

**MEETING NOTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD
March 29, 2011**

Members Present: Susan Agre-Kippenhan - Chair, Walt Banziger - Vice Chair, Kurt Blunck, Allyson Bristol, Richie Boyd for Joe Fedock, Jeff Butler, Michael Everts, Joe Fedock, Mandy Hansen, Linda LaCrone for Tom McCoy, Patricia Lane, Robert Lashaway for Terry Leist, Ed Mooney, Jim Rimpau, Joseph Thiel – ASMSU, Jim Thull

Members Absent: James Becker, Jeff Jacobsen, Tom Stump/proxy, Allen Yarnell, Brenda York/proxy

Guests: Victoria Drummond, Candace Mastel, Leslie Schmidt, VPR; Billy Dubois, Registrar's Office; Sheron McIlhattan, UBS; Julie Kipfer, Communications; Grant Murschel, MSU Student

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

ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes

Lashaway moved to approve the meeting notes from March 1, 2011. Thull seconded the motion. The meeting notes were approved unanimously.

Victoria Drummond introduced Grant Murschel, an MSU honors and planning student, attending UFPB to observe the process.

ITEM No. 2 – Executive Committee Report – No actions to report

ITEM No. 3 – Consent Agenda – Presentation of the Classroom Committee Report regarding Gaines Hall Classroom capacity increase requests

This item was pulled from the Consent Agenda by Banziger and he presented the item. A copy of the report that was provided to the Provost Office and Registrar and will go to Space Management Committee following UFPB. The report was in response to the Provost's Office receipt of a request and forwarded to the Registrar and Classroom Committee to evaluate several classrooms in Gaines - rooms 43, 143, 148 and 243. The issues were to put tables in the front of classrooms, add tablet arm chairs to increase capacity, increase left-handed tablet arm chair options, and the migration of chairs between rooms.

The Classroom Committee evaluated the request to add tables in front area of rooms for faculty according to MSU's Draft *Classroom Design Guidelines* and concurred that it is a standard and recommended it to the Provost. Also, the *Guidelines* suggests a certain percentage of left handed tablet arm chairs for the classrooms, so that recommendation was made to the Registrar and the Provost's Office. The request to increase the capacity was evaluated by building code, fire code and the *Guidelines*. In all but one case, the capacity increases would violate fire and IBC codes and go against the recommended setbacks that were outlined in the *Guidelines*. In general, the Classroom Committee recommended against increasing classroom capacities for these rooms. This report was reviewed by Registrar - 3/18/2011; Provost – 3/21/2011; UFPB – 3/29/11; and will go to the Space Management Committee on 4/1/2011.

Fedock commented on assessing the circumstances in the rooms. MSU has an incredible demand in many classes, and the reality is that in the fall we will have greater demand to identify appropriate capacities in classrooms campus wide. It is important to acknowledge the reason why MSU has the situation is because of classroom capacities. The Provost Office and the Registrar's Office are attempting a solution to accommodate record enrollments in a broad range of classes.

Banziger stated that in the Classroom Committee discussion, that was a critical factor that was looked at, and when the analysis was done many options were explored.

Mooney suggested that the answer isn't always to get a bigger room. At some point it affects the quality of the instruction. There is a demand for these classes and we should open another section, even if it means that you teach it at 6 pm. There are many rooms available from 3 pm to 5pm.

Banziger made the motion to accept the report and move it forward to Space Management Committee for final review; Fedock seconded the motion. It was approved unanimously including the proxy votes of Stump and York.

ITEM No. 4 – Recommendation – Public Art Committee's proposed Public Art Fund

Drummond gave background regarding the creation of the Art Policy and approval of procedures. On January 27, 2010, Montana State University (Bozeman campus) adopted the Public Art Policy establishing a consistent evaluation process for the procurement, ownership, display and deaccession of public works of art. The Policy was followed by operational procedures (May 11, 2010) approved by the UFPB, under which the Public Art Committee (PAC) would review proposals of art gifted, commissioned, or procured by the university and submit a recommendation for action to the University President. However, the funding mechanism was not included for proactive procurement, the maintenance of the items MSU has now and any other issues related to MSU's public art. Included was a citation of Montana code which has up to 1% for state buildings; 1% of the project fund will be used to fund public art for projects of \$250,000 or more. It would be managed by Facilities at MSU. Input from others on campus suggested the Stadium, Parking and ITC be excluded, but those that added square footage to the campus be included. The PAC met with President Cruzado November 9, 2010, (not March 10, 2010, as indicated in the staff report) and was directed by the President to investigate a fund using Montana code (MCA 22-2-404) as the model and bring back any other information the PAC could find out including what the other universities are doing – UM and other campuses. The information was to be brought back to UFPB and plan on whatever recommendation this body makes to the information at the University Council. UM does have an art policy for major maintenance projects and there is no dollar threshold, although the MSU Public Art Committee, in the policy recommendation, does have a dollar threshold. UM looks at anything that adds square footage to the campus, but excluded Parking, the Stadium and ITC.

Thull stated that the PAC decided that grant funding limitations should be included.

Schmidt added that it is not an appropriate use of F&A, i.e. the Chemistry Biochemistry Building would have not had money to do this either.

Agre-Kippenhan said this idea came out of frustration; we can now accept or not accept an art object. It is embarrassing that we do not care. MSU needs this funding mechanism so we would not be in the position of accepting or declining gifts.

Mooney suggested a line item in the budget or an endowment may be a better way to go.

Lashaway stated his perception at the budget level is that there are greater needs in other areas. The wind arc, the ball in EPS and the fountain in Renne have come from the state art program. The desire is to be able to fund and solicit art work instead of having artists approach us. Statewide solicitation is now done by Helena and usually gets line itemed out. The A&E division and Montana Arts Council work on a project by project basis to decide how much money went to Helena to provide the art up to 1%. There is more work to do before this group should vote. We have identified some questions that we need to go through. The idea that the UM may or may not have any large research building projects and so to them the reason they may have not thought to exclude them is that they don't have an issue. He didn't know why they would exclude parking other than that it would directly impact the cost of a permit at some point; however, if it mainly falls to Auxiliaries, there's a 1% increase that is primarily shouldered by Auxiliaries projects, then students will be paying that in room and board and other fees. Why would a major sporting structure be exempt? These are some of the issues we need to work through.

McIlhattan thought we should consider a cap on larger bond funded projects.

Thull wanted something to be clear: the staff recommendation items came from somebody after reviewing the policy; this was something that was not discussed in PAC. He would not be in favor of accepting parking or the stadium or those other projects.

Morris stated Stump's point: we are considering a \$15M housing project in terms of new residence halls; that's \$150K and over the life of the loan, \$300k will be paid. This is a major concern. Stump looked at the staff recommendation language. Where does McKinstry Energy Project fit in? Jutila plans to spend \$300K to put in new fixtures and move some walls in the dining halls. Also, all across campus we all struggle with deferred maintenance costs. If this had been in place for the past 2 – 3 years, how much money would that be? It could be a sizeable amount of money.

Walt stated that in terms of identifying issues that we want to consider, in identifying 1% going to art, there are other things on campus that we want to look at such as deferred maintenance, landscaping and grounds and improving the appearance of campus. The only funding source for that is Facilities Services maintenance budget, which has limited funds. Are there other priorities we need to consider?

McIlhattan asked if a bid comes in over, what gets cut?

Banziger answered that usually landscaping is the first thing cut on a project, all the aesthetics that goes on the outside of the building.

Drummond will retrieve additional information from UM for the continuation of this item at another meeting. UM has been managing the funding of art on campus since 2006. She will find out exactly what they mean by exempting the stadium renovations. They do have the same fee for Auxiliaries, so if they were to add a new residence hall, it would apply. MSU installed our most recent piece, Beethoven – a gift to MSU. It is a marble and metal sculpture. A crane was required to maneuver it into place. It was seated on a concrete pad and we plan to put vegetation around it. Those costs, as well as ongoing maintenance, were borne by MSU. The costs are pulling from other projects, so the PAC thought we should be establishing a fund that will specifically address the procurement, solicitation, installation costs, the maintenance of the public art to encourage not only more art on campus, but also the maintenance of it. She asked the group to send their requests for information to her regarding UM management of art funding. This item will come back to UFPB.

ITEM No. 5 – Recommendation – Departmental Signage Standard

Mastel gave the presentation. There have been several requests recently for departmental directory signage in Gaines Hall, and the departments of Modern Languages and University College have requested two different styles of signage. From a planning and wayfinding perspective and within the larger campus signage planning effort, it was determined that FPDC should look closely at finding a solution for all possible requests as a standard instead of on a case-by-case basis.

The eventual plan would be to provide three different departmental directory designs for three different architectural eras (i.e. historic, mid-century and modern) of buildings on campus. The design before UFPB reflected a design for a modern building and compliments those building directory signage pieces already in place in new or remodeled buildings such as Reid Hall, Animal Bioscience Building and Gaines Hall. It would be constructed of brushed metal, clear lexan sheets, metal standoff affixers, and vinyl lettering. This design would also feature a flexible slider area for bulletins and inserts provided by the department. The size of this slider area could vary, depending on the needs of the department. The other two departmental directory designs have not been completed but would complement the architectural qualities of historical and mid-century building types.

Agre-Kippenhan asked if there were no plans to provide these signs.

Drummond explained that there was a sign package for Gaines. Included in that programming were the new room signs based on MSU standards; the directional signs where they were needed; the signs for elevators and stairs, as well as the building directory and a floor directory on each floor. After the occupants moved in, based on the design and use in their previous location, they wanted a more easily indication of certain locations. They wanted to eliminate people having to go back to the directory and coming back to find the area they were looking for. In developing FPDC's wayfinding, there are room signs, a certain number of building directories, and now they are looking at ways to make them flexible to change when the layout of the floors change. It has some permanence to it and some structure, but it also has the flexibility to be changed.

Everts questioned why the additional wayfinding signage did not include ADA signage.

Mastel explained that adding additional ADA to this type of signage would be difficult and since the ADA requirement is already met 100%, it is not an option that FPDC is currently planning to do.

Everts understood the letter of the law had been met, but it doesn't seem like the intent had been met. If able bodied people need additional signage for wayfinding, then ADA should be part of it also.

Banziger stated that the intent of this sign would be more of a destination marker sign, not necessarily part of ADA required wayfinding. Already in place are the directories with brail, this is more for finding department head offices, key points in a building that someone might be looking for, like the bank or the bookstore in the SUB. It will feel more in context with the wayfinding directories in the building, particularly the directories. Also, the intent is to match the era of the building with the signage.

Butler stated that this will hopefully eliminate departments using a paper sign stuck to the wall to state "you have arrived." This type of signage will cover those who want to spend a minimal amount of money to those who would like to spend a lot of money on supplemental signage.

Everts felt that some part of the sign should have an ADA component.

Lane commented that it would be very difficult to decide what ADA aspect should be included.

Agre-Kippenhan clarified that the UFPB is being asked to approve the concept and that mid-century and historical signage would be brought back as consent items when they are requested.

Boyd asked as a contingency, what would happen if a department wanted an ADA accessible signage next to or underneath the building standard sign?

Mastel responded that all styles meet ADA requirements and are consistent throughout the building; therefore there shouldn't be a problem.

Morris asked how does the standard work for the Fieldhouse or SUB?

Banziger replied that it is more for an academic building or a residence hall.

Everts asked that the performative aspects of the standard be listed.

Lashaway moved to approve the concept of standardized signage in the modern design as presented. Bristol seconded the motion. The vote:

Yes: 16 – including the proxy votes of Fedock, Stump and York
No: 1 – Everts
Abstain: 0

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

VCD/da

PC:

President Cruzado
ASMSU President
Jody Barney, College of Agriculture
Pat Chansley, Provost Office
Victoria Drummond, Facilities PDC
Heidi Gagnon, VP Admin & Finance

Diane Heck, Provost Office
Jennifer Joyce, Planning & CIO Office
Linda LaCrone, VP Research Office
Shari McCoy, Presidents Office
Becky McMillan, Auxiliary Services
Julie Kipfer, Communications

Lisa Duffey, College of Agriculture
Robert Putzke, MSU Police
Bonnie Ashley, Registrar
JoDee Palin, Coll of Arts & Arch