

## **Facilities Council Meeting Minutes**

May 8, 2012 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. Bldg. CEN, Rm. 407

**Recorder:** Margaret Robertson

Attendees: Alen Bahret, Barb Dumbleton, Michael Friedman, Jennifer Hayward, Chris Hawken, Jyoti Naik, Andrea Newton, Cathie Reschke,

Margaret Robertson, Joe Russin, Lyndel Simmons, Todd Smith, Craig Taylor, and Dave Willis.

## **Guests:**

Item	Notes
Approval of Agenda/ Additions?	Moved UDL/MPTF report ahead of Planning Policy. Agenda approved as amended.
Approval of Minutes	Under "Planning Policy Review," change "May 10" to "May 8." Minutes approved as amended.
Announcements	Discussion:  Space Assignment Policy: Dave directed programmer to load into COPPS as approved, without rewriting. Craig reported College Council determined it would address this situation.  Jyoti and Dave are working with Disability Resources to prioritize ordering of ADA furniture, with budget limited to \$50,000.  Dave reported that Frank is working with David Dougherty of DLA to design improvements for Bristow Square, and noted we will need public process. Council members viewed design drawing.  Dave reported we sold four smoking shelters to SWCC for \$1000 each. Also, got preliminary approval to explore putting biodiesel lab in test cell area.
Bond Planning Report	Alen announced open forum to be held May 16 for discussion of Center Building, 17, and 18. Alen and Todd met with student government. Todd and Dave reported on hopes for daylighting and vertical connections within student spaces in Center Building. Architects will present three conceptual plans: Options 1a and 1b respond to having no State funding; Option 6 will show opportunities if we receive State funding. Central plan feasibility study is in process and will be complete at the end of May. Dave noted that we need a statement under "Guiding Principles" of the Planning Policy which says, "Planning process should protect the functionality of the physical plant to support the mission of the College."
UDL/MPTF Report	<b>Discussion:</b> Joe reported that the MPTF has not met again. Council members discussed their concerns: that a final development plan is being formulated and will reach the Board; that it has mostly happened without oversight or public process; that the UDL's project has taken on a life of its own without careful planning process; whether the Board will view Barry's work as a status update or the danger that it will see this as an actual plan; that there are two separate political bodies: the governance system, and the Board, who hired Barry; that a lot of work is being done and that, under the current conditions, it appears fragmented. Several Council members suggested that it is time for FC to resume strategic work, to consider how to carry this planning work forward, to create a vision and agenda for

Meeting Adjourned  Next Meeting	5:00 p.m.  May 22, 2012 3:00-4:50 CEN 407
Future Agenda Items	<ul> <li>Planning policy and guidelines update</li> <li>Vision and agenda for campus planning by Facilities Council in 2012-13</li> </ul>
Planning Policy Review	Discussion: Council discussed the preliminary planning policy document. Discussions included how to manage distinctions between policy and procedure; how to ensure genuine participation in planning, versus simply soliciting input; the need to make the process transparent and available to everyone; that the policy itself should be simple and brief; and distinctions between a concise policy and a comprehensive set of guidelines. Dave suggested language which says that as a desirable outcome of participation, all parties would feel heard, respected, and, as much as possible, that they influenced the outcome; he noted that planning needs to ensure that all viewpoints are considered before moving forward. Several members suggested the current document become campus planning guidelines, and that we create a one- to two-sentence policy which references the guidelines.  In discussion, members agreed (1) to remove procedures which include RFP processes and steps in the planning process, (2) to add language about participation and respect, and (3) to add a line under the initial "Purpose" section saying, "Ensure campus planning is learning-centered and reflects the College vision, mission, and core values."  Decision: Lyndel moved and Michael seconded that we accept the planning policy as written, with the changes discussed, to send to College Council for approval. Vote was 12 thumbs-up and 2 thumbs-sideways.  Discussion: Further discussion showed confusion whether the previous vote was for a policy or a set of guidelines.  Decision: Dave moved to reconsider the vote and Lyndel seconded. Vote was 10 thumbs-up, 1 thumbs-down, and 2 abstentions (2 members left early). Motion to reconsider was passed.  Decision: Dave moved to develop an abbreviated policy statement and to accept the former preliminary planning policy as associated guidelines. Jennifer suggested we not remove procedures if former policy document becomes guidelines. Chris recommended two votes, one on policy and one on guidelines. Dave withdrew the motion.  D
	next year, both for this group and for its subgroups. Joe reported that a subgroup is forming related to the wetlands. <b>Decision:</b> It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved to support the wetlands enhancement and restoration project, led by Joe.