

**MEETING NOTES OF THE  
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD  
February 28, 2012**

- Members Present:** Joe Fedock – Chair, Walt Banziger - Vice Chair, James Becker, Kurt Blunck, Ritchie Boyd, Jeff Butler, Victoria Drummond, Mandy Hansen, Patricia Lane, Bob Lashaway, Tom Stump, James Thull, Brenda York
- Proxy:** Allyson Bristor, Michael Everts, Tom McCoy
- Members Absent:** Jeff Jacobsen, Martha Potvin, Jim Rimpau, Troy Duker – ASMSU, Allen Yarnell
- Guests:** Tammie Brown, Chase Cardoza – student, Debbie Drews, Greg Hebner, E.J. Hook, Tim Meldrun, Dennis Raffensperger, Lauren Sherman-Boemker – student

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

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

Banziger moved to approve the meeting notes from February 28, 2012. Thull 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**

No items.

**ITEM No. 4 – Recommendation –North Hedges Suites Building 3**

Debbie Drews introduced the third resident suites building located adjacent to North Hedges and the SOB Barn and principal architect Tim Meldrun of Schlenker & McKittrick Architects and Greg Hebner of Jackson Contractor Group who is the appointed construction manager. Meldrun presented an overview of the conceptual and schematic design proposal. LEED Silver is target with the possibility of LEED Gold. They performed a study of wind implication and propose landscape strategies to mitigate the wind tunnel effect through North Hedges tower and existing suites. They are designing to vehicle circulation, pedestrian circulation, the way water is treated on the site and important areas on the site. The oval will be further developed and integrated with the suites, North Hedges and the new facility as much as possible and adapt to the student circulation. The oval will also create a gathering and activity space. The window to the Bridgers was a significant design goal. The north side of the building will be more academic while the south side will be more residential feeling. The primary entrance is on the south side and the formal entrance is on the north side for great prominence in developing the area according to the LRCDP. More work still has to be done on the north elevation. Currently the mechanical room is at the lower northwest corner and may be revisited with design ideas along with the dumpster area and a service drive for the building and SOB Barn. The layouts are traditional for residence halls, public amenity spaces and suites. On the east end the first level has a community kitchen and community living room; the second, third and fourth levels have study lounges with a laptop bar facing out; and the top level has a sky lounge with the view to the Bridgers. The two main entrances have a ramp that complies with ADA. There is an ADA unit available for each type of unit and a Jack and Jill concept of suites. Each is on every floor and all the units are adaptable to be ADA. Living spaces are also wheel chair accessible.

The building was moved about five feet to the north to help expose the SOB Barn, refining it with tree design and establishing the right planting to frame that view. A contextual reference will be established with materials. It will be brick with white accent material for a formal, clean residential feeling to adapt to. It will have punched openings mixed with floor to ceiling glazing. The east elevation window wall has rhythm lines that relate to the SOB Barn. Fedock questioned what the concept was behind the circular plaza and how it would be used. It is to provide a place that gives students a gathering area and is a focal point to increase the use of the oval. It will also be used in the summer time for conferences. North of the building will become an academic front of campus. The LRCDP has Garfield becoming a double loaded boulevard roadway with a drop-off circle, which will become a formal entry. So the building is important in the future development of this area and a circle drive.

This is a four story building with a fifth story mezzanine penthouse and mechanical area. It is a transition in height and design for the towers and suites. They are investigating the idea of using a solar thermal panel to help heat water systems and offset utility costs. The heating system being looked at is geothermal. The North Hedges Tower shields the building in the summer mornings for all but one hour of the intense sun. So there isn't a lot of cooling load. In the winter time the sun is low enough it's not going to impact it.

Fedock questioned thought process behind the flat roof structure and architects responded that multiple roof pitches were studied. The mixture of academic with residential was one driving force regarding using a flat roof. There was also talk of the pitched roofs not being respectful enough to be that important of a building. Plaza urban student housing is driven more toward a flat roof. Student Chase expressed that the pitched roof is not desirable to students, it looks old fashioned and more like a house than college living. Raffensperger mentioned that since it's taller than the other suites, putting a pitched roof on it would make it really tall. The building is a transition from the original two Hedges Suites to urban residential and the academic side of campus. Stump mentioned students view Hedges Suites one and two as old and out of date buildings because of the residential feel.

Laptop bars are part of the construction. Boyd offered a prediction that they will be torn out in five years due to student devices being more mobile and the batteries lasting longer. He advised that the bar be made easy to take out and that a lot of the same functionality can be accomplished with furniture, which is a lot more flexible. Meldrun talked about the bar being flexible, narrow, and ADA friendly. It creates a datum along the glazing so it can go from an electronic bar to something people can stand at and experience the room better. It will be plain finished wood with a front to it and 14 inches deep. It can be used for laptops, mobile devices or to spread out a book and read.

Blunck questioned if there is a unified architectural theme in the Campus Master Plan. Banziger answered as detailed in the LRCDP this campus is "eclectic" and respecting each era of development on the campus representing the history and ideals of the campus at the time. Every building is intended to be different. There is continuity in materials such as brick, glass, etc. Blunck said the building doesn't say "Montana." Dennis mentioned if you look at Animal Bioscience, CBB and Gaines Hall, they all have pitched roofs with large overhangs supported by metal outriggers of some sort. There's a concern that as you expand that and look at the way that that reflects the architecture in our larger community over the last 10-15 years is a datable design aesthetic. Taken as a whole it goes back to large overhanging roof forms with steel supports are possibly a phenomenon of the first decade of this century, looked at 30 years from now. He questioned whether we want to continue that on our campus as a design aesthetic and then where we would go with that. He also mentioned this campus wants to be launching students into the larger world and do we may not do them any favors, or do the university any favors, by being somewhat provincial in our architectural design. Blunck feels MSU should create a Montana architecture identity. Banziger pointed out that it should have a difference from those other buildings because it is being built two decades later. Students were asked that question and came back wanting it to be different. Students believe this is what they are today. Banziger moved to approve the concept design to move forward with the materials, color selections, service area & mechanical room to come back. Stump seconded the motion. The vote:

Yes:	14 – including the proxy votes of Bristor, Everts and McCoy
No:	0
Abstain:	1 – Blunck

#### **ITEM No. 5 – Recommendation – AJMJ Student Computer Lab**

Walt Banziger and Tom Morrison of ITC requested the Classroom Committee commit \$40,000 of the \$1.5 million Classroom Renovation Fund to renovate AJMJ 221, which is an ITC lab that would become a multi function ITC lab or a contemporary classroom. The terms and conditions are agreed upon between the Registrar, ITC and the Provost office. The Provost will support the funding of the room on the condition that the scheduling reverted from ITC to the Registrar. ITC agreed to schedule the room through the Registrar as long as the scheduling was to the highest use of the room. Some time would also be scheduled as "open" and a monitor would be there during that time, which is a philosophical change to the current operation of scheduling.

The lab represents an opportunity to move forward with having a high tech facility that will be reconfigurable. It has an elevated floor to allow configuring the network and the wiring completely flexible. The slope into the room is ADA. The furniture is also flexible. There are two basic functions: one is to come in as an instructor and be able to have all the students sitting down at a network computer, and the other use is for students to come in on a free form use and sit in groups and collaborate with large tables and small tables. There will be one or two screens on the wall to move towards the idea of an active learning classroom.

ITC got their approval from CFAC that would clear up the balance of the budget of the \$120,000 that ITC was looking for for this classroom. They will have \$60,000 of their own, \$20,000 from CFAC and the \$40,000 from the Classroom Renovation Fund. Lashaway moved to approve the \$40,000 of the Classroom Renovation Funds to be contributed to the project. Stump seconded the Motion and it was unanimously approved with no opposes or abstentions. FPDC will forward the recommendation to the President.

**ITEM No. 6 – Discussion – Academic R&R Fund Process**

Drummond indicated that this was requested as an agenda item by Butler. Butler reminded everyone that he’s quickly running out of time to make a project for this summer and would like to use R&R funds. Hansen mentioned when the last project was approved, she got a lot of back lash from staff senate. It wasn’t that they didn’t approve of the project, they disapproved that UFPB moved forward with committing funds without a process in place. Drummond mentioned that the minutes from the last meeting said UFPB would come back together and come up with a process that could go on and be approved so when requests come in there are metrics and something to follow, and that draft is not yet completed. Lashaway mentioned the choice would be to approve another project or stop and not do anything until the process is complete. Lashaway suggested that Butler bring his request and lay it on the table to be discussed. Banziger mentioned he has a preliminary idea that he will work out in more detail and bring a proposal to UFPB for consideration. It is based on the Space Management process. Lashaway advised that if the fund was solicited, too many ideas would come back of where to spend the money. Banziger mentioned it was limited to the vice president so that it is filtered down.

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

VCD:lk

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