

**MEETING NOTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD
April 10, 2012**

- Members Present:** Joe Fedock – Chair, Walt Banziger - Vice Chair, James Becker, Kurt Blunck, Ritchie Boyd, Allyson Bristor, Jeff Butler, Lisa Duffey for Jeff Jacobsen, Troy Duker – ASMSU, Michael Everts, Mandy Hansen, Linda LaCrone for McCoy, Patricia Lane, Bob Lashaway for Terry Leist, Jim Rimpau, Tom Stump, Jim Thull, Brenda York
- Proxy:** Michael Everts carried by Walt Banziger for Item No. 6
- Members Absent:** Allen Yarnell
- Guests:** Mike Code, Susan Dana, Josh De Weese, Jim Dolan, Victoria Drummond, Billy Dubois, Tracy Ellig, Robert Putzke, Dennis Raffensperger

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

ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes

Stump moved to approve the meeting notes from March 22, 2012 and March 27, 2012. Butler seconded the Motion. The meeting notes were approved unanimously. Victoria Drummond indicated correction proxy vote for McCoy on March 27, 2012 notes.

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 – Sidewalk Replacement between Cooley Lab and Lewis Hall

Cecilia Vaniman, project manager, presented an overview of the proposed replacement of the sidewalk on the south side of Cooley Lab. Currently, the sidewalk comes to three steps and then goes up to a landing that connects Cooley Lab and Lewis Hall. During the demolition a storm drain that went into Cooley Lab was found broken and collapsed. It has been excavated out and the sidewalk was cut to bring the new drain across. The sidewalk is sinking in some areas, heaving in others, tree roots are above ground, and the edging on the stairs is deteriorating and rusted away. Dick Anderson Construction is already working in the area so this is the opportune time to replace the sidewalk and take care of the issues with a contractor already on board. It is proposed to replace the sidewalk and have a ramp instead of steps. With the sidewalk coming up more dirt can go over the top of the tree roots. This was presented to Facilities Services and Butler has agreed to fund the money needed to do the work. It will cost approximately \$22,500. Dick Anderson Construction will already be in the area to do some restoration work so Facilities will pay them to do this while they're there. Lashaway moved to approve the replacement of the sidewalk and brick retaining walls at the entrance to the Cooley/Lewis connecting corridor and reconfigure the area to have no external steps and provide more soil coverage over the existing tree roots. Stump seconded the Motion and it was unanimously approved.

ITEM No. 5 – Recommendation – Family & Graduate Housing – Proposed Demolition of 50 Single-Family Units

Dennis Raffensperger presented a proposal to remove 50 of the small individual family graduate housing units. The houses from Deer Street to College Avenue are proposed to be removed as well as miscellaneous houses elsewhere. This is part of the energy performance contract work currently being done for Auxiliaries. There are two reasons for this removal: 1) many of the units are obsolete, structurally deficient, built with asbestos containing materials, and have lead paint; 2) for energy performance, since none of the units can be shut off from the main heating source and vacated units are heated all winter or the piping will burst. Removing 50 units will be a significant savings to Auxiliaries. It will save the energy required to heat those units in the winter time even though they are not occupied. The miscellaneous ones are being removed because they are structurally deficient. Approximately 90 units will be left. The streets and piping will be pulled out and it will return back to a grass field and then into academic buildings according to the Long Range Campus Development Plan. The project will cost approximately \$1.2 Million and a substantial part of that will go to removing the asbestos and lead paint. There will

p:\ufpb\meeting notes\2012 meeting notes\4 april\meeting notes 4-10-2012.docx

be approximately \$100,000 per year cost savings in energy. The energy performance contractor is scheduled to start demolition in May. Currently 50 houses are vacant. Some are being occupied and those people are being moved into vacant houses in the rest of the area. The majority of the houses have been vacated for a decade.

Victoria Drummond relayed the submitted information to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) demonstrating that these are not designated as Heritage Property under the State Heritage Property Record Requirements. Based on Walt Banziger's review of the Board of Regents policy, it is the President with the Board of Regents who declare Heritage Properties. UFPB would be recommending that the President designate these properties as Heritage or not. Then recommend that they be demolished and that there would be no adverse effect only if there is no consideration to pursue them as Heritage Property. If UFPB concurs with Facilities that these do not offer Heritage value to this campus, that recommendation would be made to the President, and if the President also concurs, then we would move forward with the second recommendation to demolish them. If UFPB feels they are Heritage and the President and Commissioner of Higher Education concurs with that, then they will go to the Board of Regents for permission to remove them. By state law anything over 50 years of age is eligible for Heritage Property status and these were constructed on site from 1955 through 1959.

Lashaway moved to recommends that these buildings are not now designated Heritage Properties and do not contribute Heritage value to the campus, and therefore the President not pursue Heritage status with these buildings. Butler seconded the Motion.

Bristor expressed that the Board doesn't have enough information to determine whether or not they are Heritage Property. Raffensperger pointed out that the only changes to the buildings were the siding and windows. They have not been substantively altered or upgraded. There is no evidence that they were moved onto the site. SHPO has asked that we provide mitigation. Thorough documentation of the property through photographs, floor plans, and a public display documenting the original condition if that original condition is being altered would be provided. If the majority or all of the units were removed there would be a display talking about their historical nature of time during the large post-war population booming onto campus, but since only a third are being demolished it is not the time to create a permanent display as the majority of the units are still there. When more of them are removed, that display would be warranted in the university's and public's interest. Two thirds of the structures are remaining in place and the character of that grouping is maintained at this point. It's the group of structures that carry the potential Heritage value. Even if these aren't designated Heritage Properties mitigation by way of documentation for a public display could be considered now or in the future. Everts questioned what documentation exists right now. Drummond indicated there is a 40 page Property Record; Raffensperger indicated no original construction documentation exists.

The Motion is that UFPB recommends that these buildings are not now designated Heritage Properties and do not contribute Heritage value to the campus, and therefore the President not pursue Heritage status with these buildings as two parts of the Motion, and adding "While the total number of house units will be reduced by demolishing 50 units; the remaining 87 house units appear to exhibit identical construction style materials and materials of those scheduled for demolition and thereby preserves the opportunity to pursue Heritage Property registration, if so inclined." The vote to recommend to not pursue Heritage designation:

Yes: 17
No: 1 - Bristor

Stump then moved that if the President does not pursue Heritage designation, UFPB recommends demolition of these designated units. Blunk seconded the Motion. The vote:

Yes: 16
No: 2 - Bristor and York

ITEM No. 6 – Recommendation - Public Art Committee

Jim Thull and Victoria Drummond presented the proposed sculpture gift of Black Elk by Jim Dolan. Thull explained there was a split vote where the majority of the Public Art Committee (PAC) members voted not to accept the Black Elk sculpture. The primary concerns were they did not want overrepresentation by any one artist on campus and continue to issue the cost of installation. The majority of the PAC members also thought this was the strongest of the pieces offered by Dolan. Drummond added that the PAC vote is part of the information for UFPB to consider. Photographs of the piece were provided. It is a ten foot piece and depicts Black Elk, who is a Native American and his tribe roamed this part of the country. Walter Fleming, Director of Native American Studies, participated in the PAC meeting; his first comment was that it was a very striking piece and appreciated the continued generosity, as well as the PAC, but would like to be considering art by a

p:\ufpb\meeting notes\2012 meeting notes\4 april\meeting notes 4-10-2012.docx

Native American Artist. As part of the consideration Candace Mastel, a landscape designer in the Planning Department, looked at locations that might be considered. PAC briefly considered them, but due to the ongoing College of Business Site selection it was premature to pursue a site recommendation.

Jim Dolan presented a summary of his gift. He felt the campus was lacking in art of sculpture. He looked at the universal experience of “mountains and minds,” and believes people who come to this university should get more than a classroom education. He picked Black Elk because Black Elk tried to make a connection with the Holy Spirit or whatever it might be. Dolan does a lot of Native work, and even though he is not Native, he feels that Native students need something to welcome them here. He is also a catalyst to other sculptors and would have \$1,000 for a contest on campus for student sculpture. Currently, he has six pieces on campus. His idea is not to make the campus his gallery, but to enrich the lives of students, visitors and faculty. He’s trying to generate something that the campus hasn’t had.

Thull feels that additional public art on campus has the ability to attract other and varied forms of public art. He believes Black Elk has greater connections to campus than other pieces by Dolan. He also mentioned that one of the things Walter Fleming had spoke of was that students walking by Black Elk may have no recognition of who Black Elk was, and also had the idea of having a plaque to display the significance of Black Elk. Duker mentioned that the more public art the better in his opinion. As a public university he feels like the representation of a significant minority group on campus would be great. He also thought that the comment from Fleming about wishing that the piece was done by a Native American sounded like a hint of approval. If the piece had a Native American’s name attached to it, then that would make it acceptable.

Bristor questioned what the plan was for the PAC to get more representation. Drummond said we are recipients of the Montana Percent for Arts, and the Montana Art Council is considering art for two buildings. One is for providing a piece of art for Gaines Hall and one for the Animal Bioscience Building. Law requires that the art be in proximity to those two buildings. The PAC does not have a funding stream or any mechanism in place to commission art. Lashaway mentioned the campus is in no way saturated with art and Dolan has put his effort behind his ideas of how we can get some pieces on campus. It’s not self-serving as he is an advocate for the local artist community, so in the future this can possibly take off. There are very few people offering to put art on campus. Lashaway also mentioned that what Dolan has presented with each piece is that they each have a different message, a different thought process and elicit different responses. Banziger wondered if the PAC could partner with the Foundation to solicit donations, but work to get other art on campus as part of their charge.

York questioned if there was going to be an educational plaque explaining Black Elk. Dolan said he would do one, but Lashaway advised that the university should look at that and coordinate it with Native American Studies. Banziger said it is part of the way-finding package. Currently in development is educational signage. Josh De Weese felt this piece is a political issue, not just because the artist isn’t Native, but because of one artist continually gifting works to MSU for display. As a public institution we’re continuing to have the same artist represented on the campus and Facilities is paying the bill. He suggests taking that money and putting it into a fund for a competition. Lashaway said Facilities would find funds to install the artwork.

Lashaway moved to accept the piece of art, and ask planning come back with a recommendation for the site. Bristor seconded the Motion.

The vote:

Yes: 13 (Everts by Proxy)

No: 3 – Hansen, York, Fedock

Abstain: 2 – Thull, Becker

ITEM No. 7 – Recommendation - Campus – NE Sector Parking Issues

Lashaway wanted UFPB to be aware that the College of Business Building sites affect parking in a way that it will have to be restored if it goes on the pay lot site or on the north site. In 2005, UFPB recommended a parking garage. It failed for lack of student support. At this point, if the north site is selected, the university should consider the issues of residence halls parking as well as increased pressure from the new building. They have met with several of the residence hall associations and will meet with ASMSU, faculty senate, staff senate and professional council. They have presented it to the Vice Presidents. They are trying to see if there is consensus that this parking garage move along at the same time as the College of Business Building, particularly related to the north site. The site selection is expected later this week. If it goes on the south site they will be dealing with parking in some manner also. It will be reviewed at the next UFPB meeting on April 24th for a recommendation because the Board of Regent’s item would have to go into the Board of Regents on April 27th.

p:\ufpb\meeting notes\2012 meeting notes\4 april\meeting notes 4-10-2012.docx

There will be issues of how to pay for it, and it will increase parking fees by around \$30, which might be an issue for some faculty and staff. It could be an issue for some commuters. In 2005, commuters were not very concerned or receptive about the problems the residence halls had in the northeast sector of campus. Most of those residents are female the recent incidents have changed some of the landscape. Also, in seven years, more buildings and more students have changed some of the perspective. Lashaway mentioned a recent survey indicated about 78% of the students were in favor of paying \$25 or more per permit to support a parking garage on campus.

In two weeks UFPB would make a recommendation to the President. Becker was concerned about not knowing where the site would be and making an educated decision in that short period of time. Thull advised that a parking garage is not the only alternative. There are several universities with remote lots. This university has a lot of property and if it had a remote lot a shuttle could run every 15 minutes between that remote lot and campus. It would save a huge amount of money over a parking garage. Lashaway said this is an issue that has been a problem for the campus for a lot of years and we don't want to miss the opportunity to revisit that. If it comes out that those students don't get a parking garage in that area that's ok. The desire among the student population is significantly higher now than it was seven years ago. Blunk mentioned there are two parking forums next week, one on Wednesday at 12:00 pm in the Procrastinator and Thursday at 5:00 pm in SUB 233.

This meeting was adjourned at 5:03 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