

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Facilities Planning Board: Susan Agre-Kippenhan - Chair, Walt Banziger, Jim Becker, Kurt Blunck, Allyson Bristor, Jeff Butler, ASMSU President, Michael Everts, Joseph Fedock, Brad Garnick, Mandy Hansen, Jeff Jacobsen, Tom McCoy, Mary Miles, Jim Rimpau, Craig Roloff, Tom Stump, Jim Thull, Kasey Welles – ASMSU, Allen Yarnell, Brenda York

FROM: Victoria Drummond, Associate Planner, Planning, Design & Construction

RE: **June 8, 2010**, meeting of the University Facilities Planning Board

ITEM No. 1 – APPROVAL OF NOTES

Approval of the draft notes from the May 25, 2010.

ITEM No. 2 – EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Report on any current Executive Committee actions.

ITEM No. 3 – CONSENT AGENDA - None

ITEM No. 4 – RECOMMENDATION – Construction Staging Guidelines **Presenter – Bob Lashaway**

HORIZON ITEMS

- **External Building Signage Policy**
- **Staging Discussion**
- **Seminar Materials**
- **Master Planning Issues**
- **Revisit and Update Policies**
- **MSU Heritage Properties**
- **HBO5 Amendment for lab Facility**

VCD/da

pc: Waded Cruzado, President
ASMSU President
Jody Barney, Budget and Fiscal Director, Office of Dean and Director
Patricia Chansley, Assistant to the Provost
Cathy Conover, Vice President, Communications & Public Affairs
Lisa Duffey, Assistant to the Dean of Agriculture
Heidi Gagnon, Assistant to the Vice President, Administration & Finance
Diane Heck, Administrative Associate, Provost
Jennifer Joyce, Assistant to the Vice President for Planning and CIO
Linda LaCrone, Assistant to the Vice President for Research, Creativity and Technology
Glenn Lewis, Special Assistant, Vice President, Student Affairs & Dean of Students
Shari McCoy, Assistant to the President
Sheron McIlhattan, Accounting Associate IV, University Business Services
Becky McMillan, Administrative Associate, Auxiliary Services
Kathleen McPherson-Glynn, Assistant to the Dean, Arts and Architecture
Charles Nelson, Registrar and Director of Admissions
Robert Putzke, Director, MSU Police

**MEETING NOTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD
May 25, 2010**

Members Present: Susan Agre-Kippenhan - Chair, Walt Banziger, Jim Becker, Jeff Butler, Brad Garnick, Mandy Hansen, Linda LaCrone for Tom McCoy, Robert Lashaway for Craig Roloff, Mary Miles, Ed Mooney, Tom Stump, Brenda York

Members Absent: Kurt Blunck,* Allyson Bristor,* Michael Everts,* Joe Fedock,* Jeffrey Jacobsen, Jim Rimpau,* Jim Thull,* Kasey Welles – ASMSU, Allen Yarnell

Guests: Victoria Drummond, Candace Mastel - Facilities Planning, Design & Construction; Amy Chase, Jill Davis, Alta Howells, Errol Schumann - Students for Danforth Park

The University Facilities Planning Board met beginning at 3:30 pm to discuss the following:

ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes

Brad Garnick moved to approve the meeting notes from May 11, 2010. Jeff Butler seconded the motion. The meeting notes were approved unanimously.

ITEM No. 2 – Executive Committee Report

Walt Banziger made a clarification regarding the *Sound Guidelines*, a recommendation discussed on May 11, 2010. The guidelines were designed and written specifically for equipment physically attached to the building. The guidelines refer to building operation noise, not the occupant or equipment within the building.

ITEM No. 3 – Consent Agenda - None

ITEM No. 4 – Recommendation – Danforth Park Re-Design

Candace Mastel requested the board recommend approval to implement the Iris Garden and Danforth Park Re-Design with flexibility regarding plant material and bench design. This project came before UFPB informally on August 18, 2009. Jill Davis, Alta Howells, and Errol Schumann gave background information and addressed their hope that the first phase of the project will have a ripple effect by the community and future students to cherish the space and take care of it as the first students did. The Students for Danforth Park has been working since August 2009 to secure a final design and funding for implementing Phase One of the renovations. This phase focuses on the following:

1. New bench and prune existing landscape, new signage
2. A re-visioning of the landscape with lighting and sundial
3. Create an informal amphitheater sitting space east of Iris Garden
4. Extend the path toward the east

Discussion opened with questions regarding the new sidewalk on the east side, seating material and design, the sun dial, size of the garden and ADA accessibility. Brenda York said the garden needs to be accessible to all students and varied mobility. Susan Agre-Kippenhan stated that it would be good to have a sense of the phases, as in the order of things that are being done as funding is acquired, and whether ADA accessible pathways are a high priority or not. It was noted that the polymer sand fill around the separated stones would make the path as accessible to wheel chairs as a cobblestone street, but the west entrance is still too steep for ADA current standards. Rather than approve individual phases, Walt Banziger suggested a proposal for the entire design, and the Students for Danforth Park would work internally with FS and FPDC on the phasing, design of elements, and bring things large in scope back to UFPB or to the Executive Committee. Robert Lashaway pointed out that Victor Stanley is the contemporary standard for benches and UFPB should keep that in mind instead of going in the direction of teak benches. However, an argument could be that this place is unique and historic so that it could have a different type of bench. It was suggested that the circular concept was agreeable to all including UFPB, but not the materials (metal vs. wood seating), which the Students for Danforth Park will have to work out with Facilities. Jeff Butler suggested tabling the amphitheater, because it would delay any action possible for the Iris Garden at this meeting.

The Students for Danforth Park stated they would like to proceed with the first phase by removing the overgrowth, revisiting the bench design, re-landscaping, and possibly signage and lighting.

Jeff Butler made the motion to move to approve the Iris Garden concept design with the condition that the details of the design would include FS and FPDC coordination with their approvals and input; that the amphitheater is excluded from this

approval; and at some point a plan would be given back to the UFPB regarding the phases and show the handicapped accessible pathway as a priority. Tom Stump seconded the motion; it was approved with the following vote:

Yes: 16 including the proxy votes of Kurt Blunck, Ritchie Boyd, Allyson Bristol, Mike Everts, Jim Rimpau, and Jim Thull
Abstain: 1 – Brenda York

This meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

*Member who submitted proxy

VCD:da

pc: Waded Cruzado, President
ASMSU President
Jody Barney, Budget and Fiscal Director, Office of Dean and Director
Patricia Chansley, Assistant to the Provost
Cathy Conover, Vice President, Communications & Public Affairs
Victoria Drummond, Associate Planner
Lisa Duffey, Assistant to the Dean of Agriculture
Heidi Gagnon, Assistant to the Vice President, Administration & Finance
Diane Heck, Administrative Associate, Provost
Jennifer Joyce, Assistant to the Vice President for Planning and CIO
Linda LaCrone, Assistant to the Vice President for Research, Creativity and Technology
Shari McCoy, Assistant to the President
Becky McMillan, Administrative Associate, Auxiliary Services
Kathleen McPherson-Glynn, Assistant to the Dean, Arts and Architecture
Charles Nelson, Registrar and Director of Admissions
Robert Putzke, Director, MSU Police



UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD

June 8, 2010

ITEM # 4		PTAC's proposed <u>Design/Construction Guidelines – Parking Lots</u>			
PRESENTERS:					
Bob Lashaway, AVP University Services and Kurt Blunck, Mgr, Parking Services					
PROJECT PHASE:	PLANNING	SCHEMATIC	DESIGN DOCUMENTS	CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS	
VICINITY MAP:					
Go to http://www.facilities.montana.edu/pdc/planning/files/CurrentConstructionMap.pdf to view current Staging Map.					
STAFF COMMENTS:					
<p>On May 26, 2010 the UFPB Parking & Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC) unanimously approved an initial draft of guidelines for parking facilities, which begins with construction staging in parking lots. The document includes background information on the MSU Parking Enterprise operation and considerations for both temporary uses of parking facilities and permanently displacing parking with a new building.</p> <p>Since 2007, campus parking lots have been increasingly used as construction staging areas. This shift away from using green open spaces for staging and concentrating instead on parking lots followed a cost comparison analysis of the aesthetic and monetary restoration costs in which using green open spaces cost more. On July 10, 2007 the UFPB supported the shift towards using parking areas for staging and since then, FS and FPDC work with Parking Services to identify parking lots for potential staging areas (and only use green open spaces when absolutely necessary). With the increased use of parking lots for staging, PTAC felt it necessary to promulgate guidelines.</p> <p>If approved by UFPB, the <u>Design/Construction Guidelines – Parking Lots</u> will be effective immediately and incorporated in the MSU Design Guidelines and Construction Standards currently being developed.</p> <p>The draft Guidelines for your consideration are as follows:</p>					
<u>Design/Construction Guidelines – Parking Lots</u>				<u>May, 2010</u>	
1. Background					
University System parking operations are required by state statute to function as independent, non-state funded, self-sustaining business entities. All costs associated with the development, management, operations, and maintenance of the Parking Enterprise and parking facilities must be covered by revenue generated through user <i>fees</i> and enforcement <i>fin</i> es. We are prohibited from using either state appropriated funding or student tuition to support parking facilities or operations.					

Parking *fees* are charged to legitimate users and customers of the parking system (faculty, staff, students, visitors). *Fees* include revenue from permits and the MSU pay lot. *Fees* are tied to capital improvement reserves, maintenance of existing assets, planning activities, and purchased services (e.g., snow removal, cleaning, etc). Therefore, the capital investment in exiting parking assets made by parking customers must be preserved and protected.

2. Construction Staging in Parking Lots

The University has determined that construction staging areas in general negatively impact the areas/surfaces upon which they are placed – regardless of duration – and that the negative impacts have associated repair/restoration costs (UPFB July, 2007). It has also been determined that the restoration costs associated with locating construction staging areas on landscaped surfaces are greater than the costs associated with staging on parking surfaces. Therefore, it is generally preferable for construction staging areas to be located on hard surfaces, such as parking areas, than on open spaces or landscaped areas.

When staging on parking areas, the following parameters must be met:

- a. Use of parking lots for construction staging areas shall be coordinated with and at the approval of the Manager of Parking Services. Coordination should begin as early in the project process as possible in order to minimize impacts to parking assets and parking customers, and to identify and account for project budget impacts early in the process.
- b. Any changes in approved staging parameters must be coordinated with and at the approval of the Manager of Parking Services.
- c. Since each parking space represents an individual annual revenue source, and any loss of revenue negatively impacts the future costs to all parking customers, the construction/building project budget must pay the parking account the cost of an annual permit (S/B average - or less if staging on less than S/B parking area), prorated to the actual months used for staging. [*Even though general parking is “over-sold” by a factor of ~1.36 due to diversity of use on an annual basis, construction staging uses will only be charged at a 1-for-1 rate.*]
- d. Staging areas should be sized for the minimum possible area and duration required for the project at hand. In selecting/proposing construction staging locations, also consider that since the parking lots are constructed and maintained by fees paid by the users and competition for prime, convenient parking spaces is intense, even short-term use for construction staging can be perceived by parking customers as a significant and unjust inconvenience.
- e. Staging areas must be fenced and secured to prohibit the dangers of the public walking through a staging area. Staging areas shall have danger/warning signs that include the contractor’s name and contact information. Use weighted fence posts that do not penetrate the parking surface. If any surface penetrations are required they must be approved by the Manager of Parking Services and the MSU Project Manager and utility locates must be performed prior to making any approved penetrations.
- f. Staging areas should be monitored by the MSU Project manager throughout the construction project to assure appropriate use and the earliest possible release/return of the area to general parking use.
- g. Staging areas are provided for storage of *non-hazardous construction materials, equipment, trailers and work vehicles being actively used for the construction project – NOT* for long-term storage of unused or infrequently used equipment or for parking personal transportation vehicles of construction personnel. All contractors and their employees shall abide by MSU’s Parking Regulations including purchasing parking permits and registering their vehicles.
- h. Any temporary utilities hookups required (e.g., additional lighting, water, etc.), including removal at the end of the staging period, must be paid at project expense.
- i. Haul routes from the staging area to the project site to be used by the contractor shall be delineated on the project drawings, marked on the site and maintained at regular intervals in clean, safe condition by the contractor. Construction traffic shall be confined to the designated haul routes.
- j. Contractor shall maintain existing paving in staging areas to prevent accumulated damage

throughout the use period by promptly repairing breaks, holes, low areas and other damage to maintain paving and drainage in original condition. Contractor shall keep trash and debris picked up throughout the use period.

- k. Protect parking surface from damage by storing any heavy objects on appropriately sized pallets.
- l. Do not store petroleum products or caustic/volatile materials anywhere in staging areas located on parking lots. Tracked vehicles are not allowed to be used in staging areas located on parking lots. Do not store site materials, loose gravel, dirt or demolished materials such as masonry, roofing, etc., in staging areas located on parking lots.
- m. Contract shall report any inadvertent spills of vehicle fluids, fuels, etc., immediately to the MSU Project Manager and follow clean up procedures as prescribed by MSU Safety & Risk Management, Hazardous Materials Section.
- n. At the end of staging use the MSU Project Manager (accompanied by the Manager of Parking Services) shall inspect and accept the release of the staging area. Prior to acceptance the contractor shall:
 - i. Remove all materials and sweep surface of staging areas, approaches and haul routes to clean condition.
 - ii. Remove any fence posts or similar appurtenances.
 - iii. Repair any damage to depth required to assure structural strength and surface continuity with original adjacent lot conditions.
 - iv. Repair any damage to signage, lighting, landscape elements, sprinklers, etc.
 - v. Repair any damage to haul routes and approaches to original condition.
 - vi. Re-striping of parking spaces will be scheduled and completed by MSU on the regular maintenance cycle at the expense of Parking Services.

3. Parking Permanently Displaced by a Building Project

As noted above, the construction and maintenance of existing parking facilities has been paid for by the legitimate users of the parking system with the expectation that their investment will be preserved for their continued use throughout the life time of their investment – in most cases at least 45 years. Therefore, if a building project (including but not limited to buildings, landscaping, service areas, plazas, etc.) permanently displaces existing parking, the project budget must pay the parking account the estimated cost equal to the full current replacement value of the area and number of parking spaces being displaced - without discount relative to depreciation or condition. The parking enterprise will determine how, when, where and if the displaced parking is to be replaced in the future.

Other?

COMPLIANCE:	YES	NO
MSU POLICIES	X	
COMMITTEE OR APPROPRIATE REVIEW	X	
MASTER PLAN	X	
BOARD ACTION REQUIRED:		
Recommend approval of Design/Construction Guidelines - Parking Lots as proposed.		
RECOMMENDATION OUTCOME:		