MEMORANDUM

- TO: University Facilities Planning Board: Nancy Cornwell Chair, Walt Banziger Vice Chair, Kurt Blunck, Allyson Brekke, Jeff Butler, ASMSU President, Michael Everts, Chris Fastnow, Greg Gilpin, Brett Gunnink, Neil Jorgensen, Shad Cristando ASMSU, Terry Leist, Chris Kearns, Martha Potvin, Fatih Rifki, Tom Stump, Julie Tatarka, Jim Thull, Brenda York
- FROM: Victoria Drummond, Assoc. University Planner; Campus Planning, Design & Construction
- RE: January 13, 2015, meeting of the University Facilities Planning Board to be held in the Facilities Meeting Quonset at 3:30 pm

ITEM No. 1 - APPROVAL OF NOTES

Approval of the draft notes from November 18, 2014. Draft notes from December 2, 2014 to be distributed before next meeting.

ITEM No. 2 – EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Report on any current Executive Committee actions.

ITEM No. 3 - CONSENT AGENDA -	No items
ITEM No. 4 - INFORMATIONAL -	Bike Task Force Update Presenter – Candace Mastel
ITEM No. 5 - RECOMMENDATION -	Illuminated Exterior Display Board East Julia Martin Presenter – Candace Mastel
ITEM No. 6 - RECOMMENDATION -	Public Art Committee Membership Update Presenter – Victoria Drummond
ITEM No. 7 - INFORMATIONAL -	CPDC Project Process Brochure Presenter – Randy Stephens

HORIZON ITEMS

- Chalking on Sidewalks
- Door Graphics for DSEL Space
- Harrison Dining Hall Exterior Schematic Design
- Jabs Hall Outdoor Furniture
- External Building Signage Policy
- Seminar Materials
- Master Planning Issues
- Revisit and Update Policies
- HBO5 Amendment for Lab Facility

VCD/lsb

DC.

rt.		
President Cruzado	Heidi Gagnon, VP Admin & Finance	Julie Kip
Melissa Hill, President's Office	Jennifer Joyce, VP Student Success	Jody Bar
Maggie Hammett, President's Office	Linda LaCrone, VP Research Office	Susan Fr
Keely Holmes, Provost Office	Bonnie Ashley, Registrar	Robin Ha
ASMSU President	Robert Putzke, MSU Police	JoDee Pa
Diane Heck, VP Admin & Finance	Becky McMillan, Auxiliaries Services	Victoria

Julie Kipfer, Communications Jody Barney, College of Agriculture Susan Fraser, College of Agriculture Robin Happel, College of Agriculture JoDee Palin, College of Arts & Arch Victoria Drummond, Campus Planning

MEETING NOTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD November 18, 2014

Members Present:	Nancy Cornwell - Chair, Walt Banziger - Vice Chair, Jeff Butler, Michael Everts, Chris Fastnow, Neil Jorgensen, Fatih Rifki, Brenda York, Julie Tatarka, Greg Gilpin, Bob Lashaway, Kurt Blunck
Proxy:	Candace Mastel for Allyson Brekke and Linda LaCrone
Members Absent:	Brett Gunnink, Chris Kearns, Martha Potvin, Shad Cristando, Tom Stump, Jim Thull, Glenn Duff
Staff & Guests:	Tony Campeau, Reed Simonson, Rebecca Gleason, Kristin Blackler, Jim Zimpel, Rollin Beamish, Josh De Weese, Jeremy Hatch, Krista Metzger

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

ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes

Butler moved to approve the meeting notes from October 21, 2014. Blunck seconded the motion. The meeting notes were approved unanimously.

ITEM No. 2 – Executive Committee Report

There was no action from the Executive Committee to report.

ITEM No. 3 - Consent Agenda - No Items

ITEM No. 4 - Recommendation - Bike Locker Investigation

Candace Mastel introduced the idea of placing bike lockers at the Streamline bus stop, and the students (Will, Alyson, Greg, Kelly, Riley and Jack) from Everts' architecture Professional Practice class who have done a semester long project investigating bike facilities and storage on campus. Alyson explained that they have been looking at bike organization on campus, by looking at the under-utilized areas on campus and solutions to the related issues. The group has found that MSU has continuously increased its record enrollment, and now is a good time to organize existing pathway use and differentiate short term and long term bike parking. Innovative bike solutions on campuses such as those at Stanford and MIT, include designated bike lanes, covered long term bike storage, and secure covered bike storage for short term parking that can be implemented at MSU. The group studied the Portland State Bike Hub, which is an indoor long term bike parking which allows users to buy an annual permit, encouraging the bike culture and proper bike storage through membership, clinics and maintenance classes.

The group identified some specific areas to focus on, including energy savings on campus, the health of campus, and removing bike clutter to create more green space. The two prong solution propose is placement of bike lockers near parking lots on the outskirts of campus to provide long term storage for commuters; and create a main bike route down Centennial Mall with paths that branch off and lead to vestibules near buildings. The following are questions that they note would need to be addressed:

-How does the design react and respect the existing architecture, keeping the historical value in mind?

-How is the indoor bike storage maintained, especially during the winter?

-How do bikers and pedestrians interact with the indoor bike storage space?

The group also came up with some parameters for design, including sensitivity to existing structure, location selected based on high traffic areas, and buildings with inefficient entry systems. The design should be multi-faceted and focus on more than bike parking alone, to address green space and energy savings as well.

Blunck asked about funding and the group proposed a two-step payment process which is made up of the upfront costs, and the second is the energy savings, health benefits and operations benefits to offset expenses. They are also looking at how this could be incorporated into the Freshman Residence Complex and the Norm Asbjornson Innovation Center. Lashaway asked if the group noticed a difference between bicycle commuters and what they are proposing; they responded that if there is a change in the bike culture at MSU the vehicle miles can be offset by bike miles. Mastel added that the Bike Task Force has a survey out to students, staff, and faculty, asking questions about user desires, patterns, and preferences, and they will be able to analyze the data from a large amount of responses. p:\ufpb\agenda & memos\2015 agenda\meeting 01-13-2015\draft meeting notes 11-18-2014.docx

The board revisited the original proposal for bike lockers in the vacant area of the Pay Lot on S. 7th Avenue, and Lashaway moved to approve to test the bike lockers in this location, west of the current Skyline bus stop, and get a report in the future of what is learned and the data that is been collected; Banziger amended that the lockers be removed upon construction commencement of the Norm Asbjornson Innovation Center and future installations will be brought back to UFPB. Everts seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The vote:Yes:14No:0

ITEM No. 5 - Recommendation - Cheever Hall Ghost Sign

Mastel presented the proposal to install a ghost sign on the brick wall of Room 102 in Cheever Hall, which is becoming the Design Sandbox for Engaged Learning (DSEL). In Montana it is common to see these permanent murals on exterior brick walls, that over time have become weathered, and called "ghost signs" which this project will simulate. The mural will be directly painted on the walls by students, supervised by Meta Newhouse, as a class project, and should be completed by February 2015. Butler asked what will happen when the mural is no longer wanted on the wall; Cornwell explained that the design is purposely design to be non-discipline specific so if the room changes use it can remain, or it can be scrubbed or sandblasted off. Mastel asked Cornwell to address what would happen if it becomes dated and Cornwell responded that historically this happens with ghost signs and they transition over time to become part of the architecture. Cornwell said that it would not require any maintenance and Facilities Services should provide a suggestion for the type of paint to use. Butler added that he could suggest a sealer that would aid in removal in the future. Fastnow asked if the colors are fully determined and noted that blue and/or gold might be popular. Cornwell said the colors may still change but that orange is key organizational branding color in the DSEL space.

York moved to approve the ghost sign, as long as the College of Arts & Architecture works with Facilities Services on paint and sealer selection. Blunck seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The vote: Yes: 14 No: 0

ITEM No. 6 - Recommendation - Haynes Hall Sculpture Yard Storage Containers

Mastel presented the proposal to install two storage containers in the enclosed sculpture yard north of Haynes Hall. Art students have previously stored projects within this area, but exposed to weather. The art department has requested storage units to protect the student pottery projects. The shipping containers would be placed on the ground on the east side of the yard within the eight foot tall fence, and would be accessed by students, faculty and staff throughout the year. They are a standard storage unit size which is eight feet wide by eight feet tall by 20 feet long, and would be tan or light grey (similar to the color of the fence). Similar to the storage shed that was approved for the Child Development Center at Herrick Hall, these will be within an existing fenced area that has been designated for the use and occupancy of the art department, the fenced enclosure provides separation and reduces visibility of the units, and the units will be used daily in support of the specific programmed outdoor space. Lashaway stated he was okay with it because it is not noticeably visible. He also noted that there are situations on campus where the building users deserve some exterior space that is allocated for their purposes for the things they need to do, which do not fit in the building. There is also need for service space for Facilities Services to be able to access the buildings and handle renovation; it is best to plan for these needs in the future. Banziger added that there is a possibility in the future to extend W. Garfield St through to S. 11th Ave and these units may be removed if that happens.

Lashaway moved to approve the storage containers based on the three observations that have been made to justify this decision. Fastnow seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The vote:	
Yes:	14
No:	0

ITEM No. 7 - Informational - Chalking on Sidewalks

This item will be discussed at a future UFPB meeting.

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

VCD:lsb

PC: President Cruzado Adam Arlint, President's Office Maggie Hammett, President's Office Lisa Duffey, Provost Office ASMSU President Diane Heck, VP Admin & Finance

Heidi Gagnon, VP Admin & Finance Jennifer Joyce, VP Student Success Linda LaCrone, VP Research Office Bonnie Ashley, Registrar Robert Putzke, MSU Police Becky McMillan, Auxiliaries Services Julie Kipfer, Communications Jody Barney, College of Agriculture Susan Fraser, College of Agriculture Robin Happel, College of Agriculture JoDee Palin, College of Arts & Arch Victoria Drummond, Campus PDC



ITEM # 4	MSU Bicycle Task Force					
PRESENTERS:						
Candace Mastel, Kristin Blackler and Rebecca Gleason						

PROJECT PHASE:	PLANNING	X SCHEMA	TIC DESIGN DOCUMENTS	CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS			
VICINITY MAP:							

N/A

STAFF COMMENTS:

The Bike Task Force has requested an informational meeting with the UFPB to update them on the following topics:

- 1. Why was the MSU Bicycle Task Force created?
- 2. What has the task force accomplished since it was established? (2014 projects and activities will be highlighted)
- 3. What is on the horizon for the task force?
 - a. Planning Campus Bicycle Master Plan
 - b. Education From professionals to the classroom
 - c. Outreach tours, new student orientation, define and promote "Bike Culture at MSU"

As the task force moves forward into 2015 with planned projects and activities, it welcomes regular feedback and involvement of UFPB and university constituents. For further information regarding the task force and its activities and projects, feel free to contact Kristin Blackler, Sustainability Director, at 994-6825. The task force extends a pre-emptive thank you to UFPB for allowing them the time to update the group on its 2014 projects and what is planned for the future.

COMPLIANCE:	YES	NO
MSU POLICIES	X	
COMMITTEE OR APPROPRIATE REVIEW	X	
MASTER PLAN	X	
BOARD ACTION REQUIRED:		
None, informational only		



ITEM # 5	EM # 5 Illuminated Exterior Display Board for East Julia Martin						
PRESENTER	RS:						
Candace M	Iastel, Assistant	Plan	ner				
PROJECT PHASE:	PLANNING	NING X SCHEMATIC X DESIGN CONSTRUCTIO DOCUMENTS DOCUMENTS DOCUMENTS			CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS		
VICINITY M	IAP:						
					1210 500 1212 1214 1214 1216 119 1216 119 1218 1228 1258 125		

STAFF COMMENTS:

This illuminated exterior display board would be placed parallel to the sidewalk on the NW corner of 15th. & W. Garfield leading up the sidewalk to the East Julia Martin apartment complex # 101 (currently being used as Residence Life Freshman Apartments). Currently, there is turf and one small tree, in this vicinity. This brushed bronze display board is 72" (L) X 36" (H) by 3 ³/₄" (D). This display board will stand on two metal legs (brushed bronze) which will be encased by a poured concrete slab (2' W X 4' L X 4" D).

This display board will also be hardwired for illumination with the power supported by the EJM building # 101. This is a three door display case, with clear acrylic panels with standard door locks. The display is made of durable aluminum and has weather resistant aluminum backing with silicone sealant. Estimated cost including product and installation; \$ 4,900.00. Picture of the display board can be found at www.bulletinboards4sale.com/Storemodules/ProductDetails.aspx. Model idea # is LSCBBRL234.

The illuminated display board is proposed to be installed for a period to not exceed two years or until East Julia Martin is no longer being used as a freshman residence, whichever comes first. At the same time, Residence Life and CPDC will explore the options for a permanent and appropriate alternative for informational signage at this location or throughout campus.



COMPLIANCE:	YES	NO				
MSU POLICIES	X					
COMMITTEE OR APPROPRIATE REVIEW	X					
MASTER PLAN	X					
BOARD ACTION REQUIRED:						
Recommend approval of the request as proposed, to allow the installation of the illuminated exterior display, for a period not to exceed two years or until which time East Julia Martin is no						
longer being used for freshman residences, whichever comes first.						

P:\UFPB\AGENDA & MEMOS\2015 Agenda\Meeting 01-13-2015\#5 Illuminated Exterior Display Board East Julia Martin.docx



ITEM # 6		Public Art Committee Membership Recommendation					
PRESENTER	S:						
Victoria Dr	rummond,	PAC Co-	Chair				
PROJECT PHASE:	PLANN	ANNING SCHEMATIC DESIGN CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS DOCUMENTS					
VICINITY MAP:							
Not Applicable							

STAFF COMMENTS:

As a Committee reporting to the UFPB, the PAC makes recommendations for changes to the membership for UFPB approval. It is a committee that serves UFPB – and so decisions regarding PAC membership is made by UFPB and does not require a recommendation to the President.

At the December 18, 2014 PAC meeting the following membership changes are approved for recommendations to the UFPB:

- Increase the Arts and Architecture Faculty from 2 to 3. As a specialized committee responsible for informed detailed investigation of art proposals to MSU. The Art Department is divers and has artist talent in a variety of disciplines that provide depth to evaluations and recommendations to UFPB. An additional faculty member provides additional coverage.
 PAC unanimous nomination for Jim Zimpel, Sculpture faculty, Art Department.
- 2. Reappoint the Co-Chairs Jim Thull and Victoria Drummond for a term of 11/14 to 11/17. (Thull is on a sabbatical and provided a permanent Proxy, Leila Sterman, who has accepted the Co-Chair duties as part of the Proxy).
- 3. Notifications have been sent regarding the Staff Senate and the ASMSU vacancies.

COMPLIANCE:	YES	NO				
MSU POLICIES						
COMMITTEE OR APPROPRIATE REVIEW						
MASTER PLAN						
BOARD ACTION REQUIRED:						

Recommend approval of the proposed membership changes and authorize updating the Bylaws.



ITEM # 7	CPD	CPDC Project Process Brochure					
PRESENTER	S:						
Randy Step	ohens, Universit	y Architect					
PROJECT PHASE:	PLANNING	ING X SCHEMATIC DESIGN CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS DOCUMENTS DOCUMENTS					
VICINITY M	AP:						
Not Applie	Not Applicable						
STAFF COM	MENTS:						
STAFF COMMENTS: To assist customers on campus, Campus Planning, Design & Construction (CPDC) has developed a brochure to help explain the steps in the process to deliver a project. The brochure could be used to send electronically or with face-to-face kick off meetings with customers to help them understand policies and procedures as established by MCA, MSU and/or CPDC prior to the start of a project. The brochure includes useful information about developing scope, budget, schedule, required spending authority and							

approvals, and reasonable time frames for each step of the process.

Electronic copy a	attached; please	use for your refer	rence. This will	be posted on the C	PDC website.

COMPLIANCE:	YES	NO
MSU POLICIES		
COMMITTEE OR APPROPRIATE REVIEW		
MASTER PLAN		
BOARD ACTION REQUIRED:		
No action needed		

P:\UFPB\AGENDA & MEMOS\2015 Agenda\Meeting 01-13-2015\#7 CPDC Project Process Brochure.docx

MSU CONSTRUCTION POLICIES

• The State of Montana is the owner of all University facilities.

- Campus Planning, Design & Construction (CPDC) is responsible for the management of design and construction activities:
- · New structures
- Renovations
- · Major Maintenance
- · Infrastructure projects
- · Large and/or complex construction projects
- CPDC is charged with the stewardship and preservation of University facilities.
- · CPDC administers all campus construction contracts.

CPDC RESPONSIBILITIES:

According to state statutes, all construction activities, regardless of source of funds must be administered by:

· CPDC for projects requiring design services, construction contracts and professional Consultants.

· Facilities Services for maintenance and small scale projects.

There are different construction processes depending on the project cost.

CPDC's role is to guide the client through the complexities associated with delivering a project that complies with state regulations.

CPDC will be the central contact point for all parties during the various stages of the project delivery process.



CORE VALUES

STEWARDSHIP

Promote and practice sustainable principles as proactive stewards of resources.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Be accountable to our Clients, coworkers, University Community and the Citizens of Montana. \\

BALANCE

Balance the Client need and project requirements with the University Mission and larger community.

RESPECT

Treat our Clients, colleagues and coworkers with respect.





PHOTOS BY KELLY GORHAM

CAMPUS PLANNING, DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION

Montana State University PO Box 172760 Bozeman, MT 59717-2760

www.montana.edu/us/pdc

Phone: 406-994-5413 Fax: 406-994-5665



CAMPUS PLANNING, DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION



ABOUT CAMPUS PLANNING, DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION



ILLUSTRATION COURTESY OF COMMA-Q/HENNEBERY EDDY ARCHITECTS, INC.

MISSION STATEMENT

Provide responsible leadership and systematic guidance to preserve and advance the physical environment of MSU in support of education, research and community outreach.

Campus Planning, Design & Construction (CPDC) consists of two service management sections; the Planning group and the Design & Construction group. As stewards of MSU's physical assets, our Planners, Designers and Project Managers are committed to guiding Clients through the construction process with approaches that enhance and preserve the Campus, historic buildings, landscapes, and cultural features.

In addition, the office is the liaison with local, state and federal agencies as related to planning and construction issues.

SERVICES OFFERED:

- Design Services
- · Project Construction Management
- Master and Capital Planning
- \cdot Landscape Design
- · Interior Design Services
- \cdot Long Range Building Program Planning
- \cdot Construction Standards and Guidelines
- Signage and Wayfinding
- · Space Management
- · Utility Locates
- \cdot Mapping, Drafting (CAD) and Geographic Information System (GIS)
- \cdot ADA Upgrades and Compliance

SCHEDULING YOUR PROJECT

The project delivery process is long and complex. Clients are encouraged to contact CPDC as soon as possible to facilitate a successful and pleasant project experience.



CAMPUS PLANNING, DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION PROJECT PROCESS



2 PROGRAM PLAN	$\frac{1}{1}$ SPENDING AUTHORIT	Y 4 CONSULTANT SELECTION	5 CONCEPT AND SCHEMATIC DESIGN
GOAL : Establish agreement on scope, sch budget, and funding source	edule, GOAL: Secure spending authority, approvals and funding	GOAL: Select professionals to design the project	GOAL: Confirm Schematic Design aligns with intended budget
 Outline proposed project schedule Develop estimate of probable cost Confirm overview of state, BOR and Universitia authorities and requirements Identify delegation responsibility with State A division regarding administration of project Determine desired project delivery method: I 	 (<i>i.e. Deans, VP's, Provost, etc.</i>) Transfer project funding and set up project accounting (<i>i.e. Plant Funds, MOU's etc.</i>) Secure appropriate spending authority based on project budget and type of project: \$\$0-75k = President (up to 2 weeks) \$\$75k-350k = OCHE (up to 3 weeks) \$\$350K = BOR (up to 3 months) 	 Project cost dictates design option: < \$75K Client has an option for in-house or outsourced design services > \$75K MCA (state code) requires outsource design services Project costs and Consultant fees dictate selection process: < \$20K CPDC and Client selects directly (up to 2 wee > \$20K Consultant fees and < \$500K project cost: CPDC recommends 3 firms to State A&E State A&E makes final selection Up to 1 month > \$500K project cost requires formal selection proce State advertisement and interviews Up to 4 months 	· Up to 6 months
7 CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS	8 BIDDING AND NEGOTIATION	9 CONSTRUCTION	10 OCCUPANCY AND WARRANTY PERIOD
GOAL: Finalize bidding and permit docum	ents GOAL: Execute contract for construction	GOAL: Realize project vision	GOAL: Close out project and client occupies space
Translate design intent into documents from to construct the project	which • Project cost dictates construction option: • < \$75K Client has an option for in-house or	· Contractor constructs the project	· Project is accepted
	GOAL: Establish agreement on scope, schebudget, and funding source Define and confirm the project scope and pro Outline proposed project schedule Develop estimate of probable cost Confirm overview of state, BOR and University authorities and requirements Identify delegation responsibility with State A division regarding administration of project Determine desired project delivery method: D Bid Build is most common, GCCM option for I complex projects Up to 6 months CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS GOAL: Finalize bidding and permit docume Translate design intent into documents from the	2 PROGRAM PLANNING ADAPPROVALS 4 ADAPPROVALS 60AL: Establish agreement on scope, schedule, budget, and funding source GAL: Secure spending authority, approvals and funding 9 Define and confirm the project scope and program GAL: Secure spending authority, approvals (s. Deans, VP's, Provost, etc.) 9 Develop estimate of probable cost Initiate formal internal project approvals (s. Deans, VP's, Provost, etc.) 9 Confirm overview of state, BOR and University authorities and requirements Initiate formal internal project approvals (s. Deans, VP's, Provost, etc.) 9 Identify delegation responsibility with State A&E drivision regarding administration of project Secure appropriate spending authority based on project budget and type of project: 9 Determine desired project delivery method: Design Bid Build is most common, GCCM option for large complex projects States Secure appropriate spending authority approvals (s. States 2) 9 S abox 2 States 2 States 2 9 Destruction States 2 States 2 9 BIDDING ADD States 2 9 States 2 States 2 9 BIDDING ADD States 2 9 BIDDING ADD States 2 9 BIDDING ADD <t< td=""><td>2 PROGRAM PLANNING 3 AND APPROVALS 4 SELECTION GAL: Establish agreement on scope, schedule, budget, and funding source GAL: Secure spending authority, approvals and funding GAL: Secure spending authority, approvals and funding GAL: Secure spending authority, approvals GAL: Secure spending authority, approvals 0. Define and confirm the project scope and program Initiate formal internal project approvals (i. Deans, UPS, Provost, etc.) Finitate formal internal project approvals 9. Project cost dictates design option: 9. S75K Client has an option for in-house or outsourced design services 0. Develop estimate of probable cost - Sansfer project funding and set up project accounting (i.e. Plant Funds, MOU's etc.) 9. S75K Sock = 0CHE (up to 3 weeks) 9. S75K-S35K = 0CHE (up to 3 weeks) 9. S75K-S35K = 0CHE (up to 3 weeks) 9. S350K = 0CHE (up to 3 months) 9. S20K CPDC and lient selects directly (up to 2 weeks) 9. S350K = 0CHE (up to 3 months) 9. S20K CPDC and lient selects directly (up to 2 weeks) 9. S350K = 0CHE (up to 3 months) 9. S20K CPDC and lient selects directly (up to 2 weeks) 9. S350K = 0CHE (up to 3 months) 9. S20K CPDC and lient selects directly (up to 2 weeks) 9. S20K CPDC and lient selects directly (up to 2 weeks) 9. S350K = 0CHE (up to 3 months) 9. B1D ING AND LEON LEON LEON LEON LEON LEON LEON LEON</td></t<>	2 PROGRAM PLANNING 3 AND APPROVALS 4 SELECTION GAL: Establish agreement on scope, schedule, budget, and funding source GAL: Secure spending authority, approvals and funding GAL: Secure spending authority, approvals and funding GAL: Secure spending authority, approvals GAL: Secure spending authority, approvals 0. Define and confirm the project scope and program Initiate formal internal project approvals (i. Deans, UPS, Provost, etc.) Finitate formal internal project approvals 9. Project cost dictates design option: 9. S75K Client has an option for in-house or outsourced design services 0. Develop estimate of probable cost - Sansfer project funding and set up project accounting (i.e. Plant Funds, MOU's etc.) 9. S75K Sock = 0CHE (up to 3 weeks) 9. S75K-S35K = 0CHE (up to 3 weeks) 9. S75K-S35K = 0CHE (up to 3 weeks) 9. S350K = 0CHE (up to 3 months) 9. S20K CPDC and lient selects directly (up to 2 weeks) 9. S350K = 0CHE (up to 3 months) 9. S20K CPDC and lient selects directly (up to 2 weeks) 9. S350K = 0CHE (up to 3 months) 9. S20K CPDC and lient selects directly (up to 2 weeks) 9. S350K = 0CHE (up to 3 months) 9. S20K CPDC and lient selects directly (up to 2 weeks) 9. S20K CPDC and lient selects directly (up to 2 weeks) 9. S350K = 0CHE (up to 3 months) 9. B1D ING AND LEON LEON LEON LEON LEON LEON LEON LEON

· Contract with lowest responsible bidder

· Up to 6 weeks