Building and Grounds Minutes
November 6, 2019

Attendance: Mateen Rizki (CECS, Chair), Brian Edwards (CEHS), Amelia Hubbard (COLA), Audrey McGowin (COSM), David Cool (BSOM), Rob Thompson (FMS), Javan Conley (FMS), Debbie Whisler (CaTS), Seth Hohlbein (Student Government), Mary Holland (Registrar)

1. The committee discussed the plans for chloride remediation at the site of the old salt barn. Dr. McGown noted that she and her students had done testing of chloride levels at the University well site. Mr. Conley that the chloride levels are currently below those required by the EPA. Committee requested the EPA report. Mr. Conley noted that the elevated level of chloride is not just related to the old salt barn, but also due to water run-off both from the campus and from the facilities across Colonel Glenn Hwy.

2. The committee discussed the plans for campus water treatment. Mr. Conley noted that Facilities and Planning had contract CT Consultants to review options for water treatment. Three options were presented (1) continued softening of water, (2) use of Fairborn water, (3) installation of a reverse osmosis system. The continued softening of water is expensive ($40K/year) and increases salt in the water. The use of Fairborn water has significant upfront cost (~$1.5M) and still require treatment of the water. The reverse osmosis system is the lowest cost option because it reduces the manpower required to maintain the system (~1 person per year instead of 2) and will result in better quality water in fixtures which will prolong their life. The University has a $4M appropriation that must be used soon to upgrade the drinking water. The plan is to clean the wells, bring the wellheads above ground.

3. The committee asked Mr. Conley about the status of the Capital Plan. He stated the Capital Plan was already been developed and submitted to the State of Ohio. Dr. Rizki noted that the Senate Building and Grounds Committee has a constitutional duty to review the capital plan and provide faculty input. This cannot be accomplished if the plan is not provided to the committee in a timely fashion.

Mr. Conley noted that the capital plan included plans for a workforce development center at the Lake Campus and all remaining funds were for deferred maintenance. The committee noted that deferred maintenance tends to include University level items and often fails to include many items in faculty laboratories and department level teaching spaces. The committee agreed to ask University to consider developing a well-defined process to gather information about deferred maintenance items at the faculty and department level.

4. The committee again discussed the ongoing University space survey and asked for information about the maintenance costs of the off-campus facilities (i.e. how much of the capital funds are needed to support off-campus facilities).

5. The committee reviewed parking violation data provided by Parking and Transportation showing the distribution of parking violations by type and location over the past three years (2017-2019)
there has been a 24% drop in enrollment on the Dayton Campus and a 23% increase in the number of violations issued (15,956). The committee plans to explore the data in more detail to determine the source of this apparent incongruity.

6. The committee discussed the classroom infrastructure needed to support distance education. Dr. Rizki contacted other public universities in Ohio to determine what type of on-campus testing facilities are available for distance education courses. Most universities support some type of physical space for on-campus testing. Typically, the test center handles accessibility, distance, make-up examinations for in-class students and administration of standardized testing. The exceptions were Bowling Green and Cleveland State University. Bowling Green only has accessibility services similar to Wright State’s Office of Disabilities Service, but a representative of Bowling Green noted they were exploring options to expand their services. Cleveland State University also does not support a distance education testing center. Instead, they opt to use Respondus/Tegrity; although they noted some students object to the intrusive nature of the home testing solution and therefore they also provide a facility on campus where students can use the Respondus/Tegrity software.