 

**MEETING MINUTES**

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

**Date: 12/7/21**

**Topic: Public Meeting, Facilities**

**Present:**

**- Voting members:** Erin Boas, Najee Rodriguez, Noah Robertson, Claire Kelling, Jake Snyder, Warren Sipe, Xiaoru (Tony) Shi, Latisha Franklin, Nora Van Horn, Sean Terrey, Megan Minnich

**- Nonvoting members:** Alexa Clayton, Yidi Wang, Kate Rutter

**Absent:** Sean Terrey (late- excused), Yidi Wang (late- excused), Tony Shi (1/2 unexcused)

**Agenda:**

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

*Meeting called to order at 5:02 p.m.*

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Adoption of the Minutes (October 15, 2021)**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Public Comment**
2. **Old Business**

*No old business.*

1. **New Business**

*No new business.*

1. **Topics of Discussion**

**Facilities**

Claire: Starting the discussion with the HUB expansion and wellness building. Sounded like everyone was leaning toward the wellness building. If HUB expansion is delayed, the affinity spaces will need more urgent funding.

Nora: What would be the funding for each of the projects? Would funding different spaces more have an effect?

Claire: Can’t be guaranteed if the fee doesn’t fund it as a whole.

Schönn: I think the wellness building is very important because CAPS is in disarray. The HUB renovation but the only concern with waiting, next year they could change the plans potentially without DI spaces, affinity spaces, etc.

Najee: There is justification for us making some demands so there can be accountability. Given the state of Bouke, wellness should have its own space. Third floor of the HUB given the ultimate time of the renovation; this can be done.

Latisha: In the memorandum we can speak to Schönn’s concern. Since there is nothing concrete in the plans, there is nothing saying that the affinity space on the third floor can’t be as good in the HUB expansion.

Claire: \*Showed the facilities MOU consideration document\* I want to talk a little about the gym space and its been said its important to the wellness building.

Schönn: The wellbeing building is funded solely through us? I don’t think we need additional gym space because there was a recent renovation in the IM building

Claire: Guarantee for it to be built is if its funded by us.

Tony: The wellness building would be part of the White building. There is enough gym space with the IM. The wellness building brings resources for student mental health. Ensure that the university uses the wellness building as a showcase therefore we need more student voice.

Warren: I don’t think their adding extra gym space, they are replacing the existing gym. Its an older facility and the fires put it out of commission in 2019. That facility is very heavily utilized by students in south housing. There needs to be a gym facility in there.

Najee: I think it’s fine if there is a gym, but the question is square footage after the units are prioritized for student affairs for actual student support. Then talk about the portion of the gym afterward. Students need access to these facilities such as a kitchen and wellness outlets.

Nora: Having a gym with CAPS can put students with rating disorders at risk. Walking through a public space is not inherently a good space. There is already a gym available to students, but we would be making it unavailable to students. Its almost like we are funding an athletic facility rather than a facility for all students. Concern over the centralization of resources. Having all of CAPS in one building, its beneficial for some students to change their location when they talk to a therapist.

Claire: We would be demolishing half of the White building, but athletics would still have half of the space.

Schönn: Asked to pull up the facilities plan to show the split between the CAPS side and the athletic side which would allow for a different door to the CAPS side. Doesn’t make sense to have CAPS spread out so thin.

Latisha: Agreed with Warren’s point that moving all the athletics to the IM building because its not easily accessible for all students. Agreed to Nora’s point of not consolidating all of CAPS into one space. CAPS should do outreach in other places. Will they still do outreach events if CAPS is all in one space?

Najee: In the context of the diagram on the screen, the gym and recreation takes up the most square space which seems wrong since we fund the majority of it. Important to consider what resources can be integrated into a unit like this. There is a lot of opportunity that the university hasn’t thought of. We should take advantage of a building that can supplement a lot of resources for students. If we distribute this amount of money, it would be monumental that we prioritize students that are never prioritized.

Barry: Remember this is a rough draft and there will be changes within the space.

Erin: Within the initial plan, do we know if the gym space will increase or decrease? Agree with Najee that we should have a lot of input in what goes into the building. Regarding the gym space, we can look into how many students are utilizing the existing services in the White building. Numbers on the current gym capacity.

Claire: The assumption is that it would be pretty similar.

Warren: I agree with Najee. There is a lot of potential to prioritize different offices that students really need. The way to do that is to not take away from an existing service but find the space to put in these other offices.

Barry: 74% to student affairs and 26% dedicated to intercollegiate athletics. Some of it is office space such as Greek life offices and student affairs offices which wouldn’t go into the new wellness building.

Megan: I would like an objective number on centralizing CAPS. A lot of different opinions between centralizing CAPS or having it spread across campus. Personally, benefitted in the off-campus meeting of CAPS. How long have we had offices downtown?

Claire: Long-term the university can’t necessarily depend on the off campus (downtown) CAPS office.

Barry: The university has always had spaces downtown such as student legal services.

Latisha: Question about the model. How many of these can we fund? How much can we put toward these?

Claire: Today I want to focus on priorities. I don’t have a good impression about the Natatorium and Fischer Hall. After this meeting, I can talk to people in finance for plans for us to consider in more detail.

Claire: Wellness building is a priority over the HUB expansion. Lions Pantry, Bouke student offices, gender equity, student conduct, student disability services and OSMPR.

Najee: What about a nonexistent unit? A unit for student poverty? Is there flexible space that can determined later? What about the initial concepts of temporary housing for homeless students? Can we make recommendations and suggestions?

Claire: I think we want to make realistic demands then add considerations. Kitchen is already being included.

Nora: Make sure the atmosphere is contusive with the services within it.

Warren: The gym is visible, the fields are visible, however other services are downstairs and not visible to students but should be.

Tony: How much would it cost to tunnel the building from the HUB. The wellness facilities will be pretty public, it’s going to be hard to find a noticeable door to these services.

Schönn: I wanted there to be a distinct atmosphere and entrance to CAPS.

Erin: At the end of the day, you don’t want everyone to know if you go left you are going to the gym and right you are going for CAPS services.

Claire: If the wellness building is put above the HUB expansion then the third-floor space become more urgent.

Najee: I think that with the Natatorium our hand is being forced on the recreational pool. Have there been conversations about fundraising?

Claire: Fundraising for Stone Valley but haven’t heard about anything else. With the Natatorium, it number is pretty open to what we want to contribute. The recreational number is around 20 million, but our ask is 26 million. I don’t think our hand is being forced with any of them.

Schönn: How big is the natatorium recreational pool?

Tod: Study is currently being done. Size hasn’t been finalized.

Claire: The recreational pool will cost 20 million on its own. Would serve everybody unlike the athletic pool but would be a different building then the proposal.

Jacob: I think we should contribute something to it because it is a pretty immediate student need even though it doesn’t serve everybody on campus. They did make statements that they would advertise it to more students.

Schönn: We should contribute something to it. People don’t use it because they don’t know there is a recreational unit to it. It would add more to legalization. 10-15 million sounds great. Is 20 million for the recreational pool?

Claire: A full on athletics pool would cost 80 million and our ask it to contribute 26 million.

Nora: We shouldn’t fund it at all. The 200 million on the wellness building, it’s a little odd that we care for students in one way while concurrently raising the fee to fund these projects. Seems kind of paradoxical. The other projects and services have a more significant impact on the student body.

Sean: If we don’t put anything toward the building, what will happen to the building without us?

Claire: Unknown. 20 million recreational pool is completely different from the 80 million to the athletic, fancier pool. Nothing additional to the original plan. Damon is not shy about the Natatorium not being a priority for us. They are two separate building. Trying to motivate a smaller number. If it was completely a recreational pool, then it would cost 20 million (just to motivate a lower number)

Tony: Are we only building one pool?

Claire: There would be a recreational pool under the 80-million-dollar plan that they are asking for funding for.

Schönn: So, with the 80 million, the third of that is 26 million? Correct? A separate building for a recreational pool for 20 million is too much. We should spend less.

Najee: What happens when you free up that 20 million if we don’t fund the recreational pool? Can it go to other programs? It will be factored into future student fees.

Noah: In the model should we keep 80 million as the funding?

Warren: It should be 20 in there in the percentage financed. The c column in the first sheet is how much we would be contributing to that project. I think we can talk about what the fees will look like in the future later after deciding if we want to fund the Natatorium at all.

Claire: Does not seem like there is enthusiasm about 20 million if we want to fund it at all.

Warren: 20 million seems good to me because there is no capacity for the recreational pool right now. We can facilitate access to it and the urgency is that the building is falling down.

Schönn: I don’t think I defend 20 million dollars for a pool. I would hope we would utilize that the money would go toward student needs and activities. I don’t think 20 million is justified. 10-15 million is where I would feel comfortable.

Erin: 20 million does seem a little high. It should still maintain some of the retreat space if the fee is funding the Natatorium. Would the Natatorium fall under campus rec? (answer is yes)

Sean: If we are funding this, there should be some sort of visible indicator that it was funded by the student fee.

Najee: It seems everyone wants to fund it at some level. Where is the other projected amount going to come from beside from what we contribute? If we give 10 million, where is the other 16 coming from?

Claire: We can’t guarantee what will happen if we don’t contribute the 26 million. There is a chance it doesn’t happen if we don’t fund the asking price.

Najee: If we offer 10 million and they don’t use it, does it come back to us? (answer is yes)

Warren: I think we should spend over 10 million.

Schönn. I would go lower than 10 million from the fee

Noah: I agree with Najee. If we are considering funding the 10 million, maybe there are offices that can match these funds to get to the amount asked. Why do offices have incentives to match the other money needed to fund the pool? Doesn’t seem like a worthwhile investment.

Schönn: In the recommendation: we shouldn’t have to fund more for a recreational pool. We can request if the university and Sandy would do 35 million instead of 30 million in the contribution.

Claire: Are we moving on with 10 million being a number we can tolerate? (answer is yes) Let’s talk about Fischer Hall? The ask is 10 or 11 million. Non-student facing offices that serve students. Not a lot of face time in these offices. One story building out in east halls. Any questions?

Jacob: If we don’t fund it, will they demolish it?

Claire: They won’t demolish it but will do a lesser renovation of Fischer Hall. Asked to contribute 3 or 5 million. Funding or not?

Noah: 3-4 million gives us a lot out of the investment. It might not be the most accessible, but those resources and office spaces are beneficial.

Nora: If those offices like SRPT move to Fischer Hall, do we know what will happen with the spaces they were in?

Latisha: As a graduate student, I would put this as the last priority for funding.

Claire: As a equal voting member, I don’t think we should fund this. I don’t think it will have a substantial impact on students. I would put it last as a priority for funding. It’s clear for CAPS that they need more space unlike SOTP.

Erin: Can we run through which offices would be in this space? (Claire coming back to this)

Najee: SOTP is in the Bank of America spaces? Do they want to consolidate their space?

Claire: the goal contribute is 4.75 from the fee. The offices include the parent’s program, SOTP, etc.

Warren: Sounds like we are just reshuffling offices.

Schönn: The flyer from the focus groups would help in understand Fischer Hall.

Claire: Student success center is also proposed to go in here but would be more under undergrad funding.

Noah: This gave the opportunity for offices to rearrange on campus. Old offices can be used for more student facing things on campus if they move to Fischer Hall.

Nora: There is a reason why this doesn’t sound attractive because of the potential cascading effects. How can we consolidate these spaces/offices which can be a leverage point in the planning process? I would rather spend 4.75 on Fischer Hall than on the Natatorium. Can be tangible for students if leveraged the right way.

Claire: I don’t think they need a 10-million-dollar renovation to do these things that already have existing space.

Schönn: All but one of these projects have importance for the fee to fund. This was the second to last on my list of priorities. I don’t think we should fund it this year but maybe in the future because we know our other projects have substantial impact starting out.

Erin: How much space undergrad will take up of that? Because we can’t fund academic facings.

Claire: Housing services fund 1.5 and would be split between us and undergrad.

Jacob: Can we contribute 1.5 if we want to contribute something? If SOTP is in the career services building, it’s still accessible to students in East.

Barry: CAPS would have the SOTP space in career services if it moved to Fischer Hall.

Schönn: If we are doing the wellbeing building, would the reasoning then become we are going to have additional space in the wellbeing building? Is is a part of the cascading? I don’t think we should fund it right now.

Nora: If we are able to move CAPS to a interim building then we shouldn’t turn away the opportunity.

Claire: Unclear what would happen if we didn’t fund it?

Megan: It seems like the world is moving away from office space generally because of working remotely. I don’t find it compelling to fund new renovated office space.

Claire: It seems to be that we can’t fund the HUB expansion and the wellbeing building right now. Other smaller things can fit in along the way. Will be talked about more in March.

Latisha: It could be beneficial to students but doesn’t compare to the other projects.

Claire: It’s on us to keep things affordable and watch the cost of attendance. We shouldn’t do too much comparing because that cost of attendance bit. What are some possibilities to partial funding to Fischer Hall? Let’s talk about Stone Valley. No big updates however the last time we talked campus rec said they could guarantee transportation, but they can now plan to have transportation to be a part of the project but would not have an impact on the estimate. Around 80 million split up into a few different phases. Any questions?

Latisha: It was said we could choose to do phases, but do we have to agree to the entire project?

Claire: We don’t have to fund the entire project.

Warren: I don’t think we should fund it. We have other buildings that are falling down, a CAPS service that isn’t sustainable, etc. It would be nice but should we, do it? No.

Sean: The leadership retreat looks like we are setting things up for ourselves.

Nora: I agree

Erin: I agree. In theory if we had extra funds, it sounds nice but people like it in its existing form.

Noah: I agree with Warren. Maybe consider phase two for an outdoor mindfulness space. If there is a limited amount of money, I would rate this low on priorities.

Schönn: Almost everything will go up in the upcoming years. I don’t think we should help offices expand if their existing offices.

Claire: This is not a resort.

Yidi: I agree with everyone else. I do want Stone Valley to have more marketing because people don’t know that there is Stone Valley in the first place. It’s closed in the winter.

Sean: Could we possibly only fund the transpiration to get students there more often to get more interest and use of the space?

Claire: Transportation would be infrastructure but not a current phase being considered. Interest in talking about transportation as a separate project.

Megan: How accessible by bus is it? Can they hire bus drivers?

Nora: I don’t think I’m interested into looking into transportation compared to the other projects.

Claire: Ask about transportation for feedback.

Nora: I feel like its leading them on. Before transportation was mentioned would bring a desire to fund for this project.

Latisha: Not thinking about the other projects, this is a fun thing. This is something that a student-initiated fee would fund because it creates a different space. I don’t think we should be funding the HUB expansion and wellbeing building.

Schönn: Even though there is money to give, there is a lack of bus drivers. There is still a cycle of not having transportation because of the lack of drivers.

Claire: Feedback on transportation would take a year and building the infrastructure would take a few years. Not sure if the lack of drivers would still be a problem.

Schönn: The issue has been developing. I think the problem will still exist in a few years.

Sean: I don’t think we should fund it now or in the near term. Getting the base usage is important before building an entire facility.

Claire: Get the message out more and potential thoughts on transportation which is a quicker timeline then some of these other projects. Good idea to bring up transportation before rebuilding? Or no, let’s not mention it for feedback.

Schönn: I think we should talk to them about transportation only for feedback. They don’t use it because of the transportation. They want to expand what people can’t get to.

Claire: We can either go back to Fischer Hall about if it should be funded at all? Room was split on if it should be funded at all. Would be helpful for the conversation over the next couple months. Could also talk about the HUB expansion.

Warren: If we want to keep the fee where it is, we do have to decide between funding the wellbeing building and HUB expansion right now. We would need a major fee increase it we fund those projects then. Apart from Stone Valley, everything else between the fee increases and the fee, we can pick up pretty easily over the next 20-30 years. We have the freedom to do what we want and given our concern of cost of attendance; I don’t see it being a popular decision.

Schönn: HUB expansion. There is a lot of benefit to a larger HUB expansion.

Claire: To check for Fischer Hall, split between the group.

Schönn: To me the biggest asset to the HUB expansion is the DI space. Having student facing offices in the center is very appropriate. If we do the third-floor expansion and wellbeing building, there will be substantial time before we can fund the HUB expansion. My concern about third floor, I want it to be very nice if it is a permanent solution for around 10 years then it should be done properly. 1/3 DI space, 1/3 student government and 1/3 collaborative space. Will be stuck with it for 10 years.

Claire: Comes back to our priorities. We would put it in our fee recommendation, so it’s not buried in minutes. We can still document our concerns about the HUB expansion.

Schönn: Is there a way to replace the ballroom space or the CAPS space of somehow combine the good parts of each project. The HUB expansion would then not happen for our generation.

Barry: It is a concept. The ballroom was something students wanted a few years ago. We have no idea what the priorities will be 10 years down the road. We can put the thoughts the 2021/22 student fee board in the recommendation. Priorities could change.

Schönn: Could we recommend talking to the future fee board about expanding the DI space, etc., for a smaller expansion? Whatever benefits the expansion without funding the entire 200 million dollars.

\*This is probably the last shot at such a large HUB expansion.\*

Claire: Any closing thoughts?

Nora: I think if it is a priority then it should be funded before priorities change. A HUB expansion without the ballroom that gets the things we want from the wellness building into the HUB. If student group space is a priority for us, see if it you can get an office in the HUB like CAPS offices space. Student space can’t be integrated in the wellness building.

Schönn: I think we can find alternative to the wellness building. Not the same kind of options with the things we are trying to correct with the HUB expansion. We should discuss how some of our priorities are set this year.

Claire: All the materials are up now. Please review them before Friday.

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

*L. Franklin: No update*

* 1. **Environmental Sustainability**

*N. Van Horn: Scheduling end of the year/cycle meetings*

* 1. **Standardization**

*S. Franklin: No update*

* 1. **Communication**

*N. Robertson: No update*

* 1. **Zero-Waste**

*Nora: No update*

* 1. **Equity Fund**

*Najee: No meetings before the break.*

1. **Chair Report**

*C. Kelling: No report*

1. **UPAC Chair Report**

*Alexa: No report*

1. **Communications Intern Report**

*Kate: No update*

1. **Comments for Good of the Order**
2. **Closing Roll Call**

*Meeting adjourned at 7:01 p.m.*