Space Management Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
August 19, 2014
1:00 – 2:00pm
PORTAL 242

Members in Attendance: Frank Fleming, Lee Gray, Phil Jones, Nick Patel, Steve Coppola, Chip Yensan, Kevin Hyatt, Richard Laliberte’

Old Business:

I. Review and Approve July 24, 2014 Meeting Minutes
   a. Motion: To approve meeting minutes of July 24, 2014 as presented. (L. Gray; P. Jones)
      i. No discussion. Motion approved unanimously.

II. Update Report – IT Wi-Fi Upgrade Project Progress (N. Patel)
   a. 80% of rooms being used for Wi-Fi upgrade have been reviewed and accepted by the units. Out of 24 required rooms, 5 remain as pending; working to get those remaining spaces accepted as soon as possible. Facilities Planning is working with deans and unit heads regarding space modifications due to IT infrastructure upgrades in the buildings. Working to consult with all stakeholders. Allocating space necessary to accommodate Wi-Fi upgrades has been difficult in some campus facilities, and working through those issues.
   b. C. Yensan reminded the Committee that most impacted areas are storage rooms. One was an office in Smith and two in King.
   c. N. Patel has verified that University Advancement is moving some people out of King. Once that project is underway, there will be a suite of approximately 600 square feet vacated. Once that is vacated, will try and accommodate the IT closest in that suite area. General discussion.
      i. C. Yensan – in terms of IT upgrade process, will the IT upgrades specific to King be postponed pending the departure? N. Patel - the project will not start until January.
      ii. C. Yensan – the Committee can expect a request for the use of some space in King to execute the IT upgrade. It is a project that has strategic significance for the University and must be completed.
   d. C. Yensan recommended that King space for the IT upgrade be placed as an agenda item for the November meeting. Acknowledged there will be at least one request for vacant space – possibly multiple.
   e. P. Jones commended N. Patel on the planning and execution work being conducted on this important IT upgrade project.

III. Follow-up – Food Pantry Pilot Program for 2014-15 (C. Yensan)
   a. C. Yensan followed-up with J. Raja and the faculty members who are serving as the sponsor and chief advocates of this program. The position they are taking is that Psychology is going to pilot this program on a very small scale for this academic year. As such, it will be a pilot program with the understanding that when it becomes a full program we need to revisit it and get out in front of it with the understanding that the most appropriate location options be determined and placed before the Committee for review and approval before final program commitments are made. The Committee will be requesting a formal presentation from the program organizers at some point during spring semester. Part of that presentation should include what other institutions have done with similar programs - benchmarking and best practices.
b. C. Yensan confirmed with the Committee that there were no immediate objections regarding this approach and use of space within Psychology for the current year. General discussion.
   i. As a reminder: this is basically a food distribution program which has several associated requirements regarding food storage, handling, etc.

c. F. Fleming indicated that Student Affairs has been assisting with the identification of appropriate space for this program. The space in Colvard is too small and Student Union is too public. The program needs to be accessible, but ideally not in a high volume/high traffic area. Needs to be enough and appropriate space for storage of food as well as organized distribution.
   i. Right now the program is going to be open on Tuesday afternoons and Thursday for a three hour window for students who are eligible to drop in. They are working on a policy of who is eligible. Greensboro has already piloted this successfully for 10 years. Our campus pilot program group is pretty much following that process.

New Business:
I. Guest Presentations and Comments
   a. No guest comments or presentations.

II. General Informational Items
      i. C. Yensan noted that the Chancellor referenced this (Charlotte Engineering Early College) in his convocation address this morning as a high visibility program with a lot of high expectations.
      ii. P. Jones stated the campus maps will label this new structure next to the CRI Deck 1 as “high school”.
      iii. C. Yensan had conversations with program director Michele Howard about this new program in the CRI sector and how that will impact vehicular traffic and various other operational elements of this part of campus. 100 students are enrolled in the school for the fall semester, they are expecting 50% of students will take buses and 50% will be dropped off and picked up by parents.
      iv. P. Jones noted that much credit goes to Richard for getting the land usage work squared away. Chris Gilbert did a lot of work with CMS to make sure they had everything they needed to get the infrastructure in place. It’s been a team effort. The morning student drop-off and afternoon pick-up traffic issues have been being worked on by Police and Public Safety. Facilities Management is doing the custodial work, grounds work around the building, trash removal and recycling and will be reimbursed by CMS for that work.

b. Business Affairs Modular Building.
   i. P. Jones stated two modular buildings have been placed behind the FM/Campus Police building and are now occupied by Environmental Health and Safety, Building Environmental Services, and Recycling. Occupants moved in the first week of August. The spaces they previously occupied are now vacant and ready for previously approved usage including Human Resources which will be occupying King suite 113.
      1. The modular building project was within budget.
      2. Environmental Health and Safety is closer to their parent unit, Risk Management. They got a storage shed funded by Business Affairs. Police are using that shed as well.
      3. Building Environmental Services now has all of its administrative functions located in one place.
      4. N. Patel stated there are 28 offices and one break area.

c. F. Fleming indicated that Facilities Planning has put together a rough outline of what the counseling center needs in a new facility along with associated estimated costs. Susan Brooks has reviewed cost option and is taking that to the Chancellor.
i. P. Jones provided a clarification that Facilities Planning has developed a preliminary program schematic to determine site support for this facility as an addition/annex to the current Health Services building. Phil reinforced that an addition to the current Health Services building has several advantages over a stand-alone facility. A stand-alone small building doesn’t fit well in the Master Plan of the campus and it is more expensive to maintain and operate in the long run.

ii. This project is moving to a concept stage. If a funding strategy is approved, FM will go through their regular processes of advancing this through design and construction. This would be a multi-year endeavor, but if the Counseling Center were permanently moved from Atkins it would provide options for allow the upgrade and expansion of Career Services and relieve space pressure in that facility. P. Jones stated that if the funding approach does not involve borrowed funds, the approval process could go much quicker.

III. Space Requests
   a. Grigg 267 – Academic Affairs.
      i. J. Raja, on behalf of Academic Affairs, requests the assignment of Grigg 267 to Research and Economic Development for a meeting/training room and a space in which to set-up graphics support equipment. This is one of four rooms vacated by the Office of Technology Transfer (as posted to the SMAC at the December 11, 2014 meeting) when that department moved to PORTAL. This was a meeting room and training room for CRI before OTT took occupancy of it, and it is contiguous with existing CRI administrative support space.

      ii. Motion: To allocate Grigg 267 (196sf) to Research and Economic Development for use as a training and meeting room and to support graphics equipment as requested. (F. Fleming; R. LaLiberte)
         1. Motion approved unanimously.

   b. Athletics Ticket Office – Request and Withdrawal.
      i. C. Yensan received a space request from Athletics dated August 1 in which they were seeking allocated space for the purpose of conducting ticket sales and marketing. On August 19 Chip received notification from Athletics stating they found space within their unit in which to conduct ticket sales and marketing. Therefore, Athletics has withdrawn its original space request.

IV. Anticipated Space Needs by Division – Business Affairs (K. Hyatt)
   a. K. Hyatt stated that N. Patel addressed areas regarding HR as it relates to the Wi-Fi project. Nick responded as follows:
   i. Technical operations, Internal Audit, Business Services do not need immediate space.
   ii. Risk Management is good for the next five years.
   iii. Human Resources will be fine for immediate needs.
   iv. Financial Services is in need of additional space and a reconfiguration of current space. Details of this need are still being determined.
      1. Kevin stated Financial Services space is not bundled in any type of contiguous fashion within Reese. The Controller’s office, in particular, has components throughout Reese. Financial Aid is fragmented as well.

   v. C. Yensan asked what are the top two priorities in the division:
      1. K. Hyatt response: getting particular departments’ spaces arranged by proximity; grouping/clustering offices by function. Controller’s office is split among three floors in Reese – it’s helpful to have everyone in the same space for efficiency whenever possible.
      2. Follow-up question: will reconnecting departments physically require additional space?
      3. Response: uncertain until a more detailed review/analysis is made. A new AVC for Finance is being hired and may have different priorities or preferences on space configuration reporting units.
a. P. Jones – If desired, Business Affairs Kevin can request that N. Patel conduct a study and develop a plan on paper.
b. Kevin – from an efficiency standpoint and not doing the same things more than once, it may be better to wait until the new AVC comes in.

4. C. Yensan requested that N. Patel prepare for SMAC’s review any related report or assessment in greater detail.

V. Looking Ahead to Fall Semester for SMAC (C. Yensan)
a. Does the Committee wish to maintain monthly meetings and meeting duration? By general consent, yes.
b. Does the Committee wish to maintain the same basic meeting format? By general consent, yes.
c. Should the Chair assume that all current Committee members wish to remain for an additional term for the coming year? By general consent, yes.
d. Projects of interest for SMAC review – general discussion.
   i. Place this topic on next meeting agenda for further discussion.
   ii. Look for more specific space solution options and keep to a timeline that will keep the Committee ahead of key dates and deadlines.
   iii. P. Jones – Status and implication of purchase of Medical Office buildings. Richard stated that there are compounding issues at play in this transaction. More specifically, when will we take possession of the property? Right now, we’ve agreed to as late as April we will take possession of the property. Will need to modify the contracts to reflect that.

e. K. Hyatt indicated that there are two things that SMAC does not want to forget about:
   i. Status of sale or repurposing of the Ben Craig Center.
      1. C. Yensan reminded the group that the Ben Craig Center is owned by the Foundation. Whether it is sold, kept, or repurposed could have a profound effect on campus space.
      2. P. Jones indicated that there is an endowment board meeting later this month in which the future of the BBC will be reviewed in detail. There has been a proposal from the library to use it for offsite articles that don’t get a lot of use and for offsite office space for people who do not need to be in the core of campus. R. LaLiberte stated the endowment board meets the following week and should provide some additional direction on BBC future use.
   ii. The working group formed to deal with legacy buildings and their progress and recommendations.
      1. L. Gray requested clarification on the legacy buildings review. P. Jones responded that the buildings are RDH, residence halls Cedar, Sycamore, Hickory (will come off line in 2017), CAB, and Cone. These are the buildings the Chancellor charged the committee to look at. The group began as an ad hoc group which included Chip Yensan, Keith Wassum, Jim Hoppa, Chris Gilbert, and Chris Ervin with a focus on RDH and Cone as part of the commissioned studies on the reuse of RDH and Cone. The studies had two parts 1) condition assessments and 2) what would be the highest and best use for those buildings. The biggest missing piece is the funding. It’s a heavy price tag to make these buildings program-viable for the next 20+ years. Part of the new charter of the committee is not only to look at future uses, but how to fund that.

f. To discuss at future meetings:
   i. Next steps in synthesizing near term space needs and seeking solution options – table discussion for future meeting.
   ii. Review renovation swing space needs, options and plans.
      1. S. Coppola asked for clarification regarding his folks moving out of Colvard (1000 level) during the renovation. He asked when we need to develop a plan on where they will be.
      2. P. Jones responded they are still uncertain of the timing of the renovations. There are three major renovations coming up – Colvard, Burson, and Denny
complex. Facilities Planning is working on a plan to accommodate swing space for this. J. Raja has requested that the swing space is close to the core of campus and will continue to work with Facilities Planning to refine placement options.

3. N. Patel indicated that once they have developed the final plan in total he will meet with each unit to review and discuss.

4. C. Yensan restated that there are three primary program needs for swing space — administrative support office space, classroom space, and faculty office space.

   iii. L. Gray suggested that we explore ways to query academic units about when and where they are projecting growth needs for space?

      1. S. Coppola suggested a more thorough review of the space and how they are using it that will help us understand what the additional space needs are.

      2. Lee talked to the chairs in his college regarding how they use space. General follow-up discussion.

   iv. C. Yensan suggested that at a future meeting the Committee discusses SMAC’s role related to new construction and substantial capital improvement projects.

VI. Adjournment

   a. Motion made for meeting adjournment (P. Jones; L. Gray).

   b. Motion approved unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 2:06 pm.

   c. Next Meeting: Wednesday September 17, 1:00 – 2:30pm, Cone 109

      i. Suggestion that the Committee continue to meet in new locations whenever possible (Suggestion: Martin Hall conference room)