

**NOTES OF THE  
UNIVERSITY FACILITES PLANNING BOARD  
March 31, 2009**

- Members Present:** Susan Agre-Kippenhan - Chair, Walt Banziger, Jim Becker, Kurt Blunck, Jeff Butler, Allyson Bristol, Michael Everts, Justin Folsom – ASMSU, Brad Garnick, Mandy Hansen, Jeff Jacobsen, Tom McCoy, Mary Miles, Jim Rimpau, Tom Stump, Jim Thull, Brenda York
- Members Absent:** Allen Yarnell, ASMSU President
- Members Represented:** Lashaway for Roloff; Young for Dooley
- Guests:** Dr. Brian Bothner, Chemistry/Biochemistry; Dr. Anne Camper, COE; Dr. Edward Dratz, Chemistry/Biochemistry; Debbie Drews, FPDC; Victoria Drummond, FPDC; Jon Ford, FO&M; Dr. Michael Franklin, Microbiology; Karen Hedglin, FPDC; Dr. Tom Hughes, CBN; Linda Loetterle, ICAL; Dr. Paula Lutz, Dean L&S; Sheron McIlhattan, UBS; Dennis Raffensperger, FPDC; Recep Avci , ICAL; Dr. Phil Stewart, CBE; Dr. Zhiyong Suo, ICAL; Megan Walker, FPDC
- MSU Students: Dustin Cantwell, Shane Colvin, Muhammedin Deliorman, Paige Franklin, Miles Garrod, Jarod Greenwood, Tyrell Jacobs, Shannon Kruse, Felzher Kusmer, Bryan Lehnen, Kara Miller, Lena Petersen, Vamsudhar Rayaprolu, Stephanie Ryder, Andrew Warner, Mike Williams

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

**ITEM No. 1 – APPROVAL OF NOTES**

Brad Garnick moved to approve the notes from March 3, 2009. Jeff Butler seconded the motion. The notes were approved unanimously.

**ITEM No. 2 – Executive Committee Report**

There was no action from the Executive Committee to report.

**ITEM No. 4 – Recommendation – 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue Road Improvements (Kagy and Lincoln)**

Robert Lashaway gave the presentation. The traffic study for the conditional use permit for the Towne and Country development noted that the improvements to Lincoln and 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue should include a 4 way stop. This was installed over the Christmas break. The conditional use permit also mandated a right turn lane to the south bound leg of 11th Avenue to turn west onto Lincoln which will be constructed. A Right of Entry is requested to allow the road to be widened in this area. If approved, the proposed work will be done at no cost to the University. In addition, public parking on either side of the street along 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue from Lincoln to Kagy will be removed. This is consistent with 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue through Campus from College down to Lincoln.

At the 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Kagy intersection, MSU will provide a small wedge of land for a Right of Way for installation of an overhead signal. The proposed Right of Way will not infringe or physically impact the block structure on the NE corner of 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Kagy or MSU's entrance sign.

Recommendation approval is requested of the following:

1. Additional Right of Way for the Kagy and 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue Road Improvements
2. Right of Entry for the construction of a turn lane at 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Lincoln

Lashaway made the motion to approve the recommendation as presented. Jeff Butler seconded the motion. The motion passed with unanimous approval -19 votes.

### **ITEM No. 3 – Recommendation – Disposition of Temporary Chemistry Labs**

Robert Lashaway introduced the recommendation with background information: MSU in 2005 and 2007 received funds to redo the lecture hall and ended up with 28 million dollars to add to that to do the total Gaines renovation which is currently under construction. In order to vacate the building, a request was brought to UFPB to construct a temporary laboratory facility of approximately 7,700 square feet. UFPB reviewed the site and made the recommendation that they approve that for the temporary class labs in January of 2008. When it was approved, it was anticipated that those would be temporary and that they would last approximately through August of 2010. As a result of the February stimulus legislation, MSU has the opportunity to apply for an NIH funded grant which will target renovation and improvements to the existing facilities to house centralized and shared resources. MSU might spend 4 ½ to 6 million dollars to make these long term. MSU had to quickly submit to the legislature an amendment to allow MSU to first of all, obtain ownership of the temporary spaces which were scheduled to be taken out at the end of the project and second, authorize renovation if MSU were to get a grant. Seven and ½ million dollars was the amount MSU chose so they wouldn't go over the authority MSU had, and then MSU had to quickly insert an item in the Board of Regents agenda for last week in order to have them approve the concept of going to the legislature to ask for that also. Both of those are written so that they are contingent upon receipt of special revenue, meaning grants, to do that renovation. So the planning board then needs to review and analyze and debate the issues that are straddling this item and make a recommendation to the president.

In preparation for that, the Planning and Facilities Operations ran through some of the issues that may arise. The campus planning process is inclusive and participatory; that is what this board is for. We employ principles to guide campus development and those are captured in our master plan. All of this is in the interest of President Gamble's Shared Governance so he is very interested in the opinions here and what comes out of this group relative to the issue. We must be cognizant of the original premises. Whenever we have an item like this that comes with significant changes, it is appropriate for this group to think through those and vet the issues in the planning process. The master plan notes that the character of the individual buildings and grounds comprises the overall character of the campus. Each one of these types of situations adds an aggregate to the entire effects of the campus and how it's perceived. The character itself of our campus significantly influences the first impressions and the impacts and recruitment retention. The north campus environment is an important part of the master plan for future development. The master plan promotes a considered build-out for that area of campus. It envisions transforming the north end of the core of campus by creating pedestrian corridors and opening up spaces which are defined by the buildings and the character of the buildings around those spaces to create a formal pedestrian portal into the central campus pedestrian network.

There is definitely a difference between a temporary structure and a permanent structure. The original representation was for short term temporary, and no one is denying that. So The UFPB needs to consider the parameters if we change to a longer term temporary or quasi permanent.

When the UFPB considered the temporary buildings, they did not consider the site context because they were temporary buildings. UFPB did not talk about the context of the site surrounding the buildings due to the nature of the temporary building. Nor did the Board pay much attention to the design itself because it was going to be there for a very short term, then go away. Permanent structures need to consider the master plan, appropriate density, scale, mass, character, and green space. A single story may not be sufficient use of the site. These are some of the issues open for an objective discussion. So, converting the temporary labs for a longer term use presents challenges for UFPB to consider and debate and make a recommendation to the president relative to going forward with the grant and renovation.

Tom McCoy explained that there is no question that this was initially viewed as a temporary facility in terms of these buildings. But there is an opportunity to at least try to go after a significant amount of funding to turn these into the type of facility that could look pleasing. The importance of this is first of all when talking about the long range plan, he would remind everyone, that the last time our state legislature provided funding for a new building was sixteen years ago in 1993. They have provided money for renovation, but not a new facility. There will not be any new building going on any time soon, unless MSU can tap into these types of funds that through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act have become available. NIH has not had any money for facilities improvement awards through a competitive process since 2005. There is no guarantee that if MSU applies for this, the University will be funded. There will be a huge response; every research facility in the country will be submitting proposals to this RFA. There is facilities improvement money available on an individual project basis up to fifteen million dollars. MSU is proposing to ask for money as Lashaway has outlined to fund a very specific project, which is to renovate a core research facility on campus. In a broad framework the two buildings would house ICAL (Imaging and Chemical Analysis Laboratory) that is used by faculty all over the campus and by a number of students, both undergraduate and graduate. And as part of the proposal development, MSU will also identify who will be participating in locating their relative to what MSU is referring to an Omics Facility, Metabolomics, Proteomics, and

Genomics activities on this campus. A side bar benefit is that the ICAL facility currently exists in the EPS Building and they are in desperate need of expansion with no place on campus to expand. If MSU can secure the funding, it will double their space. There is no other space on campus that almost eight thousand square feet existing space can be renovated. There is no guarantee that MSU will receive the money. The buildings not going to a landfill is a good argument for supporting green type activities. Programs would also move.

Ed Dratz explained that the whole area of Omics is growing tremendously; it is a new way of getting a hold of biological systems and understanding the greater level of depth which is applicable to just about everybody in biology. The department has a pretty good Proteomics facility now, but they are about to reach the limits of the space they are in and they are planning to expand into Metabolomics. Space is needed to obtain instruments and for grad/undergrad research.

Mike Franklin believes the other two aspects of this are Genomics which is a really a growing facility, located in Cooley on the top floor which has been a hugely successful Omics facility; also, Bioinformatic. Space is needed to analyze massive data sets, and the department recently conducted a search for two PHD level Bioinformatic scientists; it would be nice if they were located in the same facility as Genomics and Proteomics.

McCoy explained that the existing space is overflowing; NIH has facilities money and a huge amount of equipment money available. Murdough Charitable Trust has been tapped into and MSU is in the middle of bidding additional instrumentation and will continue to do so. It is going to be a critical issue as to where we put these instruments. The RFA is specific. It is for improvement of core facilities, limited to improvement of existing spaces for a core facility. This particular grant does not permit additional square footage. There is another program not for core facilities that can be used for new construction but the turnaround time required for new construction impacts grant competition. Examples of core facilities are Omics facilities, imaging facilities, instrumentation for structural biology. It is about function, not about the construction used on an existing structure as in brick, stone, steel. Relocation of a structure is not addressed in the RFA. RFA requires the structure must become LEED Certified.

David Singel stated that ICAL will liberate space in EPS, Genomics will liberate space in Cooley, some Proteomics will liberate a little space in CBB and those are the ideas that are in circulation right now. But that's not to exclude any other possibilities. There are plans to liberate as much space as possible.

Jeff Butler is sure the structure would not be landfilled and likely reused by the contractor (disposal included in the bid). Although initially these structures were never intended to remain on campus, there is the possibility that they could be reused somewhere on campus. The money set aside to dismantle and remove the structures would remain in the Gaines construction project budget.

Shane Colvin was commissioned to read a resolution recently passed by the ASMSU Senate in opposition to maintaining the temporary structures (Resolution Attached). It is not the opinion of the students to put any opposition up for growth and expansion; it is just the nature of this particular facility. The students will continue to resist the process of making these structures permanent at their current site.

Tom Hughes is currently running a search for faculty members and has five on a short list that are world class. He believes this is a fire sale for hiring world class faculty right now. Many states around the country have frozen hires so we have young people with incredible training looking for a job. If we have the space, we can hire them.

Recep Avci stated that to be competitive in nano scale imaging and analysis, MSU needs space for instrumentation and a place to write grants. We don't have that space now and we are desperate. If we do not have this space, the University must come up with another plan.

Banziger asked if Research or Chemistry departments looked at other alternatives for use of the NIH Grant. Could other permanent facilities on campus be renovated as a core facility?

Singel responded that they had considered all spaces on campus where there is 8000 square feet of renovatable space, and this is the one. He expressed that what is being discussed is throwing space away rather than trying to make this space suitable aesthetically for the campus and at the same time generate some space. It is an opportunity to put a show case core facility structure at the gateway to campus that will be a bee hive of research activity interdepartmental and intercollegiate for that matter, and so it is an exciting opportunity.

Student Jarod Greenwood stated that with a degree in cell biology in genetics, he understands the scientist's viewpoint on the retail space of research and the ability to conduct experiments, but as a current architect student at MSU, these are only temporary structures. MSU has land to be more prudent and use that six million dollars on renovating a structure that is more necessary.

Banziger interjected that we are talking about 8,000 square feet, and rounded down, five million dollars on the project. By simple math, the Chemistry/Biochemistry Building was built for approx \$270-\$300 a square foot, but this renovation would be \$600 a square foot. Is it fiscally responsible to put that kind of money into a facility such as that?

At this time, the chair requested a straw poll of non-UFPB members. in favor – 18; against – 12 The building becoming permanent. Not everyone in the audience voted.

Greg Young believes that green space is a concern; but in relationship to the east footprint of the new Chemistry/Biochemistry Building, the temporary space right now does not go anymore east than that east footprint. So the green corridor that comes north from Montana Hall all the way to Harrison wouldn't be affected by keeping the buildings.

Brad Garnick stated that when looking at the master plan, there are two major green spaces that run east and west, and the temporary buildings sit dead center of one of those two spaces. If we follow the master plan, it looks like this is not a good place for a permanent building unless we want to forgo those east west corridors that we identified in the master plan. This issue becomes a major decision affecting whether we adhere to the master plan.

Kurt Blunck was curious as to what the renovation entails and how much it will cost. McCoy explained that there is no reason to have a design done, if there is not going to be approval. What is being requested now is to keep the buildings for NIH grants and occupation for ten years.

Paula Lutz felt that the NIH grant is exciting because everyone all over campus can use it, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, and Land Resources. This is an opportunity to maximize funds and planning on campus and supports providing comparable green space to the students elsewhere. She believes that if we renovate the facility, other space can be used to increase green space because the students have a right to have it.

Greenwood stated that he would like to see the money spent somewhere else instead of on these temporary buildings.

Stump took this recommendation to the residence hall executive group who represent students in the residence halls, and in general they understand the need for lab space, but they are disappointed that it is all "research space." They view this as lost green space and poorly utilized spaced, because the buildings are only one single level. The students would like to vet this more.

Regarding the architectural nature of these buildings, Dennis Raffensperger stated that the renovation will not change the envelope significantly; we can put different material on the outside of these buildings, but they will remain the size and shape they are. These buildings lack stature and presence that would make them comfortable in their context. That will not change by putting different material on the outside of the building because they were not designed as permanent structures. Size and configuration, scale and scope of building in relation to the space are not going to change.

Lashaway explained that UFPB does not need to resolve this today because there are two other UFPB meetings prior to commencement and we wanted to let the students have the opportunity to attend one, two or three sessions, or whatever it takes.

McCoy stated that if we don't renovate the space, we lose 7,700square feet. No other Dean has stepped up to offer 8,000 square feet to be renovated to house this facility, which would not be an addition of space only renovation of existing space.

Allyson Bristor made a motion to approve the application of the NIH grant to establish the temporary chemistry buildings as permanent buildings. McCoy seconded the motion. It was then closed to Board discussion only.

Stump asked if the Board would you be willing to defer this discussion for one more meeting. It would be beneficial for ASMSU to discuss this. Stump has a large group of students who would like to talk about this as well.

Bristor withdrew her motion so continuation could be considered.

It was agreed to appoint a sub-committee to study and review the following items: The RFA, greening of the building, alternate green space on campus to offset the loss of green space, space domino, student opinion, Cooley, and potential proposals for other facilities.

Subcommittee: Kurt Blunck, Karen Hedglin, James Thull, Justin Folsom, Mandy Hansen, Victoria Drummond, Michael Everts, and Jeff Bondy

Jeff Jacobsen said there has to be other areas that need to be considered besides Omics and ICAL. In response McCoy stated there are also facility renovation projects. This is a very specific RFA for core facilities. There could be three additional submissions, Cooley and two other projects with a shorter turn around which will come from different funds.

Everts surveyed architectural faculty and students, and out of 143 people in a study 72% needed more information or were neutral or strongly disagreed, 23% were neutral because they needed more information, 36% strongly disagreed.

Stump expressed appreciation to the group because he now had additional answers for student groups. Additional questions would be forwarded to McCoy. McCoy agreed.

Jeff Butler moved to table the recommendation until more information could be gathered. James Thull seconded the motion.

The motion passed with unanimous approval – 18 (Rimpau proxy and McCoy absent).

Lashaway noted that interpreting the grant is an endless loop; it is complex and difficult to understand the RFA, so be cautious. The opportunity relevant to this particular proposal and the grant as it is set up by the stimulus package is that we have 8,000 square feet that currently exists that is scheduled to go away. There is 8,000 square feet that we do not have to take from anyone; we do not have to ask anyone for it, which would be a difficult task to do. It is unique because it exists. Do we want that space to go away or do we want to keep it. Relative to open space, one thing we can guarantee is that the character of that space will change over time, the master plan envisions that. It is not going to be open activity space as it has been for the residence halls in that area of campus. How quickly it will transition, is anyone's guess.

Walt Banziger stated that as a planning committee, we need to look at comments made today and reflect on how this will affect the campus in the long run.

#### **ITEM No. 5 – Recommendation - Roberts Hall, Room 101HVAC Unit and Exterior Condenser**

Dennis Raffensperger presented the information. The installation of the new HVAC unit is associated with the renovation of Roberts Hall 101, a large lecture room, and will improve comfort levels within the space. The current equipment is located underneath the concrete tiered slab of the space. It is shoe horned in and is only suitable for heating. The ventilation is inadequate, so the room is consistently hot. Modifications to the existing equipment or installation of the new equipment in its current location were determined to be prohibitive.

The new HVAC unit will be located on the outside of the building. The project proposes to put the new HVAC on ground runner pads between the south side of Roberts Hall between Roberts Hall and Cobleigh Hall. The proposal would include screening the equipment with a fence and plantings coming across approximately 10 feet west of the east space of Roberts Hall. It will be completely screened from 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Jeff Butler moved to approve installation of the proposed Roberts Hall, Room 101 air-conditioning unit and exterior condensing unit. Kurt Blunck seconded the motion. The motion passed with unanimous approval – 18 votes (Rimpau proxy and McCoy absent) with the following stipulations:

1. The fence will not be chain link and the fence design will be brought back to UFPB for final approval
2. Determination of the associated noise decibels will be provided for UFPB consideration

#### **ITEM No. 6 – Informational – Introduce the Consent Agenda Concept**

Victoria Drummond introduced a new member on the board, Jim Becker; and a designated proxy, Greg Young, who will represent Dave Dooley on the board.

Drummond explained that due to the policy that requires changes to public spaces require UFPB review. A number of small issues come to the Board for recommendations to the President. In some instances UFPB makes the same recommendations several times because it must get in the design guidelines.

And there are informational items. Similar to the city and county planning boards and to have quality time to focus on more global planning issues, we would like to use the opportunity of a consent agenda. The item information is still available to the campus community; it would still be included in the packet along with any site plans or staff reports, but it would be in a consent group. The consent items would be approved collectively and any could be pulled from consent to the regular agenda for UFPB discussion. A good example of a consent item would be the first item Robert Lashaway presented today. It doesn't change the charge of the committee. The information will be received, if there are concerns, it will be pulled from the consent agenda and presented.

It was generally agreed to try the consent agenda next meeting.

This meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Abel, Administrative Associate  
Planning, Design and Construction

pc: Geoffrey Gamble, President  
ASMSU President  
Jody Barney, Budget and Fiscal Director, Office of Agricultural Experiment Stations  
Patricia Chansley, Assistant to the Provost  
Cathy Conover, Vice President, Communications & Public Affairs  
Victoria Drummond, Associate Planner  
Lisa Duffy, Assistant to the Dean of Agriculture  
Joseph Fedock, Senior Vice Provost  
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  
Donna LaRue, Assistant MSU Chief of Police  
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