

Minutes of the Physical Facilities Committee December 9, 2010

Approved 01/27/2011

CAMPUS ASSEMBLY

PHYSICAL FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Thursday, December 9, 2010, 1:30-2:30 p.m.

Present: Alex Aschenbrenner, Sheila Autio, Mark Harvey, Caitlin Herby, John King, Jill Klingner, Bob Krumwiede, Adam Pine, Yongcheng Qi, John Rashid, Audrey Temple, Paul Treuer, Larry Wittmers, Mark Zmudy

Excused: Chris Haidos, Mick McComber

Guests: Cheryl Love

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:32 p.m.

I. Approval of Minutes – October 14, 2010

The October 14, 2010 minutes were approved as written.

II. Construction and Space Updates (John Rashid)

Griggs Addition:

This project is still on schedule for a July 2011 completion date.

Glensheen:

The Carriage House tile roof project should be completed by December 15. Some tiles will also be replaced on the Mansion's roof.

Chem140:

There are plans to add 12 fume hoods. Some difficulties have been identified in getting ductwork to the room, but a plan is under consideration for how to accomplish this.

SpHC/Romano Gym:

A meeting with the design consultant is scheduled for December 16. This project may include replacing stone and the floor, which was damaged by high humidity, and adding air conditioning.

Humanities:

Planning has not yet begun for the corridor upgrade, but the improvements will include installation of terrazzo flooring.

Chester Park:

This project is on schedule with a January 2011 completion date.

Tennis Courts:

The tennis courts will receive their final playing surface next spring.

Montague Hall:

The renovation design is nearing completion. A Request for Proposal for a construction manager at risk will be used. The construction manager is expected to be on board within the next couple of weeks and the project should start in January 2011, as planned.

American Indian Learning Resource Center:

The construction documents are complete and have been sent to a contractor for estimates. At that point, the project will be on hold until funding is secured.

The Farm:

Currently there are master planning exercises being held for the farm on Jean Duluth Road. This space is used by both UMD researchers and Facilities Management. A consultant has been hired to develop a master plan that reflects the needs of all parties that use the farm; this is expected to be completed in March.

Malosky Stadium:

Members were advised that tent-like structures will be erected on December 10, for painting the NCAA logos for Saturday's Division II semifinals game.

III. Parking Updates

Cheryl Love noted that typically there is a maroon permit sale for students when they return from break. However, there is still a waiting list from fall semester, so she is not sure there will be permits available. She mentioned that housing permits, as well as a limited number of gold permits, are still available.

Cheryl is working with ITSS to develop an online application for employees. It would not be a totally online process as employees would still have to show up at Parking Services to pick up their permits, but would be more streamlined than the current process.

IV. Committee Purpose and Mission

Members had previously been provided with the committee's purpose and mission as outlined in the Campus Assembly bylaws. It was noted that the committee is charged with looking at long-range physical plans and tracking how well we adhere to plan. Bob Krumwiede noted that getting input on space issues is not a part of the charge, but may prove to be helpful.

V. Space Issues

Members were emailed a spreadsheet of the issues and proposed solutions that members had received from their constituent groups. Bob indicated that the spreadsheet was created to consolidate the various projects into a compact form so that the committee could look at the commonalities, but that more complete information was available for reference, if needed. The committee was reminded that it would not be making decisions on priorities, but rather its role is to look at the existing process for how projects are reviewed, and then consider whether there is a more consistent way to move projects forward and prioritize them.

The group discussed the various ways of looking at these projects: function vs. aesthetics; indoor vs. outdoor; specialized (either departmental or collegiate) vs. institutional needs; those with clear funding sources vs. projects (like specialized needs) without clear funding; small projects vs. large ones. The issue of strategic planning was raised and some members indicated that it would be a key part of the process, providing a framework for making decisions. It was noted that campus projects have very different funding levels and different priorities – and not all projects are approached the same. John Rashid and John King gave background on three ways of classifying projects by funding (Capital, HEAPR and R&R) and noted that they keep lists of potential projects in each of these areas. It was mentioned that most of the space issues members brought forward would fall under the Capital project classification, but that some of the others were unknown to Facilities Management and could possibly be done now or

be incorporated into upcoming projects. After some discussion, it was decided to reformat the spreadsheet to first sort the projects by this type of classification.

John Rashid and John King gave the members a brief overview of HEAPR (Higher Education Asset Preservation and Replacement) projects. Funding by HEAPR occurs as the result of a University request to the State. Typically, only a fraction of the request is granted and then UMD gets a portion of that amount. They noted that the focus of HEAPR is generally fire/life/safety, accessibility and code deficiencies. These include projects like fire suppression, elevator upgrades, and HVAC. But there can be a slightly broader definition; for example, the reskinning of Darland was paid through HEAPR funds. It was noted that HEAPR projects often come as a result of the Facilities Condition Assessments that are done for all buildings on campus.

They noted that the campus gets \$1.6M every year to do R&R (Repair & Replacement) projects, and that savings from some other areas – like utilities – can get also swept into the R&R account. Projects that fit in with R&R can go on the list for consideration. The Humanities corridor terrazzo, mentioned in the project updates, was an example of this type of project.

Often, these projects will have some kind of energy payback. John Rashid noted that items on the R&R list often come from the observations of Facilities Management supervisors.

Members were advised that partnering on projects often enables them to happen more quickly and get more projects moved forward. An example provided was the replacement of hazardous floor and ceiling tile, and upgrading of lighting, that occurred at same time ITSS was upgrading their technical infrastructure. Abatement is a big focus on partnered projects right now.

Sometimes HEAPR and R&R monies are used together on a project.

It was mentioned that proposed projects that reach crisis level or involve breakdowns often get moved up the lists more quickly, but that while deferred maintenance is an issue on university campuses everywhere, it is less of an issue at UMD. The campus is in very good shape because deferred maintenance has not been the approach here. Taking care of maintenance as needed is a more fiscally conservative approach; the ultimate cost is significantly more expensive when maintenance has been deferred.

Members were encouraged to send additions to the project list to [HYPERLINK](mailto:jericks1@d.umn.edu)

"mailto:jericks1@d.umn.edu" jericks1@d.umn.edu - the committee's staff support. Then, in coordination with John Rashid, all the projects presented will be classified as HEAPR, R&R or Capital projects. This document may be used to incorporate appropriate projects onto the Facilities Management lists. Projects will be reviewed to see if any can be done now, or could be done if some funds were left over from another project.

Discussion of defining projects and establishing decision-making processes for projects will be a topic for the next meeting.

VI. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Joan Erickson