

## Physical Environment Committee Minutes

**December 10, 2013**  
**8:00am – 9:00am**  
**Lincoln Building Conference Room**

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| MEETING CALLED BY   | Ted Curtis & Harvey Sterns – Co-Conveners  |
| TYPE OF MEETING     | UC Committee   |
| FACILITATORS        | Ted Curtis & Harvey Sterns – Co-Convener   |
| NOTES SUBMITTED BY: | Shelly Keller  |
| ABSENT              | Mark Dvorak<br>USG – Vacant Position   |
| ATTENDEES           | Ted Curtis – Co-Convener<br>Garrett Dowd<br>Ann Hassenpflug – Vice Chair<br>Julie Hykes<br>Shelly Keller - Secretary<br>Chuck Kunsman<br>Denise Montanari<br>Ralph Morrone<br>Elizabeth Reilly<br>Harvey Sterns – Co-Convener<br>Shawn Stevens<br>William Thelin |
| INVITED GUESTS      | Ralph Morrone  |

Agenda topics

### MINUTE APPROVAL

|             |   |
|-------------|---|
| DISCUSSION  | Approval of the 11/19/13 minutes was requested.   |
| CONCLUSIONS | Chuck made a motion to accept the minutes as presented. Julie seconded the motion and all were in favor 11-0. |

## MEETING ITEMS

### **General Discussion**

- Liz would like this committee to make a communication loop and involve the right people at the right time. First time Sasaki came through we scrambled and by the third time we had it right. Liz believes that would help in the process.
- Harvey read our charge as a committee per University Council Bylaws –it reads as follows:  
  
*The physical environment committee is responsible for studying, monitoring and making recommendations related to overall campus planning, safety, and the use and assignment of university space, physical facilities and equipment in collaboration with staff, contract professionals and faculty in appropriate departments. These recommendations shall be forwarded to the university council for consideration.*
- Ted Curtis stated the main issues in Capital Planning are we hear about a problem too late. They need to come to us early on. Issue with grants, sometimes there is equipment that we don't know about until the grant is awarded then we find out there is more equipment needed to handle properly. We have been trying to get into the loop earlier. Ralph advised that recently we had two issues where humidity controls were not handled in a timely fashion, problems started in 2006 we were just told in 2013 about the issues.
- Ralph advised there are almost two paths of the communication process. This committee approves to the powers that be, the powers to be then have to get it to the right people. (Deans, VPs etc.) that is where most of our items get lost in translation.
- Ted added that he attends the Vice Presidents meetings and information is shared there.
- Liz agrees this committee would be the best group to handle or begin the communication process since we have representation from different units across campus.
- Harvey was involved in reviewing and approving the planning of communications. The process is defined once it comes to planning and facilities; it is getting it to that point, where we have less control of it.
- Shawn stated that in many cases when setting up labs, etc. the physical structure is overlooked.
- Grants - some of them allow us to write in the expected, others expect it to all be in there regarding the infrastructure. There also needs to be communication between the grant writer and the David Cummins' group so that the correct information is in there. Ted stated the earlier the problems are identified the quicker you can handle them. Harvey advised there are big problems with grants both not getting it and getting it.
- Liz suggested maybe it would be a good idea to bring Grant Administration into the communication process. Maybe they can bring it into Capital Planning to see where funds would be pulled from. Ralph added through grant writing process' can we pay a 1% fee to handle. Chemicals are left they lock the door and walk away. Our budget handles the cleanup, which we don't have the budget to handle.
- This committee had to handle rooms containing stock, old inventory, chemicals, etc. that hadn't been cleaned up in over 50 years. In some cases the cost is 100K per lab. Deferred maintenance for example, costs are never figured into the equation. If this committee can establish those guidelines in print we could work off of. If there is a grant process that is followed, we could just add another signature line for engineering etc. This would provide a good safety item as well. Try to keep everyone in mind and in the process on every situation. We could invite Katie in February, it may be as simple as adding a line. Ralph will check with her. Shelly advised we have a speaker for February, to see if she could come in March.
- Chuck made a motion to approve and move forward with a communication process. It was seconded by Julie. All were favor 11-0.

### **Zook Hall**

- Harvey hopes that with enacting the communication process it is another goal of his that renovation information is communicated throughout the department affected. This is the first time he has seen where no information is shared (Zook Renovations). There is something on college council's agenda for this Friday. Ann stated she is not sure what that is.
- Harvey added our architects and others are usually out there talking to the departments.
- Ted stated they are still waiting for program details from the acting dean, those details were to be in to Capital Planning, mid to late October. Still haven't seen anything yet. Information expected is what uses the areas will have, number of people, how many offices, academic rooms etc. Ted advised we can't move ahead without this program detail. This

advises us if it fits the budget. His group then massages it back and forth to make it work. Ann asked if it comes through the Provost's office. Ted advised they are involved. We have had contractors and engineers on contract since summer waiting for these details, starting and stopping this project is what is costing money and the project loses momentum. It is best to start and move right on through. Ideal but it doesn't happen all the time. This project is just sitting there in limbo right now. Harvey advised this is very disturbing that this department is having such a delay and no communication at all. We want to create new space once. In a year and a half the school of law will use that space. As of last summer the plans were that the college of education will go back to Zook. There are two departments in that building and there are many rumors spreading about the future status of all departments on campus.

- Ted added that it is not only a savings of money but if so many changes keep occurring, in the end we don't end up with a great project.
- Harvey confirmed the issue is we clearly need to lay out a process where all are involved and communication is streamlined properly.
- Ralph added that it might be proactive to make a committee for each project that has knowledge and the ability to make decisions. Once in place it is that small committee that handles everything. The process of planning the new building, communication and space allocation would be areas that committee would address. Ted added that the smaller the group the quicker the process.
- Law and College of Education have both been over five years and neither building is in the ground yet. Too many ppl involved in the planning process. Ann advised there is no committee there to help with that process. Building communications originally from Zook had more advisory at present there is additional information into the dean with no word to anyone else. Decision making is at the upper echelon. Two things per Ann that are not happening in the college. Harvey advised we need to put a process in place. Ann advised it needs to be external and internal. Denise asked where the consequences are, if we as staff members aren't doing our job we are reprimanded. Why isn't there a demand for the dean to communicate so that no more money or time is lost and people are aware of what is going on.
- Ann asked if anyone has been invited to speak to College of Education to explain what is going on.
- Shelly advised our jobs as committee members is to also report back to our constituency groups in which we all represent.

#### ***General Discussion***

- Shelly advised she needs to know who the committee would like to hear from that we haven't heard from already. Some of those ideas were Tom Wistrill on the new vision for Athletics. The Student Rec and Wellness new director John MacDonald.
- Central - Core of campus Crouse and Ayer was questioned on when those projects will take place. Ted advised those projects are in second and third biannual of requests. Six years from now. Today in University Council meeting Ted will present
- Ted advised they made a presentation to College of Law on the status of the renovation of their building, showed them pics, planning process etc. Tougher meeting than they expected, they kind of got beat up there.
- Julie advised she received an email from Beers on the tornado warning issue last summer. He will be in next month to discuss this issue and how they will move ahead in the future.
- Nonsmoking issues are being looked in to by USG; they are toying with idea of smoking gardens. Shelly advised she was informed in her last SEAC meeting that the UC committee of recreation and wellness are also discussing this issue. It would be an outdoor area of sorts.

#### **Next Meetings:**

- February 4, 2014 – 8am
- March 11, 2014 - 8am
- April 15, 2014 – 8am

#### **Wrap Up:**

- Denise made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Garrett seconded the motion. All were in favor 11-0.