

**Facilities Council Meeting Minutes**

May 14, 2019

2:30 to 4:30pm

Bldg. LCC 07/212K

**Attendees:** Jennifer Hayward, Brian Kelly, Mike Zimmerman, Mike Sims, Susie Holmes, Alen Bahret, Mike Sims, Paul Ruscher, Robin Geyer

**Recorder:** Deborah Butler

**Guests:** Ed Radza and Barbara Barlow-Powers, IT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Notes** |
| Approval of Agenda/ Additions? | Susie moved to approve 04/23 minutes as written. Brian seconded. Minutes approved.  Alen requested to move the GroupWise discussion to 4pm to accommodate Ed and Barbara’s schedule. |
| Announcements | Alen shared that he enjoyed the Taphonomy Lab presentation and visit. Paul said that there would be more information available on the Undergraduate Research Day (SUGR), and he would send an announcement about that event. |
| Master Plan Update | All information from departments has been submitted to the consultants, and they have compiled it into a single report. A Master Plan subcommittee meeting will be held on Thursday to review. There will be a Facilities Open House on June 5 and 6 for anyone across campus to share feedback and thoughts about project prioritization. Cabinet will review the draft of Master Plan Options and determine the “best draft.” The time line has been compressed somewhat due to the snowstorm in February/March and the need to have a finished draft as soon as possible to align with possible bond options. The draft would be submitted for approval by the Board of Education at their October 2019 meeting.  Paul asked that the draft also be submitted for Facilities Council review at the same time it is provided to the Board of Education at the end of September. Jennifer agreed to do so.  Alen asked how it was determined that the Master Plan would not include plans for expansion or new construction, but would work within the existing footprint. Jennifer said that concept was taken from previous conversations, including those at a board level, and has been a part of FMP planning in general in recognition of the fact that the college has far fewer students than in many of the prior several years. It is understood that there is a cost involved in maintaining facilities spaces, and an interest in reducing those costs where possible. Susie also said that maintaining the current footprint was one of the values agreed upon by the subcommittee when Master Plan work began.  Alen asked how much space was calculated to be unassigned or unused prior to the commencement of the planning process. Jennifer said that about 25k square feet were identified as available and unused, and about 100k square feet were requested as part of the department-level review process. Requests are almost exclusively academic in nature, and Brian estimated that the split was about 60% CTE requests.  Alen also asked about the age of our current Master Plan. Jennifer and Brian replied that there hasn’t been a fully developed and approved Master Plan in many years. The previous iteration of the Master Plan was developed with the assistance of a student lab at the UO, but it was never formally approved and didn’t include any budget planning.  Chris and Lorri will be returning to meet with Facilities Council at the next meeting, on May 28. |
| Facilities 15-Year Capital Renewal Plan | Facilities Council Charter states that the council is responsible for the 5-year maintenance plan approval. Jennifer provided a handout that describes the budgeted plans for FY19 through FY32. Items were prioritized according to the Facilities Conditions Report done in the summer of 2018 and some previous reports created within the FMP area that track the age of various facilities components. Tradespeople also provided feedback about their top priority maintenance items. The cost threshold for items on this list was $10k.  Jennifer noted that many of the repairs listed are scheduled in order to prevent much larger repairs at a later date (example: parking lot maintenance each year prevents the need for major repairs less frequently). Additional items have been tracked and are very close year to year (example: wayfinding costs approximately $50k each year).  Paul asked what “Variable Drive Frequencies” are. Jennifer replied that they are part of HVAC systems. Technology improvements could be added, but given reduced enrollment levels, it may not be given highest priority. There is still unmet demand for technology-enhanced classrooms during the busiest class hours of the day (10am to 2pm).  Robin asked why there were so few carpet/paint updates listed in the plan. Jennifer replied that while some minor upgrades would likely be done in between other projects, there simply isn’t enough budget available to schedule additional upgrades without additional funds.  Robin also asked where technology upgrades for classrooms would be listed. Brian replied that tech fee and possible bond funds could be used for that purpose, but there is no FMP budget set aside for that purpose.  Alen asked whether there were additional OCR mandates or Safety Committee recommendations that were not yet met. Jennifer said that there were not any known repairs or upgrades that are not scheduled. Scheduled cement work would likely improve accessibility even though they are not being done as ADA requirements.  Mike and Alen asked about scheduled use of gravel lots and whether it would make more sense to close them than to monitor their use and repair/maintain them. Jennifer agreed that there would be some savings in that course of action.  Mike mentioned that the first of three modular buildings will be removed by a purchaser this weekend. He said that he hoped that it would not be used as a defacto parking lot and would instead be used intentionally for something like a reclamation project. Jennifer said that the gravel lots are also not ADA compliant and should be taken offline for that reason as well.  Alen noticed that there were 30 heat pumps listed at the Florence Center, which is surprising considering the relatively small footprint that totals around 30,000 square feet. Jennifer said that she would check on that item to make sure it was not a typo.  Alen asked how seismic upgrades fit into the plan. Jennifer said that the subcommittee will be reviewing a prioritization list at their meeting next week, and that the plan would be to apply for upgrades from state funds each year to upgrade in order of prioritization. No matching funds are required for these grants, and they generally cover the entire cost of upgrades.  Alen asked whether there were plans within the Master Plan or Capital Renewal Plan for geothermal or other alternative energy. Jennifer said that there were plans to add solar panels to new construction, but geothermal was deemed to be prohibitively expensive according to a project completed a couple of years ago.  Robin asked about the Green Revolving Fund. Jennifer explained that the fund is managed by the Institute for Sustainable Practices and is designed to cover projects that will result in reductions in energy use that will reduce college utility bills. The savings from the project are committed to repay the cost of the project to the fund. Updating lighting in the tunnels to LED was a Green Revolving Fund project, and estimated payback was calculated as 5 years.  Alen asked about how upgrades in LTD bays or access would be budgeted. Jennifer said that if LTD requested the upgrade, LTD would pay for most or all of it. If LCC requested the upgrade for convenience, LCC would pay.  Alen asked about track resurfacing, and whether the funds in the “sinking fund,” which captures a portion of rental funds generated within departments, would pay for it. Mike and Jennifer said that resurfacing was estimated to be necessary sometime in 2023-2027, but Jennifer said that it was unlikely that the sinking fund would cover the total cost.  Facilities Council members were asked to send Jennifer any additional questions or comments. The handout has been appended to these minutes for reference. |
| Future of Facilities Council | Alen reported on the most recent All-Council meeting, which he interpreted to convey that there was unlikely to be a Facilities Council moving forward. He set out some options for action from this council, including a “minority report” to advocate for a continued council presence. Another option would be to transition this council to a “Facilities Leadership Committee” group to continue all or some of the work being done now by this group. One potential disadvantage of that model would be that, while classified contracts create an allowance of release time for governance councils, classified employees may not be able participate at the same level.  Jennifer H. asked whether Safety Committee members were granted release time. Brian and Alen said that they did not believe that was the case.  Paul asked how BLT was formed as an example of how that might work. Alen said that he was “very strongly suggested” by the VP at the time that he chair the committee. There were hours associated with that work and release time was granted, but it was specific to that role.  Robin shared that, as a member of the Governance Task Force, it was generally discussed that operational work, such as that performed by Facilities Council and Tech Council, might be merged into a single “Infrastructure Council” or something similar. The actual recommendations were not specific in terms of a new council structure, but were instead a list of 11 individual recommendations to carry forward into any future council structure. Brian asked whether Finance Council might also be included in an “infrastructure” grouping. |
| Safety Committee Update | Jennifer shared that most meeting time is taken up by accident report review and recommendations. At the next Safety Committee meeting, a SAIF representative will be visiting to share an annual report about claims. |
| **Next Meeting** | **May 28, 2:30 – 4:30pm** |

Future Agenda Items:

* Safety Committee Training recommendations on June 11 (Jennifer H)
* [after you left Deborah] - Taphonomy Lab update in Fall Term meeting (and perhaps a bi-yearly or yearly report out?)