

**MEETING NOTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD
September 13, 2011**

Members Present: Joe Fedock - Chair, Walt Banziger - Vice Chair and proxy for Brenda York, Jim Becker, Kurt Blunck, Mandy Hansen, Linda LaCrone for Tom McCoy, Patricia Lane, Jim Rimpau, Tom Stump and Joe Thiel – ASMSU

Members Absent: Allyson Bristor, Jeff Butler, Michael Everts, Jeff Jacobsen, Terry Leist, Martha Potvin, Jim Thull, Allen Yarnell and Brenda York

Guests: Ritchie Boyd, Lisa Duffey, Laura Humberger, Robert Lashaway and Candace Mastel

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

ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes

Lane moved to approve the Meeting Notes from August 30, 2011. Blunck seconded the Motion and it was unanimously approved by the Board.

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

ITEM No. 3 – Consent Agenda

ITEM No. 4 – Informational - Academic Building R&R Fund

Laura Humberger presented an overview of the Academic Building R&R Fund to better understand the funding source. Building fees are pledged to pay debt service first. What hasn't been clear is the internal division of those fees. The fees are looked at as a lump of money that is sufficient to pay the bond debt first. For what is now projected and what the building fee has been used for, the need has declined. Now there is extra money after what is set aside to pay debt service. Last year's collection (about \$325,000) and this year's collection have built up to over \$600,000 that is not committed for debt service. While money will always enter the pledged revenue stream first, and something hazy happens, such as with the Land Grant Income, some of the building fee money may be needed to pay for what the Land Grant Income would have paid for. If something like this happened there would be enough notice to make a change if needed. Right now there are two years absolutely available.

This piece is generating about \$325,000 per year and would be used for academic needs to the extent that it exceeds debt service. The Fund would take care of things the state is ultimately responsible for, but isn't going to do. This represents an agreement with the students. The University locked into debt from many years ago with the projected payments coming from projected revenues. With 30 years of debt services you have to be careful. If something declines, more of the building fee would be used to pay for the debt, which could mean less than \$325,000 available per year. For the foreseeable next few years, there aren't any plans to use any of the building fee money. This would not typically be used for newly bonded projects and wouldn't be a source of repayment without a very transparent process. The larger projects should be borne by the state and students should not be paying for projects without seeing anything new. So Laura cautioned against a too long term commitment with the funds. It might be better to do projects in a smaller range. Larger projects that could be paid off in three years, or a shorter time horizon, are supported. The pledge of the revenues is subordinate to bond debt and should be treated like a cash fund. The Fund shouldn't be tied up too long because it is unknown what else it may be needed for. It should be used at a pace that would allow it to be spent on the students who are generating the funds. When a list of projects is compiled it should be taken to the students so they can see what projects are being recommended. For the next meeting Walt will do an overview of project process development and bring a list of sources projects can be pulled from.

The Chair would like to continue to discuss the role and expectation of UFPB for consideration of major facilities that impact the future of the campus.

ITEM No. 5 – Recommendation - Prototypical Building Information Signage

Candace Mastel presented an overview of the Prototypical Building Information Signage. This is a wayfinding system that includes hierarchal signage for buildings, building information, departmental identification and room numbering. The largest

part of the hierarchal system of signage is the entry signs on campus, and the smallest is the room numbering. The building and informational signs in buildings would be placed in the lobby or entry way of buildings. They would have information about the floors, or the configuration of floor plans for the building, including where major departmental groupings were, room numbers, stairwells, handicap accessible areas, exits and access points to the building and would also help you navigate between buildings that might be connected. There would be two versions. One for historical buildings (bronze with silver) and modern (silver with bronze accessories).

The sign is designed to allow changing the inserts without disengaging the standoffs or the metal fixtures. The large sign is for buildings with multiple floors or multiple informational areas and located in the main entry lobby. The inserts would be administered by Facilities to ensure consistency. Facilities would make sure restrooms, ADA entrances, major classrooms and departmental head offices are noted on the inserts.

There was concern from Staff Senate about branding efforts. It was pointed out that the MSU logo has changed over the years and the stacked MSU is on building signs already. Cost was also questioned. System cost would be about \$1,200 for the bigger sign and \$900-\$1,000 for the smaller ones. The glass makes it more expensive, but it's also more durable. With the flexibility of the system, there is no need to pay someone every time a new floor plan is inserted. This saves time and money, and wear and tear on the signs. The intent is for the signs to become a campus standard to be installed in conjunction with new and major maintenance including building renumbering.

Tom Stump moved to approve the Prototypical Building Informational Signage. Joe Thiel seconded the Motion and it was unanimously approved with no opposes or abstentions.

ITEM No. 6 – Recommendation - Campus Entry Signage PPA# 09-0159

Joe Bleehash presented an overview of the Campus Entry Signage, which is the second time the board will see the presentation for the campus entry sign to be located at College Street and 11th Avenue. The roundabout has a site prepared for the installation of the new campus entry sign. This sign is essentially the same shape and configuration that was presented to the board six months ago. The sign will be located at the southeast corner of the intersection and will sit between two earth and berms. The berms will serve to anchor both sides of the sign in the landscape. The side closest to the intersection is composed of a granite mass, which replicates the granite used at the Centennial Mall gates (S. 11th Avenue and North of Roberts Hall).

The original proposal was for a powder-coated steel back and stainless steel front panel. The current proposal is a toned down front panel to emphasize the natural elements (see attached drawing). The sign is approximately 40 feet long. The top of the "University" panel is about 4'8" off the ground and the "Montana State" panel is about 5'10". The bottom of the "University" letters is at about 3 ½' and 3-4" thick. The scale of the design fits well into the corner. The steel horizontal banding in front of the sign replicates the fences of Montana. Lighting would be behind the "University" panel and would illuminate "Montana State." The letters would be a dimensional style letter made out of cast metal or dye cut metal and affixed to the front panel of the sign along with the University Seal. The change is the material on the front panel from metal to stone to connect with other elements on campus.

The final material selection will be made by the architect from Place Architecture once the design has been approved. It is about \$175,000 for total project cost and is within the budget established for the project. Landscape around the entry sign would resemble vegetation planted within the roundabout circle for visual connection to the campus. The design is intended to be iconic and timeless while making a statement of arrival to Montana State University.

Kurt Blunk moved to approve the Campus Entry Signage. Mandy Hanson seconded the Motion and it was unanimously approved with no opposes or abstentions.

This meeting was adjourned at 4:58 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