## MEETING NOTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACILITES PLANNING BOARD July 20, 2010

Members Present: Susan Agre-Kippenhan - Chair, Walt Banziger - Vice Chair, Kurt Blunck, Allyson Bristor, Jeff

Butler, Lisa Duffy for Jeffrey Jacobsen, Michael Everts, Mandy Hansen, Patricia Lane, Robert

Lashaway for Craig Roloff, Jim Rimpau, Tom Stump, Jim Thull, Brenda York

Members Absent: Jim Becker, Ritchie Boyd for Joe Fedock,\* Tom McCoy, Ed Mooney, Kasey Welles – ASMSU,

Allen Yarnell

Guests: Candace Mastel and Victoria Drummond, Facilities Planning, Design & Construction; Dana

Longcope and Loren Acton, Physics

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

#### ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes

Jim Thull moved to approve the meeting notes from June 22, 2010. Tom Stump 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 - Update on Danforth Park/Iris Garden Project

Tom Stump made the motion to approve the consent agenda. Kurt Blunck seconded the motion; it was approved unanimously with the proxy vote of Ritchie Boyd.

#### ITEM No. 4 – Informational – National Solar Observatory site Selection

Walt Banziger introduced the item by stating that it is an informative presentation, basically to get some ideas and direction from UFPB as it moves forward. The item will be coming back for an eventual site selection (vicinity maps attached) and to move forward to complete a proposal for the National Solar Observatory (NSO) in association with the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy (AURA) who are seeking to partner with a host institution to consolidate its directorate operations currently located in New Mexico and Arizona into a single facility. MSU Physics Department has received approval from the President and VP of Research to enter the competitive proposal which will demonstrate MSU's ability to support both the NSO research operations and foster recruitment and development of solar education. For the proposal due in December, the ten proposed sites will be narrowed down to one preferred site approved by the President for a 40,000 SF facility that would house administrative and research personnel offices, several research/instrumentation labs, optics labs, conference/meeting space, data center and other miscellaneous space in support of the NSO operations. In addition, the concept in development would propose to offer shared classroom space, faculty space, as well as TA/GA space to facilitate partnership between the university and NSO operations and promote development of education programs. If MSU is successful in competing, the facility will be constructed between 2014 and 2016, and expected to have a facility on line by 2016 or 2017.

Dana Longcope explained that the NSO has an observatory that has been around for approximately fifty years, but the National Science Foundation (NSF) just approved a \$300M state of the art telescope to be built on the island of Maui. In exchange, the NSO had to promise to close down their old telescopes that NSO argued were obsolete in order to acquire a new one. The old ones are in Sacramento Peak in Cloudcroft, New Mexico and Kitt Peak in Tucson, Arizona. This is a perfect opportunity to consolidate a structure that basically has all the administrative staff and scientists, which are currently split between the two sites. A minimal number of technical staff operating the telescope is required to be in Hawaii. MSU is considered one of the front runners with twenty professors, ten post doctoral researchers and a nice campus to offer them. The decision will be made in 2011, and if MSU is selected, the university will inform them where they will be located. Longcope believes their real strength is their integration with the university. The NSO would like to be part of a university environment, not a research building off campus.

Banziger informed the UFPB that Facilities Planning is currently assisting the Physics Department with development of the building program, cost estimates and funding options. Construction budget is anticipated to be \$12.5 M to \$15M range, depending on development of final program needs. The majority of the sites identified are on the east side of 11<sup>th</sup> Street, although a few for argument's sake and discussion purposes are located west of 19<sup>th</sup> Street, which would support more of a

research type facility per the master plan. Through discussion at this meeting, it is hoped to get direction from the UFPB as to where we should be going and what other questions there might be that need to be answered. Facilities Planning hopes to hire an architect within the next few two weeks to put together cost estimates, renderings and drawings that will look good in the proposal, and also that focus on a site that makes our proposal stronger. The more specific the proposal is, showing where the building is, what it might look like, and how its relationship is to the rest of campus as well as the air port, the stronger the proposal is. Arizona and Colorado will have strong proposals with a site selection as well. MSU Arizona, Colorado and New Mexico are the other strong contenders.

Sites proposed - not prioritized (see attached maps):

- 1. NE Lawn (across the lawn from the Chemistry Building)
- 2. Hannon Green
- 3. Existing Plew Facility
- 4. South Gatton Parking Lot
- 5. 7<sup>th</sup> & Grant Parking Lot
- 6. Faculty Court
- 7. Huffman Parking Lot
- 8. East of the Huffman Building on Kagy
- 9. West of 19<sup>th</sup> on Garfield across from the Tech Research Park
- 10. On Huffine

Initially, the sites that interest the Physics Department team are four sites east of 7<sup>th</sup> (Kagy, Huffman, Faculty Court, and Plew) and possibly the Hannon Green site, because of its proximity to the engineering district.

Jim Rimpau asked if the expense of the site will impact the proposal. The NSF prefers to lease, rather than own a building. MSU will have to tell them what the cost of leasing the building is. It will probably be constructed using bonds, and it will be a University owned building.

Bob Lashaway requested that the Physics Department bring back written support (spell out what the connection will be) from the Dean and the Provost Office to the next meeting. If there is a strong academic connection, a new building may be considered for the Physics Department as well as the NSO building. This connection may make the existing Plew Building the preferred site. He also clarified that there is no need for more parking, unless the structure takes up parking spaces.

Mike Everts noted that bringing in more offices instead of students to the center of campus is not a good idea; the Plew, Faculty Court or 7<sup>th</sup> and Grant combined with a parking structure would be a better way to go.

Kurt Blunck stated that there is no money for a parking structure at approximately \$25,000 a space.

Lashaway remarked that there may not be enough time to propose for a grant that makes sense for parking coupled with a structure, or we can decouple and say the grant would put parking structure in a certain location beneficial to the NSO structure. He suggested the UFPB come back with the pros and cons of the following sites: NE Lawn, Hannon Green, Existing Plew Facility, South Gatton Parking Lot, 7<sup>th</sup> & Grant Parking Lot, Faculty Court, Huffman Parking Lot, and East of the Huffman Building on Kagy.

Banziger suggested bringing this back to UFPB in late August to get the number of sites down to one in order to give the architect three months to put renderings and estimates together, so the proposal is ready to be submitted by December. He also added for the record that a triangle of land currently leased by the Forestry Department was not considered because the lease has approximately forty years more to run, so a new building would have to be constructed for them in order for the site to be considered for the NSO.

<u>ITEM No. 5 – Recommendation</u> – Construction Staging on Parking Lots Guidelines (Continued from 6/8/2010) In June, Robert Lashaway suggested the UFPB send him notes, suggestions and comments so they may be addressed and the recommendation be brought back to UFPB. The revised guidelines reflect those suggestions and comments; therefore, Susan Agre-Kippenhan called for the question and it was approved unanimously with the proxy vote of Ritchie Boyd.

This meeting was adjourned at 4:40 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



