

**MEETING NOTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD
October 23, 2012**

- Members Present:** University Facilities Planning Board: Walt Banziger - Vice Chair, Jeff Butler, Greg Gilpin, Bob Lashaway for Terry Leist, Ritchie Boyd for Martha Potvin, Tom Stump, Jim Thull, Cara Thuringer – ASMSU
- Proxy:** Kurt Blunck and Patricia Lane carried by Walt Banziger, Brenda York carried by Tom Stump, Allyson Brekke and Tom McCoy carried by Victoria Drummond
- Members Absent:** Nancy Cornwell - Chair, Michael Everts, Chris Fastnow, Mandy Hansen, Jeff Jacobsen, Fatih Rifki, Jim Rimpau
- Guests:** Matt Carr

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

ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes

The October 9, 2012 meeting notes will be approved at the next meeting.

ITEM No. 2 – Executive Committee Report

There was no action from the Executive Committee to report.

ITEM No. 3 – Consent Agenda

ITEM No. 4 – Recommendation – Proposed Campus Air Conditioning Policy

Matt Carr presented for a second time an overview of the updated Campus Air Conditioning Policy. It was originally created with the intent to curb uncontrolled installation usage of temporary window mounted air conditioners. It's important to maintain the visual appearance throughout campus and control the electrical usage. Language was added to the "Introduction and Purpose" to explain why spaces get hot due to increased loads from computers and how buildings in the past were designed without cooling, but still designed to be comfortable. The "Policy" section was clarified and places more emphasis and responsibility for building occupants to work with Facilities Services so something can be done without putting in individual window or portable air conditioners. Portable air conditioning devices were added in as the previous version only mentioned window units. Also added was that air conditioning aspects of residence facilities will be governed by pertinent Residence Life policies. In the "Procedures" section, "Cost Responsibility" was moved to the top so it's the first thing read. The requesting department is responsible for the cost. For "Need" occupants have to demonstrate a reasonable attempt to reduce cooling loads other than by mechanical means in order to place a request. Facilities Services is available to help occupants with changing their habits or working with janitor services to open windows at night. Facilities Services will go through a process for a solution, and as the last case will come up with a cost and an air conditioning plan, which would be presented to UFPB. "Installation Factors" hasn't changed and units should still be installed per the Construction Activities Policy. "Aesthetics" is a primary consideration. For "Maintainability" units should be installed at a location where it can be maintained by Facilities Services. For "Responsible Energy/Resource Use" units can greatly increase the energy usage of a building. Since it comes out of the Facilities Services budget the user doesn't see that cost. For "Ownership of A/C Installations" Facilities Services is generally responsible for the operation and maintenance costs and eventual capital replacement costs for central building systems. The "Control/Enforcement" section was shortened and reviews the process of working through Facilities Services and then presenting a proposed solution to UFPB for approval.

Stump requested that the last sentence in the "Policy" section be changed to say "governed by pertinent housing policies" rather than "governed by pertinent Residence Life policies." Boyd wanted clarification that in "Installation Factors" the Construction Activities Policy didn't preclude the window operated units that take up a small part of a sliding window. Lashaway clarified that the Construction Activities Policy doesn't say what can and can't be put in. Banziger further explained that the Construction Activities Policy says you have to go through Facilities Planning, IT, or Facilities Services for appropriate work. Boyd understood that it's not excluded, but that there are considerations to be made for the particular type of unit. Thuringer questioned if these units would be a permanent fixture to the building or are temporary. Banziger replied that they are the residential grade units that sit in the window and were proliferating around campus. For energy, aesthetics, and safety reasons the policy was created to control them.

Lashaway explained that the process for this policy is for UFPB to recommend it to University Council. If they agree with it, it will be posted for three weeks, considered, and then approved. He recommended that the policy be presented to CSAC for their recommendation before going to University Council. If there are significant changes from CSAC it will be brought back to UFPB. Lashaway moved that UFPB review this policy with CSAC prior to forwarding it to University Council. Butler seconded the Motion and the Motion was unanimously approved.

ITEM No. 5 – Recommendation – Verizon Wireless MT8 Bobcat – supported by the MSU Telecommunications Antenna Committee – request to relocate four existing antennas on Leon Johnson Hall rooftop.

Victoria Drummond presented an overview of relocating four existing antennas on Leon Johnson Hall rooftop. With the renovation projects to Leon Johnson over the summer a substantial amount of equipment was located on the rooftop and it creates interference. The antennas are completely obstructed by the equipment. The lease agreement MSU has with Verizon Wireless states that they need to make their antennas work at their cost and they would relocate them. Facilities Services would supervise that to protect MSU assets. AT&T put an antenna in the same eighth floor area and because of where the antennas are moved to it required new cabling. This will parallel what AT&T put in so there will not be any new penetrations in the rooftop and they will be in the same cable tray area. The antennas will be located on a penthouse piece on the west side of the building and colored the same as the building. The only other solution looked at was to leave them where they were, but make them higher. However, making them 10 feet higher did not give them the clearance they needed. Butler moved to approve the relocation of the four existing antennas on Leon Johnson Hall rooftop. Thull seconded the Motion and it was unanimously approved.

ITEM No. 6 – Recommendation – Public Art Committee Recommends that the Conkey Wall Sculpture be returned to the Renne Library and installed in a public area.

Victoria Drummond presented an overview of a recommendation from the Public Art Committee that the Conkey Wall Sculpture be returned to Renne Library. One of the Conkey sculptures, that used to be in the atrium area when there was an atrium and fountain in the library, was moved to the Atkinson Quadrangle area. The second sculpture that hangs on the wall was crated and put in storage. The Public Art Committee looked at how to get it back out for display in the community and received a request from the Dean of the Library that it is returned and that they would pay to have it reinstalled in a public area of the library. Jim Thull added that the exact location is still being worked on, but it will go in a prominent first floor location. Drummond mentioned that Conkey was a professor at MSU up until his passing and he produced several pieces and gifted the university with them. Stump moved to approve that the Conkey Wall Sculpture be returned to Renne Library. Lashaway seconded the Motion and it was unanimously approved.

ITEM No. 7 – Discussion – Provide an outdoor drinking fountain on campus for community use

Victoria Drummond presented an overview of providing an outdoor drinking fountain on campus for community use. This is based on a request to the President from a third year student. The student found it difficult to find a place to get a drink of water outdoors in the evening or on weekends. It was suggested that the university look at providing an outdoor drinking fountain on the campus to serve the community. The first thing to look at is what a drinking fountain does. It serves the purpose of providing a source of water, a station to fill a receptacle and could include a place for water for pets. It can also be included in sculptural pieces. Most drinking fountains in our community are seasonal and turned off during the winter. Standard outdoor units that have frost control would still be seasonal for our use. Drummond gave some points to discuss. The first point was its priority because it will take resources, staff and funding. The second point was the style that would be considered. The cost, funding source and where it would be located on campus are other points. The next point was seasonal use and it would likely parallel what is done with irrigation and be kept on between May and September. The final point is that water is available all year long inside buildings, but they do have varying lock down times. The fact that there is water available inside the buildings would factor into the priority.

Thull commented that the seasonal aspect of it limits its effectiveness and there are drinking fountains in most buildings including the library, which is open from 7:00 am to 2:00 am, open all summer and in the center of campus. Stump commented that the SUB is open until midnight. Boyd pointed out that you can't take a dog into either building and questioned what the cost estimate would be. Drummond replied that the least expensive unit, not including other factors, was \$2,500. Lashaway mentioned it is about a \$10,000 installation and Butler said it would require a drain and backflow preventers. Thull suggested it be referred to ASMSU since there isn't readily funding available and is primarily a student focus. Student fees could be suggested for funding. Banziger stated that installation and long term maintenance costs would have to be considered as well. Lashaway questioned how many locations there would be and Gilpin wasn't certain who this would be serving, so he wouldn't know where to put them. Thuringer replied it would serve students and people visiting the campus. She then questioned if there was a way plumbing could be housed internally, such having it on the side of the

p:\ufpb\meeting notes\2012 meeting notes\10 october\meeting notes 10-23-2012.docx

building so plumbing would be inside and the fixture would be outside. Butler replied that it is an option. Thuringer commented that students would like to see more of the drinking fountains with the water bottle filler and Lashaway commented that those were easy to mount inside and an exterior one may be a whole other level of perplexity and interface. It might be more worth it to put the ones with the water bottle filler in all the buildings rather than have an exterior one. Students might rather get those first. Butler reminded everyone that this came from a student and if it was a movement from ASMSU then it could be looked at more seriously. That's why Thull would like to pass it on to ASMSU and have it be student lead. Thuringer will send out a survey to the ASMSU senators. Butler commented if outdoor recreation wanted to put one next to their building it would serve a function there. Banziger also commented that it would make sense to have something there where you're not close to an open building. Butler came across an outdoor drinking fountain in Missoula and one in Billings. The one in Missoula was functioning, but was beat up and the one in Billings wasn't in great shape and was constantly running.

The request won't be completely rejected, but there are other priorities. Boyd questioned what would happen if ASMSU raised money for an outdoor water fountain and Lashaway replied that Facilities Services would work with them and once it was installed Facilities Services would own it and all the maintenance. Boyd commented the students need to consider two things: the cost and if it's a priority for ASMSU, as opposed to indoor fountains or another option. Thuringer believes students would prefer to see building renovations before this, especially if it's going to be more expensive. Putting five of these around campus with a cost of \$10,000 each to purchase and install is \$50,000 that could be spent putting new seating in a room in Reid Hall. She thinks that would be preferred because we are lagging there and this is more of a luxury item. Thuringer will send the proposal to the ASMSU President and it may be put on the agenda for Thursday. She will get feedback and bring it back to UFPB. Thuringer requested a rough estimate and Stump questioned what the unit with the bottle filler would be. Drummond replied it was about \$5,600. Thuringer said that would probably be preferred because it services pets, people without a bottle and people with a bottle. The estimate is \$7,000 to \$10,000 per unit with installation.

ITEM No. 8 – Informational – Interest in placing a Sculpture in the Roundabout at College and S 11th Ave

Victoria Drummond presented information regarding interest in placing a sculpture in the roundabout at College Street and S. 11th Avenue. MSU participated in a conceptual meeting with a committee formed from the Bozeman Chamber of Commerce. The center area of the roundabout was thought to be a good location for a sculpture. Bob Lashaway, Walt Banziger and Victoria Drummond met with the committee to discuss their ideas and make sure they understood the history of the roundabout. In order to facilitate the intersection for the roundabout additional land was needed and most of it came from the university side. An exchange was made so the rights the university had on the land that was used were placed in the center of the roundabout, giving MSU the rights for what goes in the center. The committee's conceptual idea was to show a bridge and a partnership between the Bozeman community and MSU. As a land grant institution the partnership is with the entire state and the university might prefer to do something broader than the connection to the city. The committee will respond in November if they want to move forward.

Boyd questioned if the committee had an idea of a particular piece of work and Lashaway replied Peter Koch was mentioned as one of the contributors of land and was instrumental in getting the land grant college in Bozeman. He also mentioned that in a conversation with the President it was thought that something could express MSU statewide, like agriculture. The committee's interest is local and not around the state. The lines of communication will remain open, but they may not be able to move forward with something. Drummond mentioned the new MSU entrance sign will be on the southeast corner of the intersection, and Lashaway pointed out that the middle of the roundabout was more suited for a nice piece instead of an MSU sign. Thuringer questioned if this did move forward if it could be opened up to the students of the College of Arts and Architecture for design proposals and be a student driven art project. Lashaway replied that it could be. Thuringer suggested parameters in the call for proposals such that it has to represent the state of Montana. Lashaway said it could be artwork and not anything symbolic about land grant, but many people would look for more of a connection to MSU.

This meeting was adjourned at 4:35 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