

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO
Fresno, California 93740

Campus Planning Committee

Minutes

November 15, 2013

Members

Present: Saeed Attar, John Bushoven, Robert Boyd, Mike Coles, Yolanda Doub, Rick Finden, John Kriebs, Kathleen Moffitt, Dennis Nef, Jan Parten, Cynthia Teniente-Matson, Mike Tillman, Richard Vaillancour and William Wright

Absent: Deborah Adishian-Astone, Amy Armstrong, Charles Boyer, Hongwei Dong, Paul Halajian, Brad Hyatt, Lisa Kao, Jeff Macon, Fred Nelson, Patrick Newell, Mikey Sanchez, Meaghan Smith (C.O.), Bernie Vinovrski and Gary Wilson

Guests: Adan Avalos, Tom Gaffery, Laura Meyer and Lori Pardi

Meeting called to order at 8:07 a.m.

1. Approval of the November 15, 2013, agenda. It was MSC to approve the November 15, 2013, agenda.
2. Approval of the October 18, 2013, minutes. It was MSC to approve the minutes of October 18, 2013 with minor corrections:
3. Temporary CCA Art Installation (*Action*) – Shane Moreman

On August 30, 2013, Dr. Shane Moreman, Executive Director of the Center for Creativity in the Arts (CCA), brought forth a request for approval of a temporary art installation. This would be a life-sized reproduction of a General Atomics MQ-1 Predator drone sculpture that would measure 27 ft. long with a 48 ft. wing span.

Dr. Adán Ávalos, Artistic Director for CCA, returned to the committee to address two of the main concerns expressed by Campus Planning Committee members: 1) anchor or support for the structure so that it is stable and does not collapse or blow away; and 2) securing the structure in terms of access or individuals attempting to climb the sculpture.

Dr. Ávalos shared with the committee the proposed anchoring system that consists of a series of posts made of 3" PVC pipe that will be attached to an interior skeletal frame structure within the sculpture. Each of these posts, a total of six plus the three in the landing gear, will be individually anchored to the ground using lawn appropriate mounting plates to be connected to the PVC piping. Heavy duty 8" tent stakes/ground anchors will be used to anchor a steel plate into ground to secure the sculpture.

Chair Matson asked if the artist has completed a similar project elsewhere. Dr. Ávalos stated that there have been similar projects, but this one is different in that it will be housed outdoors.

Ms. Parten asked if the sculpture would include a perimeter so that people who are blind or visually impaired are alerted to the anchors, ties and/or the protruding/overhang aspects of the sculpture. Existing sculptures on campus include a base so that one does not run into the structure.

Dr. Wright asked who would bear the cost should something get damaged. Chair Matson clarified that the artist or the CCA/department would bear the cost with supplemental insurance.

Mr. Boyd expressed concern regarding the ability to properly secure the sculpture using tent stakes, especially considering it will be on display during two months which typically offer heavier winds.

Dr. Wright added that he does not believe the committee is qualified to make the determination as to what would ensure the security/anchoring of the structure. He recommended consulting with a licensed engineer, specializing in this area, to make that determination.

After considerable discussion, it was determined that the proposal did not contain sufficient information to call for action. As mentioned during the discussion in August, Chair Matson requested a final proposal to include an engineering/architectural drawing or schematic that details the project with specificity (dimensions, size, weight, material) and would indicate that the project is structurally sound and capable of addressing the university's concerns: support/anchor, security/access and ADA concerns voiced by the committee.

Chair Matson suggested the project team meet with Mr. Boyd to review the engineering components that are necessary in the proposal. Ms. Parten requested that the ADA component be addressed in that discussion as well with the inclusion of Mr. Gary Wilson, the university's ADA Title II Officer.

Furthermore, Chair Matson reiterated the importance of connecting with specific groups on campus, specifically ASI and the Veterans Group. Dr. Bushoven acts as the advisor for the Veterans Group.

Chair Matson also stressed the committee's support in this project and the resources available to address the issues and concerns. This item is scheduled to return for action at the next CPC meeting.

4. Communication after building incidents (*Informational*) – Robert Boyd

Chair Matson brought to the table the topic of building incidents that happen throughout the campus from time to time. Within these incidents the university has multiple means of communications but the focus of first responders is getting the situation under control. Mr. Boyd shared some details regarding the incident that occurred the evening of Sunday, November 10 in the Science 1 building.

There was an outlet fire that damaged a display case used by the Biology Department. The University Police Department, the Fresno Fire Department, individuals from the university's electrical unit and EH&S all came to the scene. The fire was caught early enough that it did not spread but there was significant damage to the display case and items stored in it.

Throughout this process, there was no communication with the dean of the College of Science and Mathematics or the department chair. The university's protocol with broader incidents, such as floods, is to contact the college's dean. That did not happen with this incident as it was contained, considered minor in scale and the action would not have changed the outcome.

Chair Matson commented that the university is trying to identify a system to handle initial communication when it comes to these types of incidents and seeks the committee's input in this regard.

The university does not have an emergency preparedness coordinator or business continuity planning coordinator so the people who get the first call are first incident responders: 1) They are not necessarily the people that trigger a phone tree; 2) Every college/school wants something different or notification for these types of incidents or activities handled differently.

Administrative Services is conducting a review of its own internal system and network to determine what is the most practical way to initiate a call to someone. Should the call go to the Provost so that he can determine whether or not any others within the division, colleges or schools need to be notified/called?

The university does not have the staffing to respond/take care of the incident and handle all the calling/communication pieces. The communication would need to be uniform because there aren't enough resources to accommodate individual communication plans for the different units.

There was significant discussion regarding the appropriateness of designating the Provost as the first point of contact; other individuals who might be designated as first contacts (deans/associate deans); and some of the issues with listing multiple contacts for each of the colleges/schools.

There was also discussion regarding another incident in the Engineering building and some of the ADA implications with that incident which was discussed by the President's Committee of Disabilities.

In regards to urgent communication, Dr. Nef commented that not everyone needs to know or should now about incidents that occur outside of work hours. The Provost or his/her designee can best determine if an incident warrants contacting the dean(s) or other personnel. The Provost would have the most up to date schedule for these individuals and can best determine who should be called at that given moment. Chair Matson added that the Provost, deans, etc. are more familiar with the culture of the college/school and can better determine who and if any other individuals need to be contacted.

Dr. Doub added that what is minor to one individual may not be perceived the same by the person whose work or area was damaged.

Dr. Wright asked if this communication is part of the Kualu-Ready plan. Chair Matson responded that it is, but the Kualu plan comes into effect on bigger/broader incidents.

After much discussion, Mr. Boyd agreed that perhaps, as a start, any incident that results in property damage should warrant immediate notification/call to the Provost or his designee so that he/she can best determine next steps in communication for that particular area.

5. Wayfinding Signage Program (*Update*) – Tom Gaffery

Mr. Gaffery provided an update on the Wayfinding Signage program. The project team begun work with A-Plus Signs and made significant progress in signage for the parking permit dispensers, which could be up within the next couple of weeks; farm-edge signage will be finalized; and the project team will begin walking the locations for some of the pedestrian signs.

The existing parking permit signs will be phased out. The new sign will be installed before the old sign is removed so as to minimize the disruption. Work continues with IDA to finalize the Cedar/Shaw gateway monument that was discussed at the last meeting and will soon move into production.

Parking signs are still on track for installation during the winter break. Temporary signage referencing the old "letter" parking designation will be used during the transition period.

Chris Vieira from the Office of the Vice President for Administration and University Communications are working to communicate these changes with the campus community and the community in general.

The unveiling of the new location for the Veterans Memorial monument went well. The Veterans Group asked Dr. Bushoven to relay their thanks and appreciation for this project.

6. Recycling Changes Communication Plan (*Update*) – Matson/Kao

Chair Matson distributed a copy of the communications plan that was developed to inform the campus and community about the changes in the university's recycling. The Recycling Center on Bartow Avenue was removed and recycling efforts with IWS as described during the last meeting continue. The goal is to increase awareness of our ongoing recycling program and sustainability efforts by using multiple mediums such as: social media, email, University Journal, as well as postcards.

7. Other Business – None

Ms. Rochelle Reames, a Fresno State Ag student and part of Associated Students, Inc., attended the

meeting to voice her concern with the walkways being proposed for the vineyards and orchards as upcoming projects for the University Farm Laboratory.

She explained some of the challenges students face with maneuvering tractors and equipment through the vineyards and orchards and that adding walkways, benches, sprinklers, etc. would not only increase the difficulty in driving this area but also waste the university's financial resources given that these would probably get damaged. She further expressed her concern with plantings, specifically if water-wise plants are not used.

Chair Matson provided clarification regarding recent discussions as they relate to the perimeter of the University Farm Laboratory.

The City of Fresno brought forward the idea of fencing the University Farm Laboratory as part of its General Plan 2035. The university did not support this at the time, but did acknowledge that something needs to be done around the farm to mitigate some of the comments and complaints received as it relates to the university farm operations and neighboring residents/homes. The university is looking at some viable alternatives for landscaping around the farm and is in the process of increasing signage that would restrict and discourage individuals from walking on the farm.

Furthermore, the university is looking to widen Barstow Avenue to add a bike lane. There is also discussion regarding the need to enhance the aesthetics in this area, specifically O'Neill Park, with the addition of the Jordan Research Center.

Dr. Bushoven commented that the farm is a laboratory and there are pesticides, chemicals, etc. used on those premises. He further added that many of the schools are focusing their work on the ag-urban interface issue.

Dr. Wright offered that all these developments might present an opportunity to improve driving areas for the tractors and perhaps warrant consultation with Mr. Mike Mosinski, the University Farm Manager as well as Dean Boyer.

There was additional discussion regarding the addition of a fence and some of the issues with that idea. It was also clarified that the solutions being proposed are to assist the University Farm Laboratory in addressing some of the issues and not to hinder their operation or reduce Ag land.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:04 a.m.