

MEETING NOTES
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD
April 14, 2009

Members Present: Susan Agre-Kippenhan - Chair, Walt Banziger, Jim Becker, Kurt Blunck, Jeff Butler, Allyson Bristol, Michael Capp – ASMSU, Brad Garnick, Mandy Hansen, Tom McCoy, Mary Miles, Jim Rimpau, Tom Stump, Jim Thull, Brenda York

Members Absent: Michael Everts, Greg Young

Members Represented: Banziger for Everts; Duffy for Jacobson; Lashaway for Roloff; McCoy for Young; Stump for Yarnell

Guests: Dr. Recep Avci , ICAL; Wes Baumgartner, CTA; Dr. Brian Bothner, Dr. Alan Craig, Research; Chemistry/Biochemistry; Jeff Davis, FO&M; Dr. Edward Dratz, Chemistry/Biochemistry; Debbie Drews, FPDC; Victoria Drummond, FPDC; Todd Eliason, Alumni Board; Tracy Ellig, OCPA; Jon Ford, FO&M; Dr. Michael Franklin, Microbiology; Jaynee Groseth, Alumni; Karen Hedglin, FPDC; Dr. Tom Hughes, Laura Kellerman, ICAL; CBN; Ting Liu, Chemistry/Biochemistry; Linda Loetterle, ICAL; Dr. Paula Lutz, Dean L&S; Candace Mastel, FPDC; Sheron McIlhattan, UBS; Kate McInnerney, Genomics; Dennis Raffensperger, FPDC; Lindsay Schack, FPDC; Dr. David Singel, Chemistry & Biology; Dr. Lee Spangler, Energy Research Institute; Dr. Jean Starkey, Genomics; Dr. Phil Stewart, CBE; Elizabeth Stoller, Proteomics; Dr. Zhiyong Suo, ICAL; Megan Walker, FPDC

MSU Students: Jared Bowden, Dustin Cantwell, Erin Chamberlin, Muhammedin Deliorman, Mark Egge, Justin Folsom, Paige Franklin, Jarod Greenwood, Tyrell Jacobs, Shannon Kruse, Felzher Kusmer, Bryan Lehnen, Kara Miller, Lena Petersen, Vamsudhar Rayaprolu, Stephanie Ryder, Nathan Schaff, Reed Taffs, Andrew Warren

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

Because of the number of visiting guests, the chair requested the Planning Board members introduce themselves around the table.

ITEM No. 1 – APPROVAL OF NOTES

Robert Lashaway moved to approve the notes from March 31, 2009. Kurt Blunck seconded the motion. The notes were approved unanimously.

ITEM No. 2 – Executive Committee Report by Walt Banziger

1. The Executive Committee did not meet to discuss the Special Olympics Banners. There will be a report on the banners at the next meeting.
2. For UFPB consideration: With the increased awareness toward ADA Guidelines throughout the country MSU has been attempting to create an ADA Advisory Committee. A select group of individuals met last week to discuss who should be included in the committee and how the charge should be made. Those included in the discussion were Walt Banziger, Tammie Brown, Jeff Butler, Candace Mastel, Duane Morris, Tom Stump, Leslie Taylor, and Brenda York. They recommend the Advisory Committee be a subcommittee of UFPB, and will bring a proposal to UFPB within the next month of the charge, a representative committee membership, and its role and scope for UFPB to review.

ITEM No. 3 – Consent Agenda

- A. Classroom Renovations: Reid Hall, Room 108 & Roberts Hall, Room 101**
- B. Linfield Hall North, Second Floor Lighting & Ceiling Renovation**

Banziger explained that in order to streamline UFPB's review process of projects, particularly those which are more design oriented rather than plan oriented, a Consent Agenda was proposed where a design related project was sent out to the

committee ahead of time, similar to the ones that are in the packet at this meeting (items 3A and 3B). If there are any concerns or questions regarding the design, any member of UFPB can pull it off the Consent Agenda and ask either some quick questions that could be answered here today; or, if it needed, a full presentation. It would then be brought back to the next meeting. If the committee votes to move forward, the consent is that the projects are approved and will be sent to the President for recommendation for formal approval.

Brenda York was concerned as to whether the classroom renovation included tiered seating. Banziger explained that going by the layout of the space, the teaching level and the first five rows will be ADA accessible. The last few rows will not be ADA accessible.

Tom Stump made the motion to move forward. Jeff Butler seconded the motion. The motion passed with unanimous approval.

ITEM No. 4 – Recommendation – Continuation of Disposition of Temporary Chemistry Labs

Lashaway gave a quick overview of the issue based on background information distributed prior to the last meeting. To accommodate the Gaines renovation and vacate that building entirely during construction, a temporary laboratory facility of approximately 7,700 square feet was constructed on the north side of the Chemistry/Biochemistry Building. 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 and to make them long term facilities. An interim committee was charged with getting some answers on issues they would like to raise, and Stump was going to take information to the Resident Halls Association and bring input from them.

Blunck reported that the interim committee looked at the NIH Request for Funding Applications; the funding process; what the RFA's stipulate; what the funding can be used for and whether or not that was in line with the objectives. The charge of the interim committee was not a solution or a recommendation but to acquire a better idea about some of the issues involved around the move. Also, are there any common sense alternatives on campus, so this plan can be judged with perspective. As discussed in the last UFPB meeting, the RFA under which this proposal is planned to go forward limits what you can use that funding for to existing structures. You cannot change the footprint; add exterior walls, or additional floors. The grant will not pay to move the buildings and then renovate them. You are limited to renovating the interior and exterior of the facility in place. Under the same act is a separate RFA that allows MSU to seek funding to construct new facilities.

In terms of options, one of the things looked at was the disposition of these two buildings and whether this was a good plan for these two structures. There might be other options. Karen Hedglin, Project Mgr, was asked to come up with some costs to move the buildings. One of the main obstacles was having those particular buildings in the middle of a campus in a location not preferred by all. We have other places on campus where they could serve as temporary space where we could move other research entities as we are renovating those facilities. It would cost approximately \$800,000 to move those buildings from their current location to Faculty Court where there is available space but insufficient infrastructure. It would cost \$438,000 to move the buildings to Faculty Ct, hooking up the water, electricity, HVAC. In addition, upgrading the services in that part of MSU property (sewer, water, electrical to upgrade the infrastructure) was estimated at \$425,000. Currently, there is no space on campus to consolidate research entities while a facility is being renovated. Faculty Court will not work with the core facilities because of its location. The research district is on the north side of campus in the Master Plan.

McCoy commented that Faculty Court is a terrible place from a logistic stand point, as far as users are concerned, for a core facility. There is no money to move the building; Gaines demolition dollars cannot be used to move the building. The current location of the temporary labs addresses the needs for core facilities. The subcommittee did not look at any other potential locations. There is no other location on campus that would be feasible to move the temporary lab. Faculty Court represents most of the issues involved in picking up and moving the buildings and the eventual location is only a minor part. According to the RFA, the building would have to be moved before the renovation.

Bristor asked if there are any examples of projects like this that have been awarded in the past. McCoy explained that this is a brand new RFA. This RFA does not apply to new construction for core facilities because there is another RFA that deals specifically with new construction. The definition of renovation according to the RFA is modifying an existing structure. MSU is currently negotiating with NIH on the issue of resolving Cooley Lab having been discontinued because of lack of funds to get the project reinvigorated almost to the point of renovating all of Cooley Lab. That project would be for individual laboratories with faculty and students conducting biomedical research.

Stump stated that prior to the last meeting, he met with the Executive Council of the Residence Halls Association (RHA). The council brought up all the same issues that have already been vetted here. They asked to be able to speak to their entire committee comprised of approximately sixty-five students residing in residence halls. That group overwhelmingly supported the McCoy proposal. They fully understood the need for a core lab and additional space on campus. They also recognized the ongoing concerns about losing green space and their play area being encroached upon; however, the RHA students are in support of renovating the buildings in the current location.

At this time, the chair requested a straw poll of non-UFPB members in the audience. In favor - 26; against – 9 of the building becoming permanent. Not everyone in the audience expressed a preference.

Lena Petersen, in support, stated that what the core facility can do for students is phenomenally important.

Speaking for himself, Jon Ford was not for or against the renovation. He felt issue is between the most expedient, most cost efficient way of a campus to develop versus something that was planned. He has learned that there is no such thing as a temporary building. There is never enough space and never enough money. A campus can develop without planning; it will constantly seek the most economically efficient level, the lowest cost alternative. MSU does its best with the money and resources it has. A lot of effort went into the Master Plan, and this is the first test. The cost, if MSU sticks to the Master Plan, is the NIH Grant money.

Kate McInnerney presented a handout to UFPB on what a core facility is and why it would be a good thing to combine the core groups on campus. She informed the group that Genomics provides a service for researchers to get grants, and for that reason it would be good to put the core groups into one facility. Putting them in a distant location would be the death of the core.

Jean Starkey informed the group that the PI's would be hurt if the labs were removed from a central location, and because we are in a recession, the stimulus money presents a very exceptional opportunity that MSU shouldn't ignore.

Ed Dratz believes this is a terrific opportunity that may not come again. We should take advantage of it because it is the best thing for the campus. This would positively affect the education of countless numbers of students.

Elizabeth Stoller has been working with Dratz for a year and a half. Stoller believes this is an opportunity MSU needs to catch.

Nathan Schaff is graduating this year, but believes it would be a tragedy to put aesthetics over education.

Brian Bothner and Jared Bowden concur with Schaff.

Mark Egge, ASMSU Senator, stated that the students were assured two years ago that the buildings would be removed and that green space is an issue. He encouraged UFPB to make good on the commitment to the Long Range Development Plan. There is a lot of buy-in from the members of the Senate on the Long Range plan. Separately, he would encourage the Office of Sponsored Programs to restore departmental and PI and F&A recovery payments to at least their FY08 level before seeking additional research space.

The chair made a note of clarification: The Master Plan designates this area as a formal outdoor green space; in the Long Range Plan there is designated green space as a view portal into campus and a gateway for people to visit.

Lee Spangler pointed out that these facilities will also support research in the energy field as well as a variety of other fields. Some of the core facilities are very cramped which limits student opportunities within these facilities. In terms of high tech businesses in the area, MSU's core facilities help support those businesses.

Recep Avci circulated a copy of *An MSU Space Reallocation Proposal*.

Bryan Lehnen asked how long the renovated building must stay in place. McCoy's response was that the institution must make a commitment for ten years. In terms of long term, the campus would benefit from an entire Biomedical Research Building. Whether that can happen in the next ten years in the current state of the economy remains to be determined.

Andrew Warren is against the plan for the renovation. He suggested using a percentage of available renovation funds for analysis of a potential ten year energy payback on existing structures, then implementing these upgrades in heat, electricity and water and sewer efficiency. He would volunteer his time with the goal of saving University dollars and generating a spirit of efficiency. If the space must be used, this building must be an energy jewel and he would like to see the ten year analysis of its life cycle.

Jarod Greenwood comment was that if this building can't be renovated into a multilevel elevation where it is more dense, then there is no point in putting money into it to redecorate it.

Michael Franklin is in favor of the proposal and believes that the idea of having all of the omics facilities together is an outstanding idea in terms of student education. It is not a space for scientists, it is a space for students to do experiments together and rub elbows with other departments and expand their opportunities.

Paula Lutz believes the core facility will provide everyone on campus with equipment at a central location. It will allow interdisciplinary research on campus.

McCoy moved approval for this particular project which allows MSU to go forward and submit in response with this NIH/RFA to renovate the temporary classrooms into core facilities for the purpose of conducting biomedical related research contingent upon receiving the NIH Grant.

Lashaway seconded the motion, and offered the following friendly amendments; 1) Approval is contingent upon getting the NIH grant (that is the same as the legislation so it shouldn't be a problem; 2) That we continue to consider these facilities as long or medium term temporary, expendable buildings; and, 3) That no exterior upgrades are anticipated; and that we will probably want to prohibit any in the future. McCoy agreed with the proposed amendments.

Discussion opened with Stump questioning why prohibit exterior upgrades? Lashaway replied that, while the grant doesn't prohibit using it on exterior upgrades, he is suggesting that we shouldn't do that – in order to preserve an obvious, “temporary” look and feel to these temporary facilities and avoid any attempt to make them more palatable for even longer term use.

Planning wise this might be the first floor of a future new (AnBioSci-sized) facility of 40,000 to 60,000 square feet on three different floors, and so if we are successful with this, we might even be able to work into a new facility that is ready to go at the end of the ten year NIH obligation.

Banziger remarked that the NIH Grant does call for the building to be LEED certified, so MSU would have to bring it to at least a minimum of LEED certification. The grant funds would be spent for that along with equipment, casework and cabinetry that is involved with interior upgrades.

Lashaway stated that the long term benefit of such temporary buildings has been shown on campus from the surplus WWII Quonsets and barracks that we had right after the war, very similar to this situation. MSU accepted such facilities because people were going to go to college on the GI Bill. MSU used a great deal of the temporary facilities offered and we have some of it left. But if we look at a campus footprint from the fifties and the current time relative to such facilities, a majority is now gone, has been replaced or retired. So they do go away. Some can last a long time. The Master Plan is going to evolve. We cannot say that the green space, because we didn't anticipate it when we did this plan awhile ago, that we have committed to it being green space for ten years or twenty-five years. We said that it will evolve in some manner over the next seventy-five years, and we don't really know how that is going to evolve, but it will change. UFPB should resist characterizing the current proposal as a departure from the Master Plan. We have to be able work within our overall concept and accommodate medium term temporary kinds of situations with the eye toward getting there eventually. We can't just go there right out of the box. And regarding that the perception that these temporary labs aren't energy efficient, the wall sections are one of the most energy efficient wall sections that we have on campus and there is very little window area. Greening this thing won't be architecturally challenging regarding the building shell. The challenge will be in the mechanical systems and how they work within this facility.

Banziger carries Evert's proxy along with a statement Everts asked Banziger to read.

“First, I fully support the mission and work of the chemistry and biology departments on campus and the tremendous work they do. Also, I fully support the educational and research benefits that the grant they are seeking would provide.

However, I vote **against** the renovation of the existing temporary labs in their current location for the above purposes. I feel that the building typology (1 story shed) and placement (in a main pedestrian corridor that is an integral aspect of the master plan) is unacceptable.

I might recommend that these buildings be moved to another space on campus and then renovated with the grant money (although I am unsure of the logistics). As an architect, I know that these buildings can be shored up and transported without complete disassembly, having had personal experience in similar projects.”

One thing Banziger wanted to point out is that one of the major goals of the Master Plan is to establish a consensus vision from the physical development of campus environment that is practical, useful and most importantly, inspiring. As a community, we all support the research division of the campus; but we need to ask ourselves if we are doing that in the best way.

We know what the student’s position is, what we need to do is think about how this impacts our long range goals in terms of our campus development.

Blunck believes it is wrong to use these as long term facilities. We have the opportunity to build a new building. At some point we are still living in temporary buildings. Go for the long range plan with a new building and do it right from the beginning.

Lashaway responded by saying with the time elements involved, the importance is not to stand in the way of getting the program up and running. We can apply for grants for a new facility over time as the proposed program becomes successful.

McCoy interjected that we plan to apply for new construction grants and that new facilities amount to a significant amount of O&M which has a long term process of approval to do this which is a huge issue. He would also argue that two years ago we were not in the worst economic crisis since the great depression. This is a readymade project.

The question was called and the motion passed.

Vote: 10 yes to include Dooley’s and Yarnell’s proxies
9 no to include Evert’s proxy
1 abstain

ITEM No. 5 – Recommendation – Conceptual Review of Alumni Plaza

Lindsay Schack introduced Wes Baumgartner from CTA who gave the presentation. Previously, UFPB approved the recommendation for the location of the Alumni Plaza; today they are asking approval of the conceptual design of the plaza. Last year his company was hired to do a master plan study for the area.

At one time Montana Hall had a grand entry from the north. The intent is to revive some of the potential of the space with the creation of a formal pedestrian corridor. During the planning and design process, the intersection of the sidewalks at the corridors from Montana Hall to Johnstone Center and Herrick to Linfield Halls were identified as a pretty important node, space. The design wanted to create something along with the campus, something exciting to go in this node, a place where people could hang out, rest and study. About the same time, the Alumni Board had come up with a proposal to a place a sculpture. They thought this node would be a great space for it. Recently, CTA was hired to look at the design and further the design for Alumni Plaza. The first thing was to come up with an area for the bobcat, “Spirit.”

The intent is for Spirit to enhance the view, the view from Johnstone Center that will eventually be opened up to go through the sculpture of Spirit and up to Montana Hall. The vision for this came from the Alumni Board and from campus planning. Along with this was the idea that the bobcat sit in a natural setting. The vision is for a six feet by six feet bobcat to sit upon a large boulder and overlook the space and engage the people as they entered into this area. The space and circulation is then created around the plaza. Some of the elements of Montana Hall were chosen and brought into the space like the stone foundation of Montana Hall. Bringing that into the landscape complemented Montana Hall instead of competing with it. Low seat walls will be created to mimic Montana Hall; this provides seating and a vertical element so it won’t appear to be a

sea of plaza pavers with a sculpture in it. The proposed plants are purple, blue, yellow, and white and will be draught tolerant and low maintenance.

The design so far has been well received. It is considered appropriate and exciting use of the space. Water features were considered and then excluded because of cost and maintenance. There is a dry stream bed design element included in the design. The Master Plan envisions a split sidewalk to be added in later renovations. For now there will only be a singular sidewalk to allow the circulation around the sculpture. The service yard at Wilson will not be affected. No access would be removed for getting across campus. The pavers are accessible. The snow will be removed to the concrete and plantings.

Butler stated that the original intent when CTA was hired was to align the sidewalks.

Todd Eliason, Chair of the Alumni Board, stated that this is fully funded and awaiting approval from President Gamble. There is an issue in his mind relative to timing. It looks like the alumni can accommodate the bulk of the circle.

Banziger stated for clarification that the UFPB did see the double loaded sidewalk for the conceptual approval.

Brad Garnick moved to approve. Jim Thull seconded the motion. The motion passed with unanimous approval.

Banziger informed the group that the process is being walked through by Jaynee Groseth and the Facilities group. This is the final design approval. The next step is President Gamble's approval. One group, the Commemorative Tributes Committee, does not have an aesthetic or functional issue with this. They do have problem going through with this because of the politics of the economic climate. Groseth and Eliason made a presentation to the President's Executive Council yesterday, and the President is taking that under advisement. Our job is to look at this from an aesthetic point.

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