

**MEETING NOTES OF THE  
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD  
October 9, 2012**

**Members Present:** Nancy Cornwell – Chair, Walt Banziger - Vice Chair, Kurt Blunck, Dan Stevenson for Jeff Butler, Michael Everts, Christina Fastnow, Mandy Hansen, Lisa Duffey for Jeff Jacobsen, Patricia Lane, Linda LaCrone for Tom McCoy, Bob Lashaway for Terry Leist, Jim Rimpau, Tom Stump, Jim Thull, Cara Thuringer – ASMSU, Brenda York

**Members Absent:** Ritchie Boyd, Allyson Brekke

**Guests:** Dennis Raffensperger, Todd Jutila, Tracy Ellig, Joe Tavary, Haley Schranck, Sam Lombard, Sam Irons, Kasey Welles, Theresa Lindenau, Kasey Belzer, Nick Kosenkranius, Kristin Elsner, Pablo Prats Mira, Brian Cichosz, Andi Duroux, Connie Strittmatter, Greg Durham, Tyler Soares, Hannah Wahlert, Sam Atkins, Audrey Lee, Susan Dana, Dave Mogk, Victoria Drummond, Ben Lloyd, Lindsey Klino, 15 others declined to sign the register

The University Facilities Planning Board met beginning at 3:30 pm in Leon Johnson Hall, Room 339 to discuss the following:

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

Thull moved to approve the meeting notes from September 11, 2012. Blunck 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 – Faculty Senate Appointment, Tracy Dougher, to Classroom Committee**

**ITEM No. 4 – Recommendation – Review College of Business Site Plan, Floor Plans and Exterior Elevations**

Walt Banziger introduced Ben Lloyd with CommaQ Architects. He is the local design consultant and is partnered with Hennebery Architects from Portland, Oregon. Banziger summarized that the building will be located at the corner of Cleveland Street and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, a building site north of Wilson Hall. It is set according to the Long Range Campus Development Plan (LRCDP) for densifying campus, proximity to the historic core of campus, and walking distance to academic buildings being 10-15 minutes away. The building is placed equidistance off the center sidewalk from the bobcat down to Harrison Street and Johnstone Center. That green space will be preserved as well as from Herrick Hall to Linfield Hall as part of the LRCDP. Those created setbacks for the building as well as for the street and parking lot. The building will take up portions of the parking lot during construction for staging materials and when the building is done for new handicap parking, new service parking, dumpsters, etc. Parking will be replaced and two new rows will be created so there is no net loss of parking. There is a southeast entry, a north entry, and a west entry. Service access will be on the north east side.

Ben Lloyd presented an overview of the mechanical system, site plan, floor plans and exterior elevations. The mechanical system is a three part system. A local mechanical system at the College of Business building and the Leon Johnson Plant will assist the project in providing energy. The third component is the main MSU Heating Plant. There are 45 500 ft deep geothermal wells for the local mechanical system. The building is oriented in the east/west direction, which affords great passive solar access on the south side of the building where the classrooms are. The north side of the building is for faculty services, institutes, offices, and support spaces to the classrooms. The two primary materials are terra cotta on the north elevation and zinc on the south elevation. Zinc is a natural material represented as a 300 year material. Both materials were decided with beauty and maintenance in mind. The terra cotta is a rain screen system that hangs on the building. The waterproof system is directly behind the terra cotta and will allow air movement. Sculptural forms will provide shade to the south facing spaces as well as the metal frames providing shade to the west facing spaces. A large curtain wall near the main entry with an image of the state of Montana is backlit and will glow at night. A café is at the southwest corner and the walls will open up to the plaza so the space can expand. The two classroom spaces on the ground floor can also open up to expand for events. The column of blue tinted windows is operable. Future long range plans include an auditorium on the north side.

The terra cotta is a modular material and there is a geologic stratification of that part as well as other geologic connections to the zinc side. Two active solar components are in the southeast corner: photovoltaic panels and solar hot water preheat tubes are being pursued. The main west entry opens to the large common area that also provides connection to the two building masses. The two large classrooms have moving walls so the whole space can become one. There is an epic lab, which is an opportunity for the College of Business to collaborate with other entities on campus. More classrooms and offices are on the second, third and fourth floors. The dean's suite and conference room are on the third floor. The building is intended to be USGBC LEED Silver Certified at minimum. Morrison Maierle, engineers working on the project, have partnered with ARUP Engineers, a globally recognized sustainable engineering group who is helping with energy modeling and will help to determine appropriate systems. When the building is done it will likely be the most sustainable building on campus in terms of energy efficiency, solar gain, photovoltaic, temperature control, etc. The sculpture on the exterior transmits through the building what is happening inside and denote the public spaces within the building. They show outside what is happening inside. The southern wall is glass for solar gain in the winter and shaded in the summer. Susan Dana added that they wanted to create as many collaborative spaces as possible. It is focused on collaboration and drawing people, not just from the College of Business, but students from other colleges and the community. The interior of the building will be brought back to UFPB for review.

#### Board comments:

Cara Thuringer of ASMSU questioned if the building contained a family restroom and Banziger replied that it will have one as well as a unisex restroom. Jim Thull questioned how firm the exterior design was for the preheat tubes and solar panels, and was uncertain what they were voting on. Banziger replied they are voting on the overall look including the preheat tubes and solar panels if they can get them in with the budget. Thull commented that solar panels have more function and if they had to lose something he would choose the glass. Tom Stump questioned if the zinc material oxidized over time and Banziger replied that it will weather, but should remain its general color. Mandy Hansen wanted to see elevations that showed the service drive more completely and asked if it would be screened. Banziger replied that the details are still being worked on, but there will be a retaining wall with the dumpsters tucked in behind and there may be a screening wall. Patricia Lane questioned where the handicap access is and Banziger replied that all three entries are handicap accessible, there is an elevator in the building and there will be handicap parking. There will be a 1/12 grade from the parking and sidewalks will be adjusted so they aren't too steep. Mike Everts wanted to know if there were examples of the terra cotta rain screen detail in this climate. Banziger replied that it's originated in northern Europe and is close to all four seasons. It will be the first in Montana. There is one in Portland and the architects would know of other places in the northwestern territories. Hansen questioned what would be done for visitor parking and Banziger replied that there will be five spaces near the handicap parking. Current parking lost from the handicap area, visitor area and service area will be replaced.

#### Public comments:

It was questioned, sustainability wise, if there was an issue with a flat roof. Lloyd replied that the flat roof will hold the snow and will have a white membrane to reduce the heat island effect. Sam Atkins, President of the Network of Environmentally Conscious Organizations (NECO) on campus thanked the design team for considering sustainability so broadly, but expressed two concerns. One is the impact the location of the building has on the trees. That group of trees represents a carbon bank and he is concerned with the impact on the carbon footprint of the university and specifically how it correlates with the university president's commitment to climate. One of the goals of the Climate Action Plan is to become carbon neutral. His other concern was about providing covered bike parking. With concerns of having the appropriate number of parking spaces one of the ways to reduce pressure on the parking around this building would be to provide covered bike parking. It would encourage people to ride their bikes year round. Banziger replied that they are looking at parking for bikes scattered around the site and will look at covered parking. Banziger also mentioned that the project budget is \$18 million and they are very tight on the budget. So they do need to make tradeoffs between building program elements, educational elements, sustainability elements and other elements, which are all being weighed together. In response to the tree issue, Banziger explained that the committee took a lot of effort and a lot of considerations and how they affect the siting of the building. They held a lot of public forums, went to public presentations, received input from a lot of groups and had a lot of factors in determining the site of the building. Three sites were picked based on proximity to utility systems and the steam plant, being sustainable by creating a dense campus, walking distance of 10 to 15 minutes between academic buildings, access for students from the dorms, and impact on trees, which was heavily considered. Nine trees on the site will be relocated and 15 will be removed. Six Ash trees to the north of the building are intended to be protected and saved. One might be at risk because its health. To offset the carbon impacts, a tree plan is in place for replacing trees on site and the rest of campus. To densify the campus, the tree plan for the future looks at the Long Range Campus Development Plan and Landscape Master Plan. Both plans look to preserve green spaces on campus and the building site is consistent with those. As long as future generations follow the plan, trees will be put back in those green spaces and be protected. A couple steps back need to be taken in certain areas, but replacing trees in those protected areas will allow campus to move forward for the

long term. An individual identified himself as Faculty and said it is outrageous that the building being called a LEED building when an old grove stand of Spruce of about 18 trees is cut out and he doesn't see that any of those will be preserved. He said the building should be sited slightly to the north to maintain the grove of 80-100 year old trees. When Faculty Senate discussed the sites, it was the general placement of the building and its flexibility to be put further north to not impact any trees. Then it seemed that the location was decided without further input from the public. Banziger clarified that the project did go through the design process and all three sites went through public forums, UFPB and the President. Comments were received on all the sites and conditions were discussed when the site was picked. It came to UFPB as a public forum with open comment, was heavily discussed, and was not a back room decision. Another person commented that he was part of the discussions, as a member of Faculty Senate, and doesn't remember this amount of trees being taken away as part of the discussions. He said moving trees is hard to do and a lot of trees die from it and parking and the Long Range Campus Development Plan seem to be the two things stopping the building from moving away from the trees. A discussion about putting multi level parking near the new building got shot down and he doesn't think we should be planning for this building with the thought that there's going to be a parking garage there. He believes that if things go against parking in the long term plan, then the long term plan should be questioned. He asked what it would take to reopen the discussion about where that building will be placed. Banziger replied that the discussions have gone through the entire process and the President has made her decision, and at this point the site selection is closed and done. To go back it would set the project back six months or more, in terms of deliverability. A student commented that a group of students have expressed outrage on the placement of the building and he feels that it wasn't publicized enough when the discussions were happening. He asked if it would be at all possible to move it to the parking lot space since parking is not a huge problem on campus. He would like to open up the discussion again for a larger group of students to put their opinions in. Banziger replied that all comments are being shared with the committee and administration, but at this point it is out of the hands of this group as designers. It was asked what would stop the building from being moved to the north and Banziger replied that promises were made to the residence hall residents, particularly female residents, on taking up the parking spaces and creating a longer walking distance at night. That was one of the primary reasons of not putting it in the parking lot and losing parking. Stump also commented that a lot of work was done with the Interhall Association and the community and they voiced those opinions and most of the parking lot was saved for the students that are housed in the northeastern quadrant of campus. There was a lot of legwork to retain that parking. A student questioned why the building couldn't be moved a little to the north and the parking be moved to the other side of the walkway. Banziger replied that he can't answer all the points, but it went through a lot of decisions. Another comment was that this is the first time he has seen an extension of the parking into the green space. 40 years ago, where there is green space on the master plan, there are now temporary labs. The master plan was ignored and now those temporary labs are permanently there. That space gave residents a space to recreate and it's been taken away. Additionally, the plan calls for the opening of Harrison Street which will take away basketball courts. The volleyball court beside Langford Hall has also been taken away. So the space is slowly being chipped away. He would like to see that space opened up again, and if not, he would like to see a recreation space where the family graduate houses were. Banziger replied that the basketball court is tentatively being looked at as going over where the family graduate houses were. So it would not go away in its entirety, if Harrison Street is opened up. The temporary classrooms will be there a minimum of two years and are not intended to be permanent. Once the College of Business is done and classrooms opened up, they would be used for turnover space for the Romney Hall and Reid Hall renovations. Once those are done they would go away. A comment was made that he is skeptical given that the temporary labs were supposed to go away when Gaines Hall was complete. Banziger replied that the temporary labs aren't on a foundation; they are on blocks and, at some point, have to go away. A student asked who they would talk to in order to get the building moved and what the process would be. Lashaway replied that all the meetings have been widely advertised, they have been to ASMSU, and a lot of effort has been put in to getting this out. He doesn't know how to go back and re-enter the process. The students, various work groups, and sustainability groups have been involved all along. The outcome isn't what every individual would like, but that's not to be confused with not having been heard, debated or considered seriously because a lot of people have been in the process and done that. Banziger also mentioned that they have talked to the Campus Sustainability Advisory Committee (CSAC) and they expressed the same concern about trees, but also expressed a lot of praise for a lot of other efforts going into the building in terms of sustainability. It's gone through a lot of different processes and groups and to set that back would be a tremendous cost to the university and a tremendous delay to the project. Going through a process that has already been gone through will likely create other ones. If the building is moved 100 feet to the north, the tree group would not be here. It would be the residence hall students asking why parking is being taken away and saying to move the building to another location. The siting of the building can't satisfy every group on campus. The best efforts are taken with all the criteria that are impacting the building and a decision is made that is best for the long term growth of campus. Thull responded that the answer the student's question is it would be the President that he would go to about moving the building. A faculty member addressed the students and said moving the building has to be from the students to the President. He also commented about the coordination of space on campus. Years ago there was an adaptation to the Wilson Hall design to accommodate the grove of trees that stand on the inside of Wilson Hall. They were going to be cut down at that time, but students protested and

prevented those trees from being cut down, making Wilson Hall so much nicer with the trees in its interior space. He believes re-situation of the building slightly would alleviate some of the problems.

#### Final Board Comments:

Stump asked Dana if the donor has seen the new materials and she replied that she believes he has. Stump moved to recommend the exterior appearance of the building. Fastnow seconded the Motion. Thull was still unclear and asked if the preheat tubes and solar panels were a sure thing and if they were voting on the terra cotta and zinc or all of it. Banziger replied that they were voting on all of it if it can be fit into the budget. Thull had a hard time voting on the appearance if something could be lost. Stevenson replied that for the solar collector there is a lot of constructability work in the design to know how that would work on that part of the building, and is part of the contract document phase where a lot of detailed engineering work is done. If that part of the project can be made technically feasible and constructible then there is a high chance it would go into the project because solar shading is needed for that surface anyway. So the incremental cost to make it an energy source is fairly small. Thull questioned what would replace it if it went away. Stevenson replied that it would be something architectural that would function as a shade. Banziger also replied that the top would still be glass if there aren't photovoltaics. The appearance of the roof shouldn't change significantly either. Stump added to his motion that if something dramatically changed it would come back to UFPB. Banziger clarified that what is shown at this stage is lining up with the projected cost of the general contractor. Blunck questioned what milestones would be left for UFPB and Banziger replied that the interior would be the last one unless something significantly changes. The Motion was unanimously approved.

#### **ITEM No. 5 – Recommendation – Request to Use Academic Building R&R Funds for a Gaines Hall Compressor**

Victoria Drummond presented an overview of a request to use Academic Building R&R Funds for a Gaines Hall compressor. The request was received from the Earth Sciences department head, Dave Mogk. The compressor is necessary for classroom instruction, specifically geochemistry and paleontology courses that are taught in Gaines Hall. It was discussed early in the programming stage, but compromises were made and not everything necessary made it to the final plan. The department appealed to EFAC for \$7,000 and received it and purchased the compressor. Work Control estimated the installation at approximately \$8,000. Department proposal is to install it in Room 134A near the dock area, which is very durable, sound proof and for equipment of that type. The \$8,000 estimate is too much for the department and they request use of the Academic Building R&R Funds because it supports students.

Drummond reminded UFPB that they approved the guidelines for use of the Academic Building R&R Funds in August, 2012. Guidelines specify appropriate use of funds is to augment department contribution. The department did what they could by purchasing the compressor. It will be in an appropriate place, will not displace any occupant, and connect to infrastructure that's already placed in the building. Drummond reminded the board of all the recommendations to use Academic Building R&R funds the board made since August 2011: \$300,000 was allocated for the Wilson Writing Center; \$150,000 was allocated for Leon Johnson Hall, Room 339; and \$175,000 was allocated for EPS Building, Room 103. There is another request at this meeting as well as one at the next meeting. Thull questioned how many students this would benefit. Mogk replied that they have 30 paleontology majors and the courses would encompass a paleontology preparation course, a preservation course, a large number of independent study projects, and undergrad scholars projects. The lab is used every day. The airline would go to the paleontology lab and to a standard wet chemistry lab. Lashaway reminded the board that this was in the original design of the building and, due to budget constraints at the time, was one of the things eliminated. Piping was still able to be done in the original project. With the compressor installed, Facilities Services will take responsibility for the maintenance as it was part of the original building intent. The department and instructional funds will no longer have to buy compressed gas all the time. Hansen asked Drummond how much funding was available from the Academic Building R&R Fund. Drummond handed out a sheet from Facilities Accounting that shows all the projects that have been funded along with the dollar amount that is currently in the account. An accountant wasn't available to go into the ledgers and identify what has been contributed. So there may have been credits made that aren't shown. Drummond will have the amount confirmed for the next meeting. Based on accounting data provided, it appears there are sufficient funds for all the requested items (through next meeting agenda) with approximately \$735,000 left in the account that is still accruing fees. \$1.5 million may be everything since the fund was developed.

Lane questioned if it was near Room 130 and Drummond replied it is off the dock and lower than the first floor. Lane was also curious how noisy it would be and Stevenson replied that the noise shouldn't be an issue. Piping is on one level and would not go to the floor above. Often the pipe is what transmits the noise. Lashaway suggested plugging it in and firing it up to see what the sound transmission is before installation. Banziger also mentioned it could come back to UFPB as an informational item with the decibel readings before it is permanently installed. Lane moved to allow use of the Academic R&R Building Funds for installation of the air compressor. Blunck seconded the Motion and it was unanimously approved.

**ITEM No. 6 – Recommendation – Request to use the Academic Building R&R Fund for Linfield Hall and Linfield Hall South Fire Sprinkler Installation**

Dennis Raffensperger presented an overview of a request to use Academic Building R&R Funds for the Linfield Hall and Linfield Hall South fire sprinkler installation. The project in design in both Linfield Hall and Linfield Hall South has several components. One component is additional restrooms and remodeling of restrooms on the first and third levels of Linfield Hall as part of an accessibility project. The second component is to install an elevator and an additional fire stair at the junction between Linfield Hall and Linfield Hall South. The elevator will make the first and second levels of Linfield Hall South and the first through third levels of Linfield Hall accessible. About 85% of the building will be accessible when the project is complete. The third component is a remodel of the lecture hall, Room 125, in Linfield Hall South. Linfield Hall South was built about 50 years ago and Linfield Hall was built over 100 years ago. Linfield Hall is a masonry building with a wood interior and Linfield Hall South is a concrete building. By today's code they have different construction types and are required to have a fire separation. The additional elevator and fire stair will be part of Linfield Hall South. The city is giving two choices: execute the fire separation between Linfield Hall South and Linfield Hall, which is difficult and not in the budget for the project, or fully sprinkle both buildings, which is also a lot of money. The design team will go back to the city and explain they can afford part of it, but can't afford all of it. They will ask the city to accept two sprinkler risers, one in the existing north stair of Linfield Hall and one in the new stair. Sprinklers would cover the corridors of the buildings, but not the remaining rooms of the buildings. Since the infrastructure would be in place they would commit to the city that future renovated spaces would include sprinklers. The estimated cost of the sprinkler risers and sprinklers in the corridors is about \$225,000 and is not covered in the budget. Some money was found to backfill the project amount and the request is for \$195,000 from the Academic Building R&R Funds to make the project possible. It is a student centered project. A number of classrooms are primarily used by the College of Agriculture in both buildings. Room 125 in South Linfield Hall is Registrar controlled and used by the entire campus.

Thull questioned why anyone wasn't aware of this sooner that with these codes this would be a problem. Raffensperger explained that certain elements of code compliance are discretionary. Working in an existing building, we would not be required to bring the entire building up to current code. The code specifies up to a certain level of work, which is somewhat discretionary. They didn't have a real sense that the scope of the project would trip that level. The primary code official is deferring the decision to the fire marshal who is concerned about the old buildings on campus that have primarily wood structures. Under the fire code he has the discretion to say we need to meet current code. Part of it can be met, which is moving a great deal towards concerns about life safety, and we are hoping the city agrees. It's the discretionary aspect of this code that this has come up somewhat unexpectedly. Hansen questioned what would happen if the funds were committed and the fire marshal did not accept the proposal. Raffensperger replied that the project would stop until additional funding is secured, and the \$195,000 would revert back to the fund. They could work with the code and work out an agreement. The campus fire marshal got involved and suggested offering a dry standpipe in each of the two stairwells for about \$35,000, which they thought could be absorbed through the project and the city said it wasn't enough. That's why they are scrambling to come to a mutual agreement so they can make this project happen. The city understands that having the project is a major improvement in life safety in the building. The north stairwell of Linfield Hall and the open stairwell in the middle of the building is not a good exit scenario. The fire escape on the south side of the building covers the third and fourth floors also is not a good exit scenario. The city doesn't want the project to go away, but they are trying figure out how much they can get. Blunck questioned what happens with the accessibility project if it ends and where that leave us with accessibility issues. Raffensperger replied that the project will be contracted. They will still do the restrooms and classroom renovation and then look for additional money and execute the rest of the project when they can. The city is pushing harder on the issues with older buildings. York commented that it is \$195,000 well spent to make the building as accessible as they can, especially with more mobility problem students on campus. Thuringer questioned why you wouldn't want to put sprinklers in a wooden building. Banziger clarified that they do want to. The issue is finding the funding source. They've tried other sources to go to, including the LRBP, and there are none available. This fund is the only one available. Lane also clarified that the issue is whether or not these funds are used, which are put in by students for their benefit. Banziger commented that a wet system in the stairs and down the corridors should be a satisfactory solution. It also puts in the mains going down the corridors, which allows any future small project to easily tap off of that and put them in the spaces down the road. The water service to the building would be sized to accommodate the entire building. It's a big step forward in doing it rather than trying to find \$600,000 at once. Raffensperger explained they installed a state of the art fire alarm system four years ago, are adding a full fire stair and felt they were going a fair ways towards increasing life safety concerns in an old building. Drummond commented that since it's over \$150,000 it would need the Board of Regents approval. Thull moved to approve the use of the Academic Building R&R Funds for the Linfield Hall and Linfield Hall South fire sprinkler installation. Stump seconded the Motion and it was unanimously approved.

This meeting was adjourned at 5:15 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, Auxiliaries Services  
Julie Kipfer, Communications

Lisa Duffey, College of Agriculture  
Robert Putzke, MSU Police  
Bonnie Ashley, Registrar  
JoDee Palin, Coll of Arts & Arch