NA

Other Members present

Karin Rees	Program Assistant
Tom Satterly	Advisor
Simon Tavener	Co-Advisor
Kristi Buffington	Facilities Management

1. Meeting convened at 5:00 pm
2. Clark C-145 Research and Study Lab Remodel—Jonathan Carlyon
 - a. Why wait to renovate Clark?
 - b. Languages, Literatures, and Cultures
 - i. Used to be in the bottom floor of Eddy, then moved to Clark. Using the same space until 1997.
 - c. Current issues:
 - i. Industrialized design from the 90s→ Professors lecture students, and no collaboration
 - ii. Ceiling tiles are falling from runners
 - d. Future:
 - i. Wide open spaces with various use cases
 - ii. Lounge area for student clubs, standing desks, computer bars→ alter the entire layout of the area
 1. Dedicated space for language proficiency and service learning
 2. Recording studio for American Sign Language learners or faculty to record lectures
 3. Lounge for clubs, discussion groups, etc
 4. Add a window to engage other students in what the language department is doing
 5. TV for movie nights and advertisement
 6. Standing tables for collaborative projects
 7. Traditional sitting area to work for students
 - e. Impact:
 - i. 813 majors and minors in every college (Liberal Arts and Natural Sciences are the largest colleges represented)
 - ii. 328 students CLA, 52 LLC students in Vet Med, 104 students from Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Engineering, 106 Health and human Sciences students, 75 students from Business school, 138 students in Natural Sciences
 - iii. Second highest minor in languages on campus (behind business)
 - f. Questions:
 - i. Logan: Have you heard of the proposed fee increase and the renovation of Clark?
 1. **Jonathan:** I understand that Clark will be an external remodel that will most likely begin in Clark A, we are in Clark C... We are still talking 5-6 years from this pint.
 2. **Tom:** Actually, Clark C will be the first phase and the interior will be the first thing to be updated
 - a. Both A and C would get an exterior renovation
 3. **Jonathan:** One last addition: this is an old space. I am very focused on the students that are here now.
 4. **Tom:** Then what is the return on investment? 60K a year if this is renovated and used for 2 to 3 year minimum window

5. **Jonathan:** We have many students that are currently taking classes now. There needs to be a return on investment for students that are paying now.
6. **Tom:** How much can be reused or repurposed?
 - a. Tables, chairs, Televisions, technology would be phased out
7. **Jonathan:** Window is a metaphor of opening up campus to languages
- ii. Allison: The original space looked more like a lounge setting?
 1. Changing the layout and the purpose. Students want to have the ability to move around and explore. The department is able to foster this, but the lab does not. Interested to have various zones for students
- iii. Zach: If you did receive funding, when could the renovation start and end?
 1. We hope to begin in the summer and finish in the summer. This may not be the case because facilities may not be prepared to complete this. Even if it were online by SP21, this would be ideal.
 2. Furniture purchase is the largest holdback for renovations like these.

3. **Modernizing Student Researcher Offices in Chemistry—Amber Krummel**

- a. Goal: To enhance the undergraduate research experience and to increase the health of students by providing ergonomic workstations
- b. Investment life: Bring updated aesthetics to the chemistry building, add modular designs of the workstation for ease of reconfiguration
- c. Chemistry at CSU: Biological, synthetic, materials, theory and computational, analytical and physical
- d. Impact:
 - i. 30 faculty research groups (11 in ChemR & 19 in Chem 1)
 - ii. 190 graduate students between 2 buildings and mentor 50 undergraduate researchers (does not include summer programs)
 1. Mentored research for students is essential for experience and success
- e. Current state:
 - i. ChemR (Chemistry Research, new building) sets the standard with open areas, collaboration, and cleanliness.
 - ii. Chem1 (opened in 1971)
 1. Chemistry has made investments to move students out of the lab environments, but this requires that students are moved into small areas
 2. Most desk and chair areas share common workspaces from CSU Surplus
- f. Transformation:
 - i. New chairs and tables with plenty of storage as well
 - ii. Making lab spaces to open concept office spaces
 1. Breakrooms can be added to each floor
 2. Design collaborative office environments for researchers
- g. Request:
 - i. Funding for ergonomic workstations for undergraduate and graduate students
 - ii. ~\$105,500.84

- iii. Chemistry department will fund the infrastructure to turn lab spaces into open concept office spaces
- iv. UFFAB would be funding work spaces
- h. Questions:
 - i. Courtland: What open office areas were you referring to?
 - 1. In the written proposal, called out two types of rooms and smaller office spaces. Since submitting proposal, they want to house truly open concept workspaces.
 - 2. Lab space renovations in this building have issues with abatement. Removing a fume hood would help with energy savings.
 - ii. Dillion: Would these proposed changes for the office spaces be able to increase capacity?
 - 1. Yes, we can probably increase numbers, but that includes increased cost on the graduate students. There is actually a large amount of students that are helped here now.
 - 2. Summary: May be able to increase numbers in sheer workstation numbers, but
 - iii. Mauri: UFFAB would only be funding furniture ?
 - 1. Yes, chemistry will fund the rest of the improvements that have been mentioned.
 - iv. Marie: Will Chemistry fund this regardless of UFFAB funding?
 - 1. Yes, we are working down this path to get these areas renovated down the road, but it would be very helpful to have the furniture funded.
 - v. Courtland: Are you still asking for height adjustable desks?
 - 1. We would like to... the researcher that is in this lab works a data intensive jobs sitting at a desk. Height adjustability would be a very good thing.

4. College of Natural Sciences Undergraduate Lab Space revitalization—Melissa Reynolds

- a. Student impacts:
 - i. 82% of students that have graduated from CSU have been required to take these labs
 - ii. Yates and the Engineering Building (Departments: Biochemistry, Biology, Chemistry, and Physics)
 - 1. Built in the early 2000s, and have not had many updates since this time
 - iii. Most of the first-year freshman experience is in one of these labs
- b. 2014 the university went through a planning period:
 - i. Labs are always needed... there is a large amount of square footage that is needed for current enrollment rates.
- c. Core values: Offer experiential learning opportunities for students, provide learning spaces to develop and practice skills, and inclusive of all teaching practices.
- d. Yates: 100% undergraduate space
- e. Planning process: toured laboratory rooms and identified components that are worn out or not useful for the courses that are taught. Developed a multi-year plan.
 - i. Cost is too high for one year of the plan... what is first?

- f. Needs: Additional electrical, screen that no-longer works, outdated furniture
- g. Update summary:
 - i. Electrical, seating, countertops, ceilings and LEDS, cabinets, floors and walls
 - ii. Focusing on 26 lab spaces in yates and 4 lab spaces in engineering.
- h. Updating Yates hall:
 - i. Replacing countertops with water damage or scratches.
 - 1. The countertops will last around 50 years (these are strong)
 - ii. Replacing chairs for the spaces: Optimize the right chairs for the right areas
 - 1. Allow the students to be comfortable with the correct chemical resistance
- i. Physics:
 - i. Complete overhaul of the lab spaces
 - ii. Modular design with trapezoidal tables that can be moved around.
 - iii. Some of the lab spaces needs to be updated to be conducive to the acoustic labs
 - iv. These can also be used for other labs in the future.
- j. Project phasing:
 - i. Engineering:
 - 1. P1: floors, walls, lighting, power, data, and window solar shades.
 - 2. P2: Dry erase tables and chairs
 - ii. Yates
 - 1. P1: Chemical resistant countertops, lab seating, and walls
 - 2. P2: Screens, LED lighting, and cabinets
 - iii. These are split with projects that can have minimal impact on space each time
- k. Budget:
 - i. Dean Nerger's contribution: \$200,000
 - ii. UFFAB request: \$523,432
 - 1. Engineering--\$ 155,432
 - 2. Yates: \$568,000
- l. Benefits: 30 undergraduate only laboratory spaces that 82% of all CSU undergraduates will use
- m. Questions:
 - i. Natalie: In the physics lab, all of the stations have a computer, how will this be used?
 - 1. Brian and Ken want to move toward the IPAD model rather than computers
 - 2. Dan added that some of the technology added will be to add more data for more wifi to support this
 - ii. Marie: How will different labs have different chairs?
 - 1. Materials are dependent on what labs need certain resistances for various substances.
 - 2. So are you purchasing the same type of chair?
 - a. Types of activities differ in these areas, there needs to be various chairs used.

- iii. Logan: What is the biggest impact on students if one were only funded?
 1. Wear and tear on spaces: focused on Yates building. The use damage may continue to increase and be harder to repair in the future.
 2. Physics labs can create a new type of way that students can interact in these lab spaces.
 3. The dean will contribute a certain percentage of UFFAB's contribution.

5. Legitimizing/Discussion:

- a. Clark C-145 Research and Study Lab Remodel:
 - i. Logan made the comment that we are not sure if this will be remodeled within the next few years.
 - ii. However, this does pass the funding rules
 1. **Yes: 9**
 2. No: 0
 3. Abstain: 0
- b. Modernizing Student Researcher Offices in Chemistry
 - i. Karin will provide an updated proposal because it has altered
 1. **Yes: 9**
 2. No: 0
 3. Abstain: 0
- c. College of Natural Sciences Undergraduate Lab Space revitalization
 - i. **Yes: 9**
 - ii. No: 0
 - iii. Abstain: 0

6. Tom Satterly—UFFAB Student Fee Discussion: Capital Project Selections Considerations:

- a. **What:** UFFAB fund \$103M in construction after taking out existing funding sources
 - i. 3 million dollars a year for 30 years
- b. What does it actually cost a student?
 - i. \$12 M Cash
 - ii. \$46M UFF existing
 - iii. \$45M UFF New
 - iv. Interest on \$91M=\$86.7M
 - v. We are really paying for **\$189.7M** including interest
- c. Construction fund sources (without state money)
 - i. 51% UFFAB, 20% donor cost, 29% central admin
- d. Projects:
 - i. Glover building 1: 140 gross square feet (80)
 - ii. Clark: Push classrooms to windows, offices and collaborative spaces to the center (55M)
 - iii. BDC building 1
 - iv. Site considerations for each place:
 1. Glover 1 with green space where building 2 can go in the future
 2. Physiology can have building one and wait for building 2
 3. Clark: If funding falls through then Clark B and C will be renovated, but A will still be the way it is now

v. **Scenario a:**

	Donor	Central	UFFAB	Project Total
Glover	16	21	43	80
Clark	11	20	24	55
BDC	14	20	36	70
	41	61	103	205

We need to decide how much to contribute to each building, or none

vi. **Scenario B:**

	Donor	Central	UFFAB	State funds	Project Total
Glover	16	8.5	55.5	0	80
Clark	11	44	0	53	108
BDC	14	8.5	47.5	0	70
	41	61	103	53	258

No student funds

1. History in terms of capital projects:
 - a. 10 capital projects to date: Bonded projects, not cash that are voted on
 - i. UCA, Computer Sciences, Rockwell West
 - ii. BSB
 - iii. Engineering 2
 - iv. Library expansions
 - v. Biggest project to date now → Glover, Clark, and Physiology
2. **WHY:** Reference UFFAB bylaws, article VII 8 criteria to evaluate a proposed project.
 - a. Bylaws listed in binders
 - b. Expect 50 year life cycle
 - c. How much will it cost to run these buildings? Green?
 - i. Geo-exchange on Moby lowers utility by 60% (this could be used for **Clark** as well)
 - ii. Other two buildings will use carbon based fuel sources.
3. Considerations for project selection: (*Takeaways to keep in mind*)
 - a. Total amount of UFFAB bond funding being requested?
 - b. How total UFFAB bond funding would be distributed among the three buildings?
 - c. Could UFFAB have discretion on the money amounts and usage (GA classrooms, etc.) to watch building? One, two, three buildings?
 - d. Assume 5% construction cost escalation per year
 - e. Opportunity for a green Clark with a Geoexchange
 - f. Clark site considerations: Could you accept a new B and C, but not a new A building?
 - g. Options to fully fund Clark: current value (\$108 M) vs what is needed (\$120M) need to check with VPUO for update on the value and impact to State scoring.
 - i. One side may have a beautiful exterior and current Clark still there, want to finish a project
 - ii. Check with Lynn to see if this
 - h. Number of students that are being served*****

- i. Remaining bond capacity for future projects, what will balance UFFAB budget if fully fund this request of \$103 M?
 - j. Need for discretionary balance for a future bonded project?
 - i. 2037 is when first debt schedules will be paid off
 - k. Status of donor fund raising, what does each dean expect to raise?
- 4. Scenario A does not include Clark A
- 5. Scenario B: Go with the state: No UFFAB Funding for Clark
 - a. 13-month long process
 - b. All of higher eds have to get their projects scored
 - c. Board of governors will review capital projects that are sent to the state
 - d. Prioritize within the system
 - e. Many other projects that are being ranked along with Clark if put into this pool
 - f. BOG → CCHE → CCHE →
 - g. CCHE: Scoring
- 6. Questions:
 - a. Logan: Do you think that Clark has the best chance of being approved with the state?
 - i. We don't know that. We know that \$108M is not enough
 - b. Noah: Architect said that Clark with weird outside can be done?
 - i. Yes, but should you do that?
 - ii. If you complete the entire building it will increase the energy efficiency and the aesthetics of the building.
 - c. Allison:
 - i. Is Clark currently being scored?
 - 1. No, because it is going to change if Lynn goes up to \$120 from \$108M.
 - ii. Does the state review happen annually? (Yes) Can we change the score next year?
 - 1. Yes, this can be altered. On average it is about 7 years by the time that the project that goes in first to the time that it gets approved. There is a lot of time that will need to be waited.
 - 2. We would need this money about year 4 or 5
 - d. Marie: Score weighting:
 - i. Put in any amount of student fees, then the score goes down.
 - ii. There are a large amount of unknowns this year
 - iii. Marie: How do we determine that geothermal spaces are correct?
 - 1. CSU needs to make these decisions now because they are designed differently that traditional spaces.
 - iv. Are there any other spaces on campus that this could be done? Montfort quad, the IM Fields.
 - v. Geothermal upfront decision needs to be made
 - e. Logan: Where would the money come form with the geothermal?
 - i. Controlled maintenance: Do we want to pay to replace boilers? Or can we just hold off and add this to the geothermal list?

1. When we move to Geoexchange, all of the heating and cooling is a lower cost.
 2. Look at buildings on the corner of monfort quad... wait to renovate?
- f. Marie: Where else would the money come from for Clark?
- i. We could ask what it would cost UFFAB to put more money into Clark?
 - ii. Have a conversation with Lynn and others to see how the buildings can be altered.