 

**MEETING MINUTES**

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

**Date: 11/05/21**

**Topic: Public Meeting**

**Present:**

**- Voting members:** Erin Boas, Najee Rodriguez, Noah Robertson, Claire Kelling, Jake Snyder, Warren Sipe, Xiaoru (Tony) Shi, Nora Van Horn, Sean Terrey, Alexa Clayton, Schönn Franklin, Yidi Wang

**- Nonvoting members:** Alexa Clayton, Barry Bram, Anne Lai, Sydney Young, Connor Perkwitt

**- Absent:** Megan Minnich (excused), Latisha Franklin (unexcused), Kate Rutter (excused), Sean Terrey (1/2 excused)

**Agenda:**

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

*Meeting called to order at 8:02 AM*

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Adoption of the Minutes (October 29, 2021)**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Public Comment**

*Sydney Young: Business, Eco-Action. Voice concern for sustainability at Penn State. It’s important for student leaders to use their voice, came to advocate for sustainable practices.*

*Connor Perkwitt: Liberal Arts. We have an opportunity to set an example for other public institutions for sustainability.*

1. **Old Business**

*No old business.*

1. **New Business**

*No new business.*

1. **Topics of Discussion**
	1. **Zero-Waste Committee Discussion**

*N. Van Horn: Introduce Anne Lai, former UPUA Waste Management Director, third year architecture student.*

*A. Lai: Why Zero-Waste? Our economy is a linear resource economy. Redesigning the waste system is a top priority of the zero-waste hierarchy. Penn State is generating about ~20,000 tons of waste per year, ~60% waste diversion per year in 2017-18, and Penn State has a 2.86/8.00 on the AASHE STARS Rating for Waste Minimization and Diversion. Waste is also measured by building—doesn’t account for programming or activities. Last year, the UPUA joined the Post-Landfill Action Network. PLAN is not a waste cure-all, there has to be an institutional commitment to zero-waste. Entities with greater power of campus function can hold administration accountable for waste reduction instead of individual volunteers. The SFB can provide an avenue for institutionalized involvement to realize a mission of zero-waste.*

*N. Van Horn: The goals of the Zero-Waste Subcommittee are to assess and reduce student-fee-funded groups’ contributions to waste at Penn State, especially by decreasing waste at the source, by a 2025 plan, and by 2030 achieve, zero-waste goals. Want to frame zero-waste as an on-going strategy. Want to leverage this assessment to encourage critical thought about systemic waste reduction in units. We also assessed stakeholders: offices with standing allocations, student organizations/governments, and facilities projects. Regarding facilities projects, we may want to consider national/international criteria (similarly to being LEED certified). Next steps are to collect more data about groups with standing allocations and do outreach to fee-funded groups, stakeholders and include them in meetings. Questions on the presentation?*

*C. Kelling: Considering UPAC-funded student organization as well?*

*N. Van Horn: Planning to survey UPAC and consider rough guidelines.*

*C. Kelling: Planning for a recommendation or a requirement?*

*N. Van Horn: Leaning toward recommendation, not a strict requirement. Important for groups to consider buying and procurement practices, not just diversion or recycling practices. Today we’ll discuss the email, survey, and questionnaire.*

*W. Sipe: Maybe introduce language about where the UPSFB is at on zero-waste, in addition to the formation of the zero-waste committee. Also add timeline.*

*A. Clayton: Can the questions be numbered?*

*C. Kelling: Worry the questionnaire is a bit long.*

*W. Sipe: What are the goals of administering the questionnaire?*

*N. Van Horn: I anticipate offices will vary in the waste production, and the questionnaire will allow us to understand how to make recommendations for individual offices, so it is feasible.*

*C. Kelling: Can offices have more time?*

*N. Van Horn: Might disable us from forming robust recommendations by considering all responses carefully. We can also say offices do not have to answer.*

*B. Bram: Consider asking SMEs to reach out to their respective offices?*

*C. Kelling: Adding a sentence about reaching out to the SFB for additional time.*

*S. Franklin: Will it matter if offices only partially fill-out the questionnaire?*

*X. Shi: Potentially include language in the email saying offices are not required to respond to every question?*

*C. Kelling: Preference about email communication?*

*N. Van Horn: I like the idea of SMEs creating a dialogue with the offices about this.*

*S. Franklin: SMEs meeting with their office contacts about this. Meet and/or discuss with offices.*

*N. Van Horn: During subcommittee meeting, we discussed asking offices to estimate their waste stream proportions.*

*W. Sipe: This might require a waste audit.*

*N. Robertson: Maybe ask if offices are interested in conducting a waste audit?*

*A. Clayton: Asking about UPAC itself or the things it funds?*

*N. Van Horn: SME send out emails, Cc’ing members of the zero-waste committee.*

* 1. **Facilities Deliberations Continuation**

*C. Kelling: Questions and Answers read during the meeting included below.*

***Fisher Hall: (answers provided 11/12/21 and included here for clarity)***

***a. What is the goal contribution of the SFB towards this project? What is the minimal contribution of the SFB that would make this project happen?*** *The current cost estimate for the proposed Fisher project is 11M. HFS would be expected to contribute 1.5M, so we’re seeking the rest from various central University sources (Provost, VPFB, VPSA),which would contribute half of the remainder, and the Fee Board, which would contribute the other half of the remainder, or about 4.75M. We can’t do this project without at least this much contribution from the Fee Board.*

***b. Is this meant to be the permanent or temporary home of OSMPR?*** *The intention is to move OSMPR to Fisher until a new Wellness Center is in place. If the design phase of the Wellness Center concludes that OSMPR should be part of that facility, we would plan accordingly.*

***c. Can other resources be made available for graduate students? Or what about this project is appealing to graduate students? Can there be a commitment to graduate resources, such as a graduate student lounge in the HUB expansion or in the 3rd floor space, that would motivate a contribution to this project that primarily supports undergraduates?*** *We need to better assess the specific needs of the graduate student population to determine what uses specific to graduate students might fit in this space. I’m more than open to consideration of graduate student space in the HUB, particularly if it could be proximate to the GPSA office.*

***Stone Valley***

***a. Can we fund partial phases of this project?*** *Phase 1, regardless of what facilities and services are involved, includes significant baseline infrastructure expenses (e.g., wastewater systems, power, ecological restoration, road improvements, stormwater management, etc.) so these items would need to be funded to move forward with any portion of the project.*

***b. What’s the transportation/accessibility plan?*** *Our plan is to work with Fleet Services here on campus and with CATA for sustainable shuttle options to get students back and forth for the 18-minute trip. The project – notably – was developed on the basis on group/public transportation, far more so than personal vehicles (e.g., we did not include large parking lots in the site planning but did include bus hubs)*

***c. How are resources (such as the leadership retreat center) going to be made available to students?*** *As is the case with all facilities that Campus Recreation manages, student access will be the top priority and non-student usage will be scheduled secondarily (e.g., during breaks, exams weeks, summertime, etc.).*

***d. How will the project be advertised so that we can be sure students will utilize it?*** *We plan on engaging in a extensive marketing and communications campaign that would begin during construction, building a “buzz” and interest for a student-centric grand opening for each phase. This would include general messaging and media coverage, specific student population direct outreach (e.g., invitations to RSO’s and other groups of students to host group events at Stone Valley), potential new student orientation programming out at Stone Valley (so that every new student gets a first-hand, onsite experience as a portion of orientation), large-scale special events at Stone Valley (to introduce students to the new spaces with no additional cost to participate), etc.*

***e. How will it be accessible to students with disabilities?*** *100% accessible for all components of the plan including fully accessible beach options, fishing options, hiking trails, indoor facilities, etc. This was a foundational value from the very start of the project.*

***f. How will they be minimally invasive to the environment?*** *Another foundational value was to have an eye on sustainability from the start. This includes building the facilities to, at minimum, LEED gold standards and WELL building standards for the Wellbeing Center. Additionally, the project goal was to not only build sustainable facilities and activity areas but to restore natural systems in the park (via strategies such as new forested riparian buffers, the embedding native plant species, wetland restoration, trail sustainability, etc.). All of these strategies, which are formally included in the master plan, would significantly improve the Stone Valley Recreation Area related to environmental impact and sustainability.*

***Natatorium***

***a. What is the minimal SFB contribution towards this project that would make it happen?*** *I do not believe we can answer this question right now, as we are just launching the “new natatorium” feasibility study this afternoon. By early spring we will have a much better idea of the costs and potential cost-sharing.*

***b. What is the plan for outreach?*** *With additional water space dedicated for recreation use, we will be able to program in a far more diverse manner than we currently can. As such, we will engage in a deliberate marketing and communications plan to attract new recreational participants to the space (very similar to how we doubled the daily “swipes” at the IM Building after the expansion)* ***Will this increase with a new facility?*** *Significantly so. We currently do not have time/space available in the existing natatorium to do many creative recreational programs. Between lap swim, club sport practices, kayaking roll clinics, academic courses, and Athletics practices, the schedule for the pool is filled 96% of our operational hours. With the concepts of the new natatorium (a dedicated recreational pool) we could program rec activities 100% of the time we are open.*

***c. Would there be potential extra space for leadership retreats?*** *(UPUA had a retreat in the Nat in the past) Yes. The preliminary plans include a “classroom”-type space that we could use to host this sort of activity, just as we have previously done.*

***d. If they have a new facility, how would they expand programming for entry-level swimmers?*** *With a recreational pool there would be a shallow “bump-out” area that would be designed specifically for beginner swimmers or those not super comfortable in water (yet). While we have not yet started to determine any specifics, here is an image that can give you an idea of what this concept could look like:*

*Our intention is to accommodate 6 lanes of lap swimming in addition to the shallow bump out for recreational games (like the volleyball shown here) and more leisure usage*

***e. What is the predicted revenue (if any) from being able to host NCAA? (answer provided 11/10/21 and included here for clarity)*** *The revenues from possibly hosting the NCAA Championships for Men’s and Women’s Swimming and Diving would be minimal. Most of the revenue from ticket sales and sponsorship is retained by the NCAA to cover the expenses of hosting the meet (which they provide for the host). There are benefits that accrue to the program (both ICA and S&D) as well as the University that are more in the nature of institutional reputation, enrollment recruiting (students and student athletes), and well as community economic impact. However, the direct realized revenue from the event is not significant.*

***Wellbeing Building***

***a. What other holistic views of wellness are being considered than what is currently being considered in the presentation? (eg. is the Lion’s Pantry being considered?)*** *When we get to the point of hiring an architect, all holistic views of wellness, including the Lion’s Pantry, will be part of the discussion.*

***b. Will this be the permanent home of OSMPR or Fisher Hall?*** *This is still undecided but the long range plans have OSMPR located in the Wellbeing Building.*

***c. There is a concern with the level of noise- will students have privacy? Is sound-proofing possible?*** *Yes; this will be part of the design discussion.*

***d. How much would this expand the capacity of these resources (such as CAPS)?*** *This would provide space for all that is needed now with some expansion possibilities included. However, until we are closer to the actual architect design and construction, it is hard to envision what CAPS will look like at that time.*

***e. Will there be outreach/connections in other places? Can programming still be placed in other areas of campus (eg. CAPS chat in other areas)?*** *The outreach/connections in other places will still continue and there will be continued collaborations with UHS on having a crisis intervention space in the SHC facility. These and other conversations surrounding this topic will continue and be ongoing.*

***f. What are the intentions with the Wellness Building? Does Campus Recreation need to be in this building? Who paid for the White Building? Could the White Building take on some Campus Recreation currently planned for the Wellness Building?*** *The Wellbeing Building does include Campus Recreation and they have been an integral part of the conversation thus far and will continue to be as we move forward. Campus Recreation does need a dedicated auxiliary gym for their programs as well as using this space and other spaces for collaborative programming that occurs in concert with HPW and other units in Student Affairs.*

***HUB Expansion***

***a. Can the student-facing offices being relocated out of Boucke be placed in the HUB (Gender Equity)?***  *The plan is that they would either be placed in the HUB or the new Wellbeing Building, depending on what makes the most sense according to mission, collaboration of offices, service to students, etc.*

***b. How will the current space in the HUB be affected by construction of this size? (hoping for more clarification)*** *This is really an unknown at this point. The goal, however, would be to construct this addition with the least amount of disruption as possible. We still need to offer programs, services, and facility space for our students during this entire time.*

***c. How will students be incorporated into the planning process? What organizations are being incorporated?*** *As we did for the 2015 renovation, we had surveys, focus groups, and open forums. We also worked with the HUB-Robeson Center Advisory Board, UPUA, and many other organizations in collecting feedback. We also formed a special advisory student group that was made up of student leaders, student employees, etc. that met and discussed the project with the architects, etc. on a regular basis. That group also was involved in selection of furniture, colors, etc. I hope this helps exemplify the many ways students would be involved.*

***d. How do you plan to move affinity group spaces from the 3rd floor to expanded space? Have you talked with these groups about this?*** *I believe there will be plenty of time to allow us to have many conversations with those groups on that future move. These groups would also be involved in providing feedback on the design of the new space in the larger HUB expansion.*

***e. What is the timeline? How soon could this happen if the SFB committed funds? (This could impact the decision for HUB Affinity Group Space)***  *The HUB expansion, if funded today, would take approximately 6 -8 years to complete – however this is a guess because we don’t know what the impact will be of the larger supply chain problem we are now experiencing. Also, I have attached Chad Spackman’s PP for reference as well.*

***f. Is there a tangible measure of how much new space is needed? (requested space vs allocated space, meeting room reservation requests?)***  *Please see slide 8 in second attachment for this information*

***HUB Affinity Group Space***

***a. What will the use of the 3rd floor space be after the move to the expansion, assuming it is built?*** *At the present time, it is slated for Student Affairs student facing administrative offices, meeting room space, and collaborative work space, although all details would still need to be vetted and designed once an architect is hired for the HUB expansion project.*

***b. What is the money being used for? What will be in the space? Will it be designed to resemble the HUB expansion space for affinity groups or with future intentions in mind after the move to the HUB expansion?*** *Not sure of the first question but I believe they are asking what the $10 m. would be used for initially. That would be used to redesign and renovate the third floor for a student government suite of offices and affinity group offices and collaborative work space. Still to be vetted and designed. The hope would be that whatever is designed in this initial phase could also be used with not much revision in the major expansion of the HUB - see answer to question #1.*

***c. Is a remodel necessary? Can we just move the organizations up there without the remodel?*** *Yes, a redesign and remodel is necessary. At the present time, the spaces do not lend themselves to an enhanced collaborative work environment nor to the aspired vision that has been discussed for the affinity groups and it is the one section of the HUB-Robeson Center that has not been renovated and/or updated in quite some time.*

***d. Where will existing inhabitants of the 3rd floor go?***  *Some of them are already considered affinity groups so they would remain. Other affinity groups would be moved from the second floor so that would allow for some of these groups to be moved to the second floor. Also, in conversation with the architect (when hired) we may have room for some of these RSOs to remain on the third floor. The ultimate goal is not to displace any group.*

*----End of Q&A with projects----*

*N. Rodriguez: Can we make requirements for construction, contingent on our funding? For example, making sure SDR has space near the Wellbeing Building.*

*C. Kelling: Not sure about attaching requirements to funding.*

*N. Van Horn: Perhaps making an MOU for these projects, so future students can hold the institution accountable.*

*W. Sipe: Might be strange to think about requirements, but we are thinking about allocating millions of dollars. Some responses were good, and some leave us with outstanding concerns. Shifting procedurally, should we structure this by budgeting or by creating priorities.*

*C. Kelling: Sharing UPSFB Survey Results. About 20 people provided feedback. How to proceed? Thinking about priorities or budget? Also discuss the potential need for a fee increase.*

*N. Rodriguez: Considering this is for the next few decades, we should set priorities and ask about potential of placing specific offices in different spaces. Priorities referring to within-projects.*

*S. Franklin: We should discuss commitments to receive the funding. Are we able to discuss scaling down some projects? For example, I don’t think GPSA was consulted, or if we need a ballroom. Continuing involvement is important.*

*B. Bram: I think it would be okay to set within-project priorities, like saying the ballroom is a lower priority. Not sure if we can say we don’t want specifics.*

*N. Rodriguez: Toured SDR with Leah Zimmerman. They were expected to go through a renovation, but it was cut. Also not included in strategic plans. The office is borderline ADA inaccessible. I think it is important to make specific stipulations for offices, thinking of some process for solidifying commitments.*

*B. Bram: SDR not a part of Student Affairs, in Educational Equity. Consider advocating for these changes.*

*C. Kelling: Perhaps making a document of priorities. Within facilities committee.*

*W. Sipe: Considering making within-project priorities near the end so we don’t get wrapped-up in details.*

*N. Rodriguez: How to make sure, for example, transportation is part of Stone Valley plans.*

*S. Franklin: What is deadline to vote on this? Consider creating a mass email to poll students.*

*C. Kelling: Deadline in mid-March. Might not have time for a detailed survey, but we can plan for February.*

*N. Rodriguez: Possible to include General Counsel in conversations with OPP?*

*W. Sipe: Framing discussion regarding necessity. Which projects are meeting a specific need, and which projects would be nice later?*

*J. Snyder: Important to consider which facilities will interface with students the most.*

*C. Kelling: Also need to discuss HUB expansion and affinity group space. I don’t think we should contribute a third of the Natatorium. But we should discuss what happens if our priorities are different than that of the President or Board of Trustees. Not sure what happens. This is the first time we’re considering facilities as a fee board.*

*B. Bram: Intent is this is a collaborative process.*

*C. Kelling: We should talk next week about our priorities.*

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

*C. Kelling: Facilities should start drafting a document of priorities for each project. Committee will meet in the coming weeks.*

* 1. **Environmental Sustainability**

*N. Van Horn: No report.*

* 1. **Standardization**

*S. Franklin: Considering reviewing UPAC’s bylaws against the UPSFB values to consider better alignment.*

* 1. **Communication**

*N. Robertson: Waiting to schedule a meeting with Kate. Set some priorities with Claire for the Committee and for Kate.*

* 1. **Zero-Waste**

*N. Van Horn: Presented today. Will Cc on emails. Will meeting more regularly to develop the recommendations.*

* 1. **Equity Fund**

*N. Rodriguez: Meeting today at 5pm. Will begin drafting a proposal and a rubric. Also working on power point and closing the form. Will present next week.*

*C. Kelling: Requests need to be made before December 15. New fee request materials are on the website.*

1. **Chair Report**

*C. Kelling: Next week, 8-8:20am UPAC will present to us. Also, will have a presentation on the equity fund.*

1. **UPAC Chair Report**

*A. Clayton: On Monday 2pm HUB 134 there will be a presentation on how to receive UPAC funding.*

1. **Communications Intern Report**

*No report.*

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

*No comments.*

1. **Closing Roll Call**

*Meeting adjourned at 9:58 AM.*