



FACILITIES COUNCIL
MEETING NOTES
October 24, 2006, 3:00 p.m.
Center Bldg./407

Present: Robin Geyer, Glenn Goss, Sandy Ing-Wiese, Patrick Lanning, Cathy Lindsley, Marie Matsen, Bob Mention, Margaret Robertson, Mike Ruiz
Guest: Tamara Pinkas

Absent: Janet Anderson, Dawn DeWolf, Rob Dow, Hanna Ebener, Susan Tatar
(Faculty union representative, TBD)

1. **Agree on Agenda**
Agenda was approved.

2. **Introductions**

3. **Long-Range Strategic Campus Plan: Review Plan Draft**
Margaret gave an abbreviated version of the presentation made to the Board October 17. Discussion followed.

Bob expressed concern that instruction is given a central role to the partial exclusion of facilities; they are part of the life of the college, too. Bob commented that a listing of low space utilization rates does not acknowledge that a primary reason is because of pedagogical and curriculum changes, not facilities-related causes.

Mike, Robin, and Bob expressed concern about several places in the plan with a negative tone, including analysis of the "dark basement" cafeteria entrance and the amount of "bleak concrete."

Marie said that while we need to celebrate progress and acknowledge good work, we also need to be honest in our assessments; she cautioned us about being too soft. Patrick noted that with regard to ecological topics, needed changes should be called out, maybe using a negative tone to call them out; the Board and the college need to decide it's worth the resources, worth the strategic investment.

Marie asked if there are things we could all agree about; for example, that a cafeteria should be a major gathering place, and that we want to signal that architecturally. Cathy observed that there are three very different entrances; the north one is quite nice. But if we studied the traffic patterns, we would find the most traffic coming in the west entrance, then the east. Those are the things we need to ask questions about. The issue is not whether we should ask those questions, but how we frame them.

Mike observed that we have learned a lot about space and circulation, and how things could look. He said it is time for some renewal, and there could be a better planning process. We could use a ton more trees; there could be a lot more shade, particularly in parking lots. Glenn commented that we need to keep in mind ergonomics and safety; Mike wouldn't mind having a sentence about that included.

Marie reported positive reactions from the president and Board. She noted that the Facilities Council should feel proud of the work it has done. Bob expressed hope that the plan will be used, and not just sit on a shelf. Bob and Mike commented that the plan gives strategic direction to facilities work. Marie said she expects the plan to be part of the whole process.

Mike commented that Demonstration Project D, cost reductions, talks about energy costs and cost reduction, but doesn't talk about energy conservation measures specifically. He suggested that energy conservation could be standalone. Marie suggested there could be two headings: operating costs and energy. We need a general statement that we need to consider ongoing costs, which may include staffing increases, and not just energy, not just cleaning. Mike observed that adding new buildings implies adding new maintenance money and staff.

4. Art on Campus

Tamara Pinkas provided information on the Art on Campus working group, convened by Mary Spilde. The committee is working on coming up with policies and procedures, and would like to collaborate with Facilities Council. Marie expressed the hope that we start to design outdoor spaces where nature is the aesthetic experience; she suggested these kinds of conversations should be part of our collaborative art-on-campus planning. An *ad hoc* subgroup will meet to develop policy language which they will bring back to the Facilities Council and to the Art on Campus group. Facilities Council representatives will be Bob Mention and Margaret Robertson. Art on Campus representatives will probably be Tamara Pinkas and chair Susan Lowdermilk.

5. Shared Governance System

This topic was tabled since all members in attendance were returning members.

6. The Year Ahead

Margaret handed out a list of suggested tasks and products. The group agreed to conduct a conversation via email. Bob suggested that another topic involves relocation of the tennis courts as part of the Health-and-Wellness-Building project. He suggested presenting the issue to the Facilities Council for consultation. Even though it's implementation, we might work together and see what we might learn from our policies and how they relate to this as an example. Marie noted that it would be a help to Bob, and it would be a worthwhile exercise for the Facilities Council to ask, how does the current state of our plan inform where we might site tennis courts? What does it tell us, what does it not tell us?

Sandy requested time to present potentially controversial information about traffic flow on campus. She will bring one page and a map.

Margaret asked for reaction to a College Council question about whether councils should meet only once a month, given the restrictions on release time. Sandy commented that would be tough given the academic calendar; it would mean only eight meetings a year. Also, if a council didn't have strong leadership, they may spend time wandering around, not getting things done.

7. Suggested Agenda Items

Covered in above discussion.

8. Next Meeting

November 14, 3:00-5:00 p.m., Center/407

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by: Margaret Robertson