

**MEETING NOTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD
May 22, 2012**

- Members Present:** Joe Fedock – Chair, Kurt Blunck, Ritchie Boyd for Martha Potvin, Allyson Bristor, Jeff Butler, Mandy Hansen, Patricia Lane, Bob Lashaway for Terry Leist, Tom Stump, Brenda York
- Proxy:** Walt Banziger, Tom McCoy and Jim Thull carried by Victoria Drummond; Jim Rimpau carried by Tom Stump
- Members Absent:** James Becker, Michael Everts, Jeff Jacobsen, Troy Duker – ASMSU, Allen Yarnell
- Guests:** Aaron Britton, Billy Dubois

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

ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes

Butler moved to approve the meeting notes from April 24, 2012 and May 8, 2012. Stump 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 ADDED – Informational – AJM Johnson 221 Computer Lab

Aaron Britton presented an overview of the AJM Johnson 221 Computer Lab project. The old GIS lab will be remodeled into a new modular lab and upgraded similar to Rooms 222 and 224, which were done last year. This will be a test model for future computer labs. There will be increased visibility to the lab. It will have a new entrance and the existing one will be closed off. It will have a new furniture layout. A new print station will be where the old entry was. The south side of the room will be a fixed type of area with computers where students can collaborate. There will be standard level tables as well as a standing height table. The tables can also be moved in the future if needed. There will be a raised floor system in order to bring modularity to the room. It gives the versatility to change the location of power and data in the floor. The raised floor is made up of 2' x 2' panels and will be left as a concrete finish. There will be a screen on the east wall with seats in front of it for students to practice presentations. Lounge chairs will be on the north side of the room and the tables will have a power strip on them. White boards will be available for students to use and move anywhere in the room. There will be wired and wireless connections. The room will be scheduled by the Registrar and will be open when it's not scheduled. It will have cat card access and will be operational for fall.

ITEM No. 4 – Recommendation – Tobacco Free Campus Transition Plan: Signage

Victoria Drummond presented an overview of the Tobacco Free Campus Signage. The University created a policy to be a tobacco free campus with an effective date of August 1, 2012. A task force group met to review signage for the program that included Facilities, Student Health and Communications. Jenny Haubenreiser, Student Health Department, has been the contact for the policy and has helped people get connected with smoke cessation packages. She was also instrumental in getting some grant money for the program, but it does not cover signage. To inform those entering the campus, Facilities will install perimeter signage. The task force group identified ten perimeter locations for the 12" x 18" and will come from a company that is already providing signage for other MUS campuses. Julie Kipfer, Communications, requested to design the sign (Facilities provided some prototypes) and since it is not yet decided, the final design will come back to UFPB. The basic goal of the sign is to announce entry to a tobacco free campus with a brief but positive message. Other signage for the interior of the campus will be considered later as areas emerge as 'hot spots' requiring additional education/awareness of the policy. Being sensitive to visual pollutions – the perimeter signs will be added to existing sign poles where appropriate. The goal is

p:\ufpb\meeting notes\2012 meeting notes\5 may\meeting notes 05-22-2012.docx

to have the signs posted by the effective date of the policy. Facilities Services will fund the signage with maintenance money. Butler moved to approve the perimeter signage locations. Boyd seconded the Motion. The vote:

Yes 13
No 1 - Blunck

ITEM No. 5 – Discussion – DRAFT – Procedures for Evaluating Heritage Property

Victoria Drummond presented an overview of draft procedures for evaluating Heritage Property. We need a set of procedures to follow when evaluating changes to Heritage Property on campus so that everyone at MSU knows the process and so that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) is aware of MSU's plan to preserve the Heritage qualities of our buildings when possible and after alternatives and mitigation is considered. SHPO has expressed an outcome of effective procedures is so that when buildings are significantly altered or removed that there is something for the public (including first time visitors and alumni visiting the campus) to see and discover that connects them to what originally existed at that site or of the building. We are a dynamic campus but we are also a collection of the state's heritage. As part of recent demolition and renovations project, SHPO has expressed understanding that changes need to be made to university buildings, but would like MSU to document and publicly display the original view of the area as part of a set of evaluating heritage property procedures. SHPO has also relayed to MSU that their communications regarding proposals to alter buildings is an opinion and that they are not in the position to stop MSU from moving forward. SHPO's intent is to be included in the discussion of property disposition and to provide what MT statutes require including determination of whether significant changes to heritage eligible buildings would cause an "adverse effect" or "no adverse effect" and discuss alternatives and mitigation possibilities. Stump clarified that UFPB recommends to the President whether or not property should be considered for Heritage designation. Part of the plan is to include a historic property record in a form SHPO requires. With this new process and set of procedures we would give SHPO all the documentation they require and MSU would review SHPO's opinion with UFPB for a final recommendation to the president. Staff reports will include documentation sent to SHPO and their response.

UFPB provided comments to improve the evaluation document that will be included and suggested that a final draft be returned to UFPB for recommendation.

ITEM No. 6 – Discussion – DRAFT – Procedures for Academic R&R Fund Proposals

Victoria Drummond presented an overview of draft procedures for UFPB review of Academic R&R Fund us. The draft was first presented on March 27, 2012 and hasn't changed as Drummond didn't receive any input. The purpose is to have criteria when evaluating proposals. Some of the information came from a suggestion from Jim Rimpau on how computer fee funds are handled. It is a compilation of criteria already being used for spending money. The procedures start with a report on an annual basis that says where the Academic R&R Fund balance is and UFPB can consider where to spend it or bank it for the year. UFPB needs to decide when to solicit for proposals and if they should be solicited at one time or reviewed as they come in.

Fedock expressed that the funds should be limited to projects that benefit students and not for an institutional level obligation. Drummond explained that proposals would have to address the values-based criteria in the draft procedures document. The procedures would be online so that anyone interested in proposals would know what is expected. Stump questioned if proposals would be accepted year round or if there would be an annual deadline. If it's a cycle he would like to see a timeline in the procedures.

Boyd thought that the proposals might burden Facilities by coming up with estimates and if proposals are not vetted by the Deans there is no way of knowing that there is a reality behind it. This can run the risk of getting proposals that don't have a realistic assessment of the true cost or time length. Boyd would like UFPB to be protected from every \$200 proposal. Since the Academic R&R Fund generates a lot of money it should be used for big things. Lashaway suggested an endorsement from the executive level of the organization submitting the proposal and questioned if UFPB wanted an annual process or a mechanism that exists where you don't solicit annual input but guide larger debt service commitments to larger projects. Lane questioned if projects that didn't get funded would be carried over year to year or if the process would start over again the next year, which could be a nightmare to manage. Lashaway suggested a possible use could be to bond it for 30 years and eliminate the proposal solicitation and have it fund the strategic goal project needs. Hansen brought up that Terry Leist and Laura Humberger (in their presentations to UFPB) recommended against that because it wasn't equitable to students and they were worried that if something else came along that revenue source would be lost. ASMSU will have the opportunity to

prioritize a list of projects, since the money is coming from students, and they would have a say in bonded projects. The item has many unanswered questions – so it was tabled.

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