MEETING NOTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACILITES PLANNING BOARD July 19, 2011

Members Present:	Joe Fedock - Chair, Walt Banziger - Vice Chair, James Becker, Kurt Blunck, Jeff Butler, Mandy Hansen, Linda LaCrone for McCoy, Patricia Lane, Robert Lashaway for Leist, Jim Rimpau, Jim Thull, Brenda York
Members Absent:	Allyson Bristor, Michael Everts/proxy, Jeff Jacobsen, Tom Stump, Joseph Thiel – ASMSU, Allen Yarnell
Guests:	Joe Bleehash, Facilities Planning, Design & Construction

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

<u>ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes</u> Meeting Notes from the previous Meeting were not submitted for approval.

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

ITEM No. 3 - Consent Agenda - None at this time

<u>ITEM No. 4 – RECOMMENDATION</u> – Part 1 - Recommendation for Wilson Writing Center presentation of concept

Joe Bleehash presented background information for the Wilson Writing Center project. The Writing Center is currently located in rooms 105 and 106 in Wilson Hall. The project includes refreshing finishes in this area and relocating tutoring carrels from room 114, which would allow for the new Writing Center to be relocated to 114 and 115 (currently a Registrar controlled classroom). The proposal includes a new entrance, improved visibility to the exterior and an interior office. New windows would match the windows on the first level in the courtyard area. On the second floor, minor changes include a walled area with carrels for student tutoring which would also be a part of the Writing Center. Board members questioned whether the Registrar's office was on board with the changes. Banziger advised that FPDC has met with the Registrar's office and they are currently exploring ideas for an exchange with the College of Letters and Science, however that issue will be addressed by the Space Management Committee. If the registrar's office is not able to give up room 115, the project will still mean an improved space for the Writing Center. This proposal will not add any additional square footage to the building.

Butler moved to recommend approval of the proposed concept of the Writing Center as presented, and to move forward whether or not the Registrar's space was available, with the notation that Board members have expressed concern and support for the Registrar's office to be able to obtain space in exchange for the space they would be relinquishing. Rimpau Seconded the Motion and it was unanimously approved by the Board.

Part 2 – Recommendation of Academic Building R&R Fund to fund the Project

The Writing Center Project is anticipated to cost in the \$300,000 range and it has been recommended that the Academic R&R Fund (a student academic fee) be used to fund this project. The fee represents pledged revenue and is committed first on a debt service with any excess available for expenditures on current projects. The protocol for using the Academic R&R Fund begins with Facilities, either by request or through the various project lists maintained by Facilities. Facilities will then bring the proposal before the Planning Board for determination as to whether the use of the fund is appropriate.

Upon UFPB's recommendation to approve use of the fund, it is forwarded to the President for approval, with the caveat that any project over \$200,000 must also have ASMSU approval. If this project is approved, it would go to ASMSU for concurrence in the fall, and then on to the President for approval. At this time, the Writing Center project is the only one on the list for the fund. Facilities believes this is an appropriate use of the funds since the Writing Center supports students on campus. Members expressed concern that the prioritization process for identifying projects to be supported by the fund be consistent, open and reasonably transparent to all constituencies throughout the institution. Banziger advised that since the fund is relatively new, there has not been an influx of projects into it as yet, and this is the first to surface with appropriateness for these funds. Members discussed various options for determining how the fund would be used:

- An RFP for a large bonded series of projects;
- Choose one bonded project and not return to the fund for 10 years because the funds are committed;
- Use the revenue stream on an annual basis to get ~\$300,000 of work done, or
- Bank funds in a year when there aren't viable projects, and hold off until the next near to have additional funds for a larger project;
- Approach the state with a partnering option.

Rimpau suggested looking at the CFAC program which addresses how many students would be touched when considering a project or developing a recommendation. The Board agreed that the Writing Center project appears to be attractive for these funds, however members wish to defer a specific recommendation vote on the funding mechanism, but also to recognize that students are going to need to weigh-in and revisit as soon as is feasible (within the next two meetings). By consensus, the Board moved to continue.

Banziger was given the charge to collectively define a process that establishes some of the factors considered. The Board may support a recommendation to spend the design portion of the fee in order to avoid delay, with a project schedule beginning immediately after commencement, and completion by fall semester, 2012. Lashaway will also be meeting with ASMSU in the next two weeks to define the process for projects over \$200,000.

ITEM No. 5 - INFORMATIONAL - LRBP Presentation and Discussion

Banziger provided an overview of the Long Range Building Program (LRBP). The LRBP is a continuous process and we are always somewhere in the cycle. The OCHE expects the University of Montana and MSU to use a similar process to develop a comprehensive list to be submitted. FPDC centrally coordinates the process, including team tours to the campus to look at their project proposals, but each stage of the LRBP process is reviewed by the President. We are currently in the odd-numbered year of the cycle where campuses are submitting their lists to FPDC to be reviewed and combined. Final revisions to the lists will be made in October and will be sent to the November Board of Regents meeting as an informational discussion item. The President will finalize the lists and in January, the combined lists of approximately 20 projects will be taken to OCHE. Over the next few months, the projects will be consolidated into an MUS LRBP Project Priority List for approval by the Board of Regents in May and submittal to the State A&E office for inclusion in the state projects list.

Of the Cash Project List consisting of our top 8 projects submitted for 2011, MSU received zero dollars. The Legislature also voted down funding for the Bonded Project List consisting of 5 projects.

Banziger distributed a packet listing projects by size, including written descriptions of the top 39 projects. The President is seeking input from the various organizations on campus regarding perceived priority for the types of projects. Members were tasked with prioritizing their top 10 of the list of 39 projects for the next meeting.

This meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

sm 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