

**MINUTES OF
THE UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD
March 4, 2008**

Members Present: Susan Agre-Kippenhan, Bovard Tiberi (ASMSU), Banziger, Blunck, Butler, Garnick, Lashaway, McIlhattan, Miles, Stump, Thull, York

Members Represented: Linda LaCrone for Tom McCoy

Members Absent: Bristol, Dooley, Everts, Jacobsen, Rimpau, Sharrock, Yarnell

Guests: Jeff Davis, Victoria Drummond, Candace Mastel, Megan Bergstedt, Karen Hedglin, Mike Absalonson (Architects Design Group)

The University Facilities Planning Board met beginning at 3:40pm, to discuss the following:

ITEM No. 1 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve from the previous meeting because they have yet to be completed.

ITEM No. 2 – EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

There was no action from the executive committees to report.

ITEM No. 3 – Cooley Renovation - Review new location for mechanical equipment.

Karen Hedglin and Mike Absalonson of Architects Design Group reported that, although an option was previously approved by UFPB, that some new issues had been brought to her attention regarding the large chiller unit that is being incorporated into the Cooley renovation.

- The option approved by UFPB (option #1) places the chiller unit on the north side of Cooley and provides an acoustic enclosure with an outside brick surface that will help with the current noise level of the unit. Although the material helps to deaden the noise, there is still a 67 decibel level of noise (60 decibels is when you must shout to be heard) within a 30 foot radius of the chiller.
 - This noise level will not only affect researchers working in the surroundings buildings, but also other building occupants. In addition, there is a plethora of utilities in the area that could possibly create conflicts.
- Karen and Mike presented an option (option #2) where the chiller unit would be moved to the west side of the building. The acoustic enclosure would remain the same, just in a different location.
 - This would decrease affects of the noise as well as the likelihood of utility conflicts. The negative to this is that the unit would be adjacent to 11th.
- Brad Garnick questioned the feasibility of an underground bunker for the chiller and Karen informed him that that is not an option, but there is a possibility of a third option. This option is to have a water-cooled chiller on the inside of the building. This would create less noise, but would still leave a small enclosure on the outside of the building. The space that would be used is the general use space owned by the Dean of Ag next to the mechanical space in Cooley. In the past, the negotiations for this space have not been successful. At this point, we do not have any other space to offer the Dean of Ag in exchange. Susan Agre-Kippenhan asked if there could be a compromise between the departments, but the only space that Ag owns in Cooley is the space being addressed with the chiller. Karen states that the chiller could not fit in the “Fish Room” because it is not quite large enough. There would need to be an additional 6-8 feet added on to the room. Jeff Butler and Tim Ford have also been working together to resolve issues with equipment in the hallways by using the “Fish Room” as storage for lab items. Walt Banziger suggested asking the Space Management Committee to address the space issues although SMC has never stepped in between two colleges in the past. Lashaway stated that he would like to try one more time to speak to the Provost regarding the indoor space in Cooley.
- Susan Agre-Kippenhan asked if we had the different energy efficiency stats for each of the options. Jeff Davis stated that a full study hasn’t been completed, but that water-cooled chillers are typically more efficient than air-cooled. The efficiency savings would equate to about \$5-6,000 per year over a 30-40 year time period for the water-cooled chiller. The difference between capital costs of the two chillers is not extremely significant, but official numbers have not been obtained. Walt Banziger reminded the committee that President Gamble has committed to implementing the Governor’s sustainability initiative to reduce energy usage by 20% by 2010. Later, Lashaway re-emphasized the

president's commitment to sustainability and that we have to be aware of this looking into the future even though it will create some tough decisions to be made. We need to send a message to our project managers that they can push for energy conservation in the future and we are behind them. Jim Thull commented that it would be short-sided of the committee not to consider the more energy-efficient equipment.

- Brad Garnick asked what the noise difference would be and Jeff Davis informed him that, although we don't have solid numbers, the water-cooled chiller is significantly quieter. Brenda York asked how the noise would affect classrooms and it was illustrated that, with the physical barriers between the cooler and actual classroom space, that the noise affect would not be significant. Bovard Tiberi inquired about campus standards for noise. Banziger said that currently even the city of Bozeman does not have a decibel standard, so we are looking into it. Currently the standard in Missoula is 60 decibels at the property line. Lashaway said that given our current situation with the chemistry building that neither option 1 or 2 is acceptable in terms of noise-level. The decibel level for the Taylor Hall building occupants is too high. At this point, controlling the noise level is more important than addressing efficiency because of the immediate negative effects from noise complaints. In addition, the standard for similar mechanical equipment around campus is for it to be housed indoors. From a maintenance perspective, Jeff Butler informed the committee that an indoor set-up would be more easily accessible for maintenance.
- After the above discussion Walt Banziger made the following motion:
 - With respect to the noise issue and the energy efficiency issue, with an air-cooled unit, we feel that neither option 1 or 2 is acceptable. We would ask that the building committee along with the deans go back and work with the design team and the Space Management Committee to find a better solution, possibly utilizing space within the building.
 - The motion was seconded by Jim Thull
 - No comments on the motion
 - Motion passed unanimously

ITEM No. 4 – LRCDP – Receive copies of Chapters 4, 5, 6 for review.

- Candace presented two hard copies of the most recent progress on the LRCDP document for the committee to look at.
- In addition the committee was provided with Chapters 4, 5, and 6 to review and edit. Chapter 4 is the most up-to-date version with the Executive Oversight Committee's edits, while the EOC's edits have to be added to Chapters 5 and 6 as well. Please use the handouts to make any edits in red and return them to Victoria Drummond in a week.
- Chapter 7 consists of acknowledgements and Chapter 8 is the glossary. Chapters 7 and 8 will not be provided for review unless requested. These chapters can be checked out from Candace Mastel.
- FPDC hopes to have the documents wrapped up in about 1 month with the EOC having a final review in April.
- Jim Thull suggested that each version of the document should be tracked for use as a historical record.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Megan Bergstedt

cc: Geoffrey Gamble, President
ASMSU President
Al Bertelsen, Director, Strand Union
Patricia Chansley, Assistant to the Provost
Cathy Conover, Director, Communications & Public Affairs
Victoria Drummond, Associate University Planner
Lisa Duffey, Assistant to the Dean, College of Agriculture/Agricultural Experiment Station
Joseph Fedock, Senior Vice Provost
Heidi Gagnon, Assistant to the Vice President, Administration & Finance

Mandy Hansen, Financial Aid Officer
Linda LaCrone, Assistant to the Vice President for Research
Donna LaRue, Assistant Chief, University Police
Glenn Lewis, Assistant to Vice President for Student Affairs
Shari McCoy, Assistant to the President
Becky McMillan, Administrative Associate, Auxiliary Services
Charles Nelson, Registrar and Director of Admissions
Robert Putzke, Director, University Police