

**Facilities Council Meeting Minutes**

October 23, 2018

2:30 to 4:30pm

Bldg. LCC 07/212K

**Attendees:** Alen Bahret, Jennifer Frei, Jennifer Hayward, Luis Maggiori, Andy Salzman, Craig Taylor, Mike Zimmerman, Paul Ruscher, Adam Atman, Caleb Peterson

**Recorder:** Deborah Butler

**Guests:** Robin Geyer, LCC Academic Scheduler

Cammie Harris, Lane Transit District, Marketing and Communications Representative

Jeramy Card, Lane Transit District, Service Planning Associate

Tom Schwetz, Lane Transit District, Director of Planning and Development

Chris Ramey, CRC Planning, Consultant to Rowell Brokaw

Lorri Nelson, Landscape Architect, Rowell Brokaw

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Notes** |
| Approval of Agenda/ Additions? | No changes proposed. |
| LTD | Tom asked some general questions about the master planning process, and Jennifer gave a brief summary of the plan scope and time line. Tom asked whether LCC is engaged in current conversations about transportation options between Eugene and Florence, and Brian confirmed that we have been contacted.  Alen shared a concern that there are not good transportation options for evening classes that end at or after 8:50, especially for students who live in Springfield. Currently, students who travel to Springfield have to ride to the U of O to change. Ridership drops off significantly in the evenings, but there is a bump on the 85 on the afternoon 3:23 trip. It’s not immediately clear why there is a spike at that time.  Tom spoke about the LTD/LCC partnership pilot that provided service to the airport. One challenge is that many people who need to travel to the airport, either for work or travel purposes, need to arrive very early. LTD services generally do not get moving until about 5:30 or 6 am each day. The most recent pilot started in the winter of 2016 and ended in fall 2017. Unfortunately, ridership was very low, averaging one or fewer riders per run. The pilot program bus transferred students to a bus at the airport that dropped students and employees directly to the aviation classroom area.  Ridership for the 92 (Lowell) and 98 (Cottage Grove) varies, but the highest percentage of riders are not getting on or off the bus at LCC.  Alen asked about the recent EmX study that indicated that the Thurston EmX bus might terminate at the LCC campus. City of Eugene study looked at 99, River Road, Coburg Road, and MLK as possible EmX routes, but none have been approved. City of Springfield study that looked at a Main Street and McVay Hwy connection to LCC via EmX, but it was not deemed appropriate given the lack of potential stops between those two areas. Another consideration was a current ODOT study that recommends medians on Main Street in Springfield, which would limit LTD options on that street. An enhanced corridor between Springfield and LCC is still a possibility. Enhanced corridors include features like queue jumps, signal priority, stations, right-of-way priority, and other smaller-scale options that can be improved incrementally.  Another possible enhanced corridor is being examined from Amazon to 30th Ave. and on to LCC.  Any options that involve EmX would likely cost $40-80 million. While LTD received significant funding for the initial EmX creation and expansion, new legislation has made the funding process more competitive, and funding also now requires a 50% match in funds. Tom described LTD’s planning process right now as happening on a “north star” level. Operational, day-to-day decisions will continue to be made, but bigger decisions have been put off at this time until the funding picture is clearer.  The Main Street transfer station boardings, for the #11 EmX that travels between the Main Street transfer station to the Downtown Eugene transfer station, have increased from about 2500 to around 4500 over the last couple of years. It is a very productive route, and could support additional trips.  One lesson learned from EmX starting during a recession in 2011 was that it was difficult to commit to 10-minute trips in areas that were developed  Bus pass comment  West 11 ridership is close to double the ridership of the Gateway route. Mid-day, Saturday, and Sunday ridership is especially productive. Accounts for about 35% of LTD ridership overall.  Bus passes are available to credit students at the main campus, Downtown Center, and Aviation Center, who are assessed a $27/term fee. Online-only students are excluded from the program, because we would have to make it available to all students or no students, and we know that not all students are nearby any Lane location. Caleb shared that he was not aware of the availability of bus passes for credit students until recently, after he became more engaged in campus activities. He also was not aware of the Bike Lane option until very recently. Of the $27 fee, $18.90 goes directly to LTD. The rest supports transportation projects on campus, such as Bike Lane, accessible parking, etc. Eligible students who would like to have a student bus pass can get one at the Titan Store. The older, white, text-only cards will expire on October 31. Kami offered to work with student government to better communicate bus pass benefits to students on campus.  Adam asked why there was a recent cut in service on the 81 to the U of O. Jeremy said that ridership on that bus had decreased, and LTD could not justify the same number of trips with fewer riders on each bus.  Caleb asked for a statement from guests in regards to an incident that occurred a few weeks ago where a student in a wheelchair was not able to board the bus because accessible seating was being used by riders who did not appear to be disabled and the LTD driver did not require the riders to clear the accessible space. Tom said that he was unable to give a statement on that issue, but provided Caleb with contact information for someone who would be able to assist Caleb at LTD’s offices.  “Mobility as a service” on-demand rides may soon be available in Cottage Grove through a partnership between LTD and South Lane Wheels. The service would be hailed through an app, and would utilize smaller vehicles for specific trips rather than a large bus. |
| Approval of Minutes | Mike Z. moved to accept the 10/09/18 meeting minutes. Craig seconded. Approved unanimously. |
| Rowell Brokaw | Chris shared a planning document with the council that included a graphic time line of the process. Although we have specified that we expect little or no growth in the 5 to 10 years ahead, he advocated for a more robust planning process that looked closely as space use and space use efficiency in addition to identifying opportunities for potential future growth.  Chris explained that the first step will be to inquire about the big-picture vision for the college in the years ahead, including areas like recruitment/enrollment, program growth and changes, and transportation. The vision is a broad look at the total picture, for the entire institution. More detailed department and division conversations will help direct and inform the plan, but the outcome should all be tied to the overarching vision. This is important in part because there is no funding/advocacy process for things that enhance the campus environment such as open space, gateways, and social/civic spaces. Lori also emphasized that they plan to be consultants and “helpers” in the process, rather than to drive the project.  Alen spoke about LCC faculty member Margaret Robertson’s assessment of campus design in the vein of brutalist, 60’s style. He is concerned about how we might look at modernizing and improving those spaces without tearing them down or completely rebuilding them. Chris said that he was excited about adapted reuse projects such as Bldg 10. The summer 2018 Deferred Maintenance report has been shared with Rowell Brokaw, so they are familiar with Lane’s maintenance needs and financial challenges.  Jennifer asked Chris to share his plan for department-level meetings when the need arises. He said that there would be some pre-meeting questions and opportunity for feedback, and possibly a survey to gather information. The meetings would be based on questions that will help consultants understand the specific needs of each program – classroom space, collaborative/creative space, or student gathering space. Whether or not the individual goals and projects can be fully funded will come to academic leadership and funding priorities into the future.  Brian said that he appreciated the conversation about aligning Master Plan and institutional vision and strategy, which isn’t always done well. He shared that the Board of Education has recently charged LCC with going out for a bond in May 2020, which will affect our planning process and vision for campus. For example, Health Care programs such as nursing are capped at a level that is limited by our facilities and staffing. Growth in that and other areas will be part of the plan. Chris responded that it is common to have misalignment between academic institution planning and Facilities Master Planning.  Chris asked what success would look like to council members in terms of a completed Master Plan.   * Brian – At the end of our last process, the end result did not look like the information that was fed into the plan. The result was a lack of investment in the plan. * Craig – The message seems to be that we, as a college, need to prepare to participate in planning. * Alen – Lessons learned from difficulties and challenges over the past few years at Lane: avoid the politics of space ownership, and look to the student focus of requests. We want to make sure space is ready for students and faculty, and that is the ultimate goal of planning. We may have to shuffle or move classes or meetings, but we want to make sure that the spaces are available and ready for use. Everyone should be focused on efficiencies and transparency in use. * Mike – There should be clear communication about the direction of the college, so that individual departments and areas aren’t holding onto an ideal or plan that will not be supported moving forward. * Paul – We have difficult statistics that are public-facing, such as our completion rates. We need to improve our success rates, but also make sure that we are preparing our students for changing career-tech and academic programs at partner institutions. Knowing that it is far less expensive to renovate a space than tear down and rebuild a facility, we should express a strong preference for that path. * Luis – As a college, we believe it’s important to grow and adapt within our existing footprint and to rely on universal design principles to best utilize the facilities we have. |
| Climate Action Plan – First Read | Luis sent the Climate Action Plan via email and it was also shared last month with the Board of Education. The Board has asked that Luis and his department work to generate cost estimates for each item in the plan, and he is in the process of preparing estimates now. The request indicates a high level of engagement with the plan and a plan to invest in the goals.  P&G is working on graphics and design for the plan.  Mike Z. asked about a chart on p. 9 that seems to omit data from 2012 to 2017. Luis said that there was a transition to a new measuring tool during that time, so consistent data is not available. The drop in greenhouse gases between measurable years is accurate and includes the enrollment drop after the surge.  Paul said that he will attempt to gather more detailed information on carbon sequestration. He also asked for an update on the President’s Climate Leadership Commitment, of which Lane is a signatory. Brian agreed that an update has been expected, but shared that no update in standards has been made at this time.  Jennifer asked about the influence of the Climate Action Plan on Bond planning. Brian said that he has consistently recommended a $5 to $10 million earmark for sustainability projects. Such projects typically poll well in this area, and he believes support is likely.  Paul asked whether we could ask Rowell Brokaw to sketch out some visions of what the campus environment might look like with investments in natural spaces, outdoor classrooms, athletic outdoor spaces, and other such areas. Jennifer thought that visioning in that area would likely be included in the Master Plan process, but it would not probably be as detailed as what Paul describes.  At this point, the original plan has been approved. As an update, this version of the plan does not need to be approved by this council or by College Council. Council members are asked to send feedback on the plan to Luis prior to our next meeting or bring it for discussion at that time. |
| 2018-19 Work Plan | Listed items will constitute our work plan for 2018-19. Deborah will resolve the document comments and questions and bring it to the next meeting for an official vote. |
| Announcements | No announcements. |
| Sustainability Committee Report | This Friday will be the 3rd meeting of the term. About 10 members regularly attend. Last week, the group talked about the Eco Challenge, and Paul shared information about Science Department events planned for National Earth Science Week and Global Climate Change Week, October 14-21. Next week, the group will begin work on a Bee-Friendly Campus application. There will be a Meatless Monday campaign for November. In the EcoChallenge, we’ve challenged Chemeketa and Pacific University. Lane’s Green Team is winning as of today. The challenge ends tomorrow (October 24).  Meetings are held on Fridays at 1pm in LCC 16/211. Everyone is welcome. |
| **Next Meeting** | **October 23, 2018, 2:30 – 4:30pm**  **-**IEC review  -Overall inward-looking review of council, including a conversation and report about whether we should continue to exist  -Location of the food pantry and clothing stash, and Paul Jarrell’s commitment to find an appropriate location for both services by the end of the term  -Review procedure/policy notes from Jen Steele (did not get to this item at this meeting)  -Policy review – campus open hours vs. facilities open hours  -Approve work plan 2018-19 |