

**MEETING NOTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD
March 22, 2012
(Rescheduled from March 13th due to Spring Break)**

- Members Present:** Joe Fedock – Chair, Walt Banziger – Vice Chair, James Becker, Kurt Blunck, Jeff Butler, Lisa Duffey for Jacobsen, Michael Everts, Mandy Hansen, Linda LaCrone for McCoy, Patricia Lane, Bob Lashaway, Tom Stump, Joseph Thiel – ASMSU, James Thull, Brenda York
- Proxy:** Jim Rimpau carried by Tom Stump, Ritchie Boyd carried by Walt Banziger, Allyson Bristol carried by Lindsey Klino
- Members Absent:** Allen Yarnell
- Guests:** Timothy Eddy-Hennebery Eddy Architects, Ben Lloyd-Comma-Q Architecture, Billy Dubois-Registrar office, Susan Dana-CoB, Marc Giullian-CoB, Frank Kerins-CoB, Alan Kahn-CoB Advisory Board, Joe Bleehash-FPDC, Candace Mastel-FPDC, Jillian Bowers-FPDC, Aaron Britton-FPDC, Christian Black-FPDC, Nate Jeppson-CoB, Shenae Stensaas-CoB student, Janel Acheson-MSU Bookstore, Katie Harman-MSU Bookstore, Katherine Zimmerman-MSU Staff, Kathleen Kavanaugh-Hennebery Eddy Architects, Kim Everts-Comma-Q Architecture, Jon McGrew-Hennebery Eddy Architects, Cliff Garness-Stetter Construction, Renee Douthit-Admissions, Heather Wofford-Admissions, Chelsey Wilson-Admissions, Dennis Raffensperger, FPDC, Nathan Newell-student, Kevin Thane-Staff Senate, Hugo Schmidt-Physics, Gail Schontzler-Bozeman Chronicle, Russ Katherman-State A&E Division, Joe Triem-State A&E Division, Bill Mackin-FPDC, Victoria Drummond-MSU Planner, Laura Black-CoB, Daniel Hodun-Residence Hall Association, Lindsey Klino-FPDC

The University Facilities Planning Board met in SUB 235 for public exposure beginning at 3:00 pm to discuss the following:

ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes

Thull moved to approve the meeting notes from February 28, 2012. York 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 – MSU LMP Website Location

This item will be presented at the next meeting.

ITEM No. 4 – Recommendation – College of Business

Banziger presented a summary of the site selection and design process for the College of Business, which started in January. A Building Committee was created along with several workgroups and a site committee. They started by looking at the Long Range Campus Development Plan (LRCDP). Within the first meeting they narrowed down all the sites presented in the LRCDP down to seven sites and then in a subsequent meeting narrowed it down to three sites. Several public forums were also held.

The design team is Ben Lloyd of Comma-Q Architecture in Bozeman partnered with Tim Eddy of Hennebery Eddy Architects in Portland. Using PowerPoint Lloyd presented four project goals: 1) create a community of professionals; 2) the creation of knowledge and the exchanges of ideas; 3) a celebration of its place; and 4) smart multiple uses. The criteria used to evaluate the sites are: planning and policy, multi-modal and user access, experience and environment, staging the action, and utilities and energy. The three final sites are: south of Grant (red), east of Hamilton Hall (green), and north of Wilson Hall (blue). They have proposed a 14,000 sq. ft. footprint. The south of Grant site is where the pay lot is, and is main parking for visitors to the SUB. The east of Hamilton Hall site is the most constricted of the three sites. The site to the east is reserved for the Native American Student Center. It is on the Centennial Mall which is a great staging and action component. The third site north of Wilson Hall is also near the Alumni Plaza and the Chemistry/Biochemistry Building.

The Building Committee was introduced: Susan Dana – Interim Dean of the College of Business, Frank Kerins – Faculty at the College of Business, Alan Kahn – Advisory Board for the College of Business, and Russ Katherman – State A&E Division.

Eddy presented the analysis of each of the sites. The Site Selection Committee provided pros and cons for each site. **Cons for the south of Grant site are:** it's not currently an academic area, it's a public pay lot (displaced parking), not in primary student circulation, on the edge of the academic core, and a busy street crossing. **The pros are:** it's close to the SUB, library and Gym, good access to parking, good relationship to public transit, good relationship to the outside community, great proximity to EPS, back of building could be more accessible for service, geothermal opportunity is abundant, room for expansion, and it helps reinforce a secondary university entrance. There is a building on this site on the LRCDP. It has the potential to create a well defined open space. Most of the academic part of campus can be reached within a ten minute walk. There is good proximity to parking and a bus stop. It has good solar access from a sustainable design standpoint. It has good views. It's close to the Fieldhouse, Romney Gym, and a significant campus entry, which links to the community. It's close to a campus utility tunnel. It's a flat site so it makes construction simpler. Parking will need to be replaced. It's farthest from the Leon Johnson cooling plant.

Cons for the east of Hamilton site are: the space is constrained so there is limited expansion opportunity, VIP parking would need to be relocated, it limits dedicated parking availability, geothermal is more difficult, "back door" access is more difficult, it could encroach on Danforth Chapel and Iris Garden, and difficult community and city access. **The pros are:** it has a front door to Centennial Mall, it's the most central site, engineering and SUB proximity is prime, close to center of campus activity, proximity to Montana Hall, outdoor space opportunities, established landscape, and close to the utility tunnel system. There is a building on this site on the LRCDP. It's within the core of campus and increases the density of the core. It could serve to reinforce already established outdoor space. From a pedestrian standpoint, it's about a ten minute walk to most academic places. It is a little further away from the major thoroughfares and bike lanes. A bus stop is nearby, but parking is greater than a five minute walk away. It has good solar access. There are more close urban views of the core of campus. The historic part of the Student Union and the back of Roberts Hall can be seen. It supports open spaces and is close to historic buildings and active spaces. It's right on a utility tunnel. The site is flat so there isn't much site prep. High value parking will need to be replaced. There is proximity to Leon Johnson Hall, but is questionable if it's close enough.

Cons for the north of Wilson Hall site are: more grading is required, requires stand alone computer lab and food service, mature trees are likely to be impacted, skateboard thoroughfare, and poor visibility from Centennial Mall. **The pros are:** good utility tunnel access, good access to parking, convenient to Columbo's, reinforces the gateway on S. 8th Street, close to residence halls, enhances ceremony to Montana Hall, reinforces significant open space (Bobcat Plaza), and new "front door" to city/campus opportunity. It's on the LRCDP and is within the dense core of campus. It will help to reinforce the open spaces. It's a little more than a five minute walk to the SUB and library, ten minutes to the pay lot and fifteen minutes out further. There is potential flexibility with the parking nearby. It's not far from transit. It has good solar access. There are views to the Bridges. It's close to a future drop-off on 8th and Cleveland. Part of the building would be exposed to Montana Hall. Is further from Centennial Mall and is focused on the future open space. It's close to the utility tunnel and also has potential to utilize Leon Johnson's utility resource. There is more site prep as there are trees to deal with and a slope. Student resident parking will be minimally impacted.

Fedock opened up the conversation first to UFPB members. Thull questioned why the north of Wilson site would require food services. Dana pointed out that it's highly desirable, rather than required, to serve that end of campus and to draw people into the building. It could create additional social space. The thought is small, local service and extended hours.

Rimpau questioned what UFPB was supposed to decide on. Fedock read from the staff report that the charge is a "recommendation regarding appropriateness of suggested site options." It's not intended to provide any ordering of any site, but to provide an assessment of the Board's collective view of the strengths and weaknesses of any given site. The President's expectation is that the Board assesses the appropriateness of each of the sites and provides that assessment in an unranked basis.

Rimpau questioned the mass of the building compared to Hamilton Hall. The mass is larger than Hamilton Hall and about the size of Animal Bioscience.

York questioned how the slope would be affected on the north of Wilson Hall site. It's unlikely to affect the major sidewalk. There wouldn't be a direct impact on the slope going up if a walkway around the building or patio space was created that would transition into the bottom and then come to the top to allow the 1:12 slope.

p:\ufpb\meeting notes\2012 meeting notes\3 march\meeting notes 3-22-2012.docx

Fedock questioned the cost associated with parking at the different sites. More parking would be disturbed at the south of Grant site so the cost would be higher. There is a premium on the spaces near Hamilton Hall so that might come into play when those spaces are taken away. The cost might be higher because of the revenue loss to parking for those spaces. Banziger advised that every site has a building scheduled for it and whatever building takes site, it's responsible for the financial impact of that site. If this building did go near Hamilton Hall, it would have to pay whatever the value is of that parking site to the parking operation. Everts added that LRCDP identified these sites as building sites but not necessarily for this specific building.

Hansen questioned if there is a plan, such as parking under the building or surface parking, to replace any lost parking. Parking under the building could be designed in, but it would be very expensive. There hasn't been discussion on where parking would go. Banziger mentioned that the project wouldn't replace the parking; it would put the money into the fund for parking to determine where it will be replaced. Blunck also mentioned about 300 spaces go unused every day. York questioned the loss of ADA spaces. The response was approximately 12 ADA spaces would be lost in the Hamilton lot and two in the pay lot. The most significant loss of ADA spaces would be in the Hamilton lot because of the limited places to replace those.

Theil questioned if the planned buildings in the LRCDP were designated to be academic or non-academic. The LRCDP does not define specifics of buildings other than a very few specific ones. It is left open and meant to look into the future and be adaptable. The only ones specifically identified were: the Native American Student Center, the indoor practice facility and three locations for parking garages. Neighborhoods were defined, such as the Arts and Architecture Neighborhood, but were also very loosely defined. It has also designated residential. Thull mentioned that two of the buildings are defining what might be new academic building defining corridors and suggested thinking about the placement of the building and that it will determine which of those corridors will be developed first. The pay lot may not be the logical place to have earlier construction of an academic corridor and the intent is to increase the density of the core of campus first.

Blunck questioned if the donor has a preference of location. Jake Jabs has not expressed preference.

Hansen questioned the removal of older trees north of Wilson. Banziger replied that to make it LEED Silver certified it will follow LEED criteria, along with the Landscape Mater Plan. Some trees have reached they're useful life expectancy and will eventually have to be taken down. The intent is to try to minimize the impact as much as possible.

LaCrone questioned if there would be an increase in traffic at the north of Wilson site. When the site was considered for a parking garage several years ago, the community wasn't happy about the extra traffic it would cause. The parking garage was going to be four levels with 600 spaces. The building will increase traffic, but not like the garage. There wouldn't be more street traffic, but bike, pedestrian and skateboard traffic would increase.

Stump mentioned the SUB is the most used building on campus and disagrees with pushing parking further away from the most public building. Thull agrees as the library is the second most used building. The paid lot is an important connection to the community. A lot of colleges would also have that concern. Banziger mentioned the LRCDP does include locations for parking garages and will relieve some of the pressure.

Fedock opened the discussion to the public.

Toni Lee with Conference Services and the SUB did not want the pay lot used for the site and advised that once the connection with the public is severed it's very hard to reestablish that connection. If the public is pushed back and they stop coming it would be difficult to reestablish that connection. As a land grant university it is important to consider the public's use of the campus community.

Hugo Schmidt mentioned that in the winter it would be bad to push the public farther away by using the pay lot. He had hoped the pay lot would eventually be covered with solar panels, and hopes the new building will have solar panels.

Katherine Zimmerman from AIRO (American Indian Research Opportunities) questioned if the north of Wilson site could be moved north to the flat area in order to maintain the landscaped area. She also mentioned it may be more cost effective to move it north and leave that steep area as is. Fedock also questioned if there is a middle ground as an acceptable site or a reason why one site was further to the south and one was further to the north and if the associated cost and slope factors were explored. The programs would be more successful if the building was as close as possible to the core of campus. In order to

design with sustainable principles, in terms of orientation, it is possible that some trees would be lost, but they would be replaced and a good outdoor space would be created for the long term of the university. There is some initial loss, but some very long term gains. If it was pushed to the north, cost would be less associated with the hill and more associated with replacing the parking. Putting the building between the north and south sites would make that area unusable for future expansion.

Alan Kahn from the College of Business Advisory Board as well as the Site Selection Committee and Building Committee mentioned he would eliminate the Hamilton site as far as public access goes. It would make it worse for anyone to access other than students and faculty, and there's no room for expansion. In terms of parking, a parking facility close to the south of Grant site could be built and funded with revenue bonds and that should be explored. He also thinks every day access is equally important for consideration.

Daniel Hodun, member of the Residence Hall Association, has concerns with the north of Wilson site. Currently students spend 30 minutes to an hour to find spaces in E lots. He was curious as to where more E parking would go. Blunck advised that there are a lot of vacant spaces, even though they are further away. He also mentioned that the lots need to be used as efficiently as possible.

Hansen questioned if the majority of classrooms will be used for the College of Business classes. The hope is to teach the vast majority of students in the new building.

Shenae Stensaas, a College of Business student and also a resident of Hapner Hall, was concerned about losing parking and having to park across S. 11th Ave. Coming back late at night she would need to have a campus police escort walk her to her hall.

Blunck questioned building a parking structure with a bond. He questioned whether the bond would be paid for by the university or by parking. Lashaway advised that it would be paid by parking and there is interest in raising permits for a parking structure.

Fedock suggested that all the sites be considered as appropriate options for consideration. Lashaway moved to approve. Lane seconded the Motion. Thull opposed the south of Grant site and Everts opposed the east of Hamilton site. Stump recommended that a poll be taken for each site rather than all three sites. Members could vote on the appropriateness of each site, and could vote for all three or none.

Becker stated in order to make a meaningful decision, he needed to know what the building would look like for \$25 Million. The building will be between 40,000 and 50,000 sq. ft. and three stories. The Animal Bioscience Building is the closest to that size.

Fedock withdrew the original collective vote for all the sites. He changed it to be a vote on the appropriateness of each individual site for consideration by the President as suggested by Stump. He would like the board to consider more than one site as being appropriate.

The vote for the appropriateness of each site (with proxy a total of 18 votes possible):
South of Grant site: 10 in favor
East of Hamilton site: 11 in favor
North of Wilson site: 16 in favor.

This meeting was adjourned at 4:45 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

p:\ufpb\meeting notes\2012 meeting notes\3 march\meeting notes 3-22-2012.docx