 

**MEETING MINUTES**

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

**Date: 10.15.2021**

**Topic: Public Meeting**

**Present:**

* **Voting Members**: Erin Boas, Najee Rodriguez, Noah Robertson, Claire Kelling, Jake Snyder, Warren Sipe, Xiaoru (Tony) Shi, Latisha Franklin. Schönn Franklin, Nora Van Horn
* **Non-voting Members:** Barry Bram, Sandy Barbour, Laura Hall, Alexa Clayton, Yidi Wang, Steve Watts, Mary Edgington, Chad Spackman
* **Absent:** Sean Terrey (excused), Megan Minnich (excused), Alexa Clayton (late, 1/2 unexcused)

**Agenda:**

1. **Call to Order and Opening Roll Call**

*Meeting called to order at 8:02 AM*

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

*C. Kelling: Motion to add facilities focus group discussion to the agenda.*

*Seconded, no objections.*

1. **Adoption of the Minutes (October 11, 2021)**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Public Comment**

*No public comment.*

1. **Old Business**

*No old business.*

1. **New Business**
	1. **Creation of Equity Fund Committee**

*C. Kelling: Programs, services, salaries, wages, facilities, etc. could be funded by this. The goal is to bring a proposal to the SFB in November. Motion to create the Equity Fund Committee.*

*Seconded, no objections.*

1. **Topics of Discussion**
	1. **Focus Group Planning**

*C. Kelling: This is our last day of presentations in the facilities plan. Everyone in SFB is expected to facilitate one of the focus groups. Looking over structure of focus groups that was created by the Facilities Subcommittee. Sent out invitations to 100 graduate/professional students and 200 undergraduate students, with more invitations to be sent out. Will discuss each project at each table, with some general questions about SFB at the end. Also, there will be a survey to capture responses.*

*S. Franklin: Separate out SFB-related questions from the group, include in the survey.*

*N. Van Horn: Include equity in the questions about ideas for initiatives. Also, can students rank the projects?*

*L. Franklin: Considering we cannot partially-fund some projects, should we remove the question about partially/fully fund each project?*

*S. Franklin: What was the reasoning behind including that funding question?*

*C. Kelling: We can do that. Partially/fully funding is more of an SFB decision, will strike from questions list.*

*L. Franklin: Can the 1-sheeter include the price tag and general benefit to students?*

*C. Kelling: Handout will include images, budget, purpose, timeline for each project.*

*N. Van Horn: Consider re-framing the HUB affinity group space questions because they feel leading, and the questions might affect the focus group.*

*S. Franklin: The two HUB projects have overlap. Also consider striking “is there urgent need for something ‘better’ than existing space…” for previous reasons. Consider asking if students would use the HUB affinity group space.*

*L. Franklin: If the Affinity Group space would exist in 10 years, why would we fund this space? But I also think this is important for Black students. I don’t think we should say they can “wait ten more years” for this space.*

*N. Van Horn: Consider defining affinity group during the presentation. Also consider explaining how student collaboration has informed the design of the affinity group space.*

* 1. **Natatorium and Tennis Center Presentation**

*S. Barbour: The project narrowed to just the Natatorium, removing the Tennis Center. The current state of the Natatorium, the facility is aging and there’s a need for this project. Previous SFBs contributed $30 million to this project. OPP is studying the lifespan of the pool, and OPP is looking at a new Natatorium facility. Consider investing in the new Natatorium, rather than upkeep of existing facility. There would be multiple sources of funding to the Natatorium (e.g., donor funding, ICA funding).*

*L. Hall: There is urgency for a new facility. Practices at the Natatorium had to be cancelled because of the state of the facility. The outdoor pool is problematic. The building is well-past its lifespan.*

*S. Barbour: The plan is to build the Natatorium around the outdoor pool. This would remove the outdoor pool. PSU Athletics current usage and impact: approx. 80 student-athletes on men’s and women’s swimming and diving teams. 36 All-Americans in the last 9 years; 30+ Olympics Qualifiers; 3 Tokyo Olympians. Campus Rec statistics pre-Covid, there were 24,123 recreational “swipes”—2389 “unique” patrons. Taught 240 Penn State students to swim, and employed 105 student staff members. Also, this is home to 3 Club Sports and OA Clinics. The design of the new Natatorium would be a 50-meter pool. This would provide proper training opportunities for collegiate and international competition; a 10m diving platform that allows for on-campus training; the ability to host multiple regular season home events; multiple opportunities to host events that Penn State does not qualify for currently; and there would be an impact on recruiting.*

*L. Hall: There would future opportunities for aquatic environments with the new Natatorium. There would be a 25-yard dedicated recreational pool and the opportunity to offer recreational aquatics during all operating hours. The OPP is conducting a feasibility study on the new Natatorium. We want to design to a number-- $80-100 million dollars in a shared-funding model. Additional annual operating funding would be approx. 1 full-time employee and operating expenses, totaling $225k per year. The ongoing costs would not be contributions from SFB. Any questions?*

*W. Sipe: What will happen to the old Natatorium space?*

*S. Watts: There might be an opportunity to put student-facing offices in the space of the old Natatorium, for an idea. It is proximate to East Halls, Creamery, East Deck, and Shields Building.*

*W. Sipe: Any breakdown of cost-sharing?*

*S. Barbour: Perhaps 1/3 from Campus Rec, ICA, and SFB. President Barron is interested in this project and might give funding.*

*L. Franklin: Any space for an outdoor pool?*

*Laura: The outdoor pool is open mostly when students are absent because of the climate. Fall programming has limited success. Youth in summer camps use the pool. No plans to find a space for a new outdoor pool.*

*N. Rodriguez: During the phases of construction, where will the athletes go?*

*S. Barbour: A benefit of funding this project right now is the current building will stand during construction of the new building.*

* 1. **Building Development & Completion Process**

*C. Spackman: Projects are initiated, and funding plans are established. Develop program/goals for the project. Hire design professionals. Then project design: Feasibility study-- validate program, schematic design, design development, contract/bid documents). At each stage, OPP verifies the budget and schedules university reviews for each design phase. Next, OPP seeks permitting (compliance with PA state building codes) and municipalities & agency approvals. Then OPP sends bids to contractors. Depending on the size of the project, OPP seeks university approval through either the PDRB or the Board of Trustees. After University approval, funding is awarded to the contractors and construction begins/closes out. The process takes about 12-32 months, varies based on project size, complexity, others, for projects <$5 million. For projects $5-10 million, the duration until occupancy is 30-49 months. For major capital projects (projects <$50 million), the duration until occupancy is 43-60 months.*

*C. Kelling: Does this timeline mean that if we commit to fully-funding the HUB renovation, the project will be completed in 3.5-5 years?*

*C. Spackman: Yes, with the appropriate approvals that could be the timeline. The longer the construction, the more expensive it becomes.*

*S. Watts: The project would probably be phased based on sequencing and construction needs, so it could be longer. The timing of the SFB discussing this project aligns well with the university capital plan, which is a 5-year plan renewing in 2023.*

*C. Kelling: How often does a project go over-budget? Any over-budgeting contingencies in the budget given to the SFB?*

*C. Spackman: With current market conditions, that is happening because suppliers will not hold their prices. Typically, projects anticipate some additional costs of unforeseen variables. These project costs are expected total costs.*

*S. Watts: There are also budget check-ins to calibrate the project to the remaining project. There are also other mechanisms for cost-control such as determining add-ins to cut based on the budget standing.*

*C. Spackman: Here are preliminary estimated costs for the projects, from the Student Affairs Master Plan, in 2021 dollars, for the midpoint of construction. The range reflects -40% to +60% of the mid-point cost. The HUB 3rd floor expansion is $6-16 million. Fisher Hall is $6-16 million. Stone Valley Recreation Area Enhancements are $48-128 million. The New Wellbeing Building is $116-309 million. HUB Additions and Renovations is $120-320 million. The new Natatorium is TBD. Total project cost of $269M+ to $789M+. Once a timeline is established, these numbers would be escalated out to project duration.*

*C. Kelling: We will have facilities discussions in November.*

1. **Subcommittee Reports**
	1. **Facilities**

*L. Franklin: Talked through focus group, no other report.*

* 1. **Environmental Sustainability**

*N. Van Horn: Met Monday to finalize the final application, in the Google Drive. Used the template created by Standardization and modified it for ESF needs.*

* 1. **Standardization**

*S. Franklin: No report*

* 1. **Communication**

*N. Robertson: Meeting soon, waiting for intern.*

* 1. **Zero-Waste**

*No report.*

1. **Chair Report**

*C. Kelling: Going back to Focus Group discussion on the agenda.*

1. **UPAC Chair Report**

*A. Clayton: 150 requests for media. Allocated about $4,000. Equipment is $81,000. Total allocated so far is $1.5 million. Funding information sessions upcoming.*

1. **Communications Intern Report**

*C. Kelling: Coming soon!*

1. **Comments for Good of the Order**

*N. Rodriguez: Met with the Equity Fund Committee last week. Discussed rubric and proposal. Meeting with administrative unit heads for discussing projects. Meeting bi-weekly on Fridays, meeting next week.*

1. **Closing Roll Call**

*Meeting adjourned at 9:58 AM.*