

**MEETING NOTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD
September 10, 2013**

Members Present: Walt Banziger - Vice Chair, Kurt Blunck, Jeff Butler, Linda LaCrone for Anne Camper, Chris Fastnow, Greg Gilpin, Bob Lashaway for Terry Leist, Ritchie Boyd for Martha Potvin, Fatih Rifki, Tom Stump, Julie Tatarka, Jim Thull, Cara Thuringer, Brenda York

Members Absent: Nancy Cornwell - Chair, Allyson Brekke, Glenn Duff, Michael Everts, Mandy Hansen, Robert Marley

Guests: Tammie Brown, Billy Dubois, Dan Stevenson

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

ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes

No notes were approved.

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 – Discussion – Discussion of Potential Sites for Future Residence Hall

Walt Banziger started the discussion potential sites for the future residence hall and suggested that the Board narrow the list down further to three sites. The sites will then be taken to Interhall RHA and ASMSU for endorsement and then to the President. Stump commented that the President would like three sites but not ranked. **Thull moved to approve site F, Blunck seconded the Motion.** Comments and a cost analysis were added to the analysis of the sites (attached). Stevenson commented that for sites B-south and C there is a big electrical primary issue and some sewer requirements that add additional complexity in the future. If sites G-west or G-east were chosen, parking would have to be created somewhere else, which could impact site F. Gatton Field was added to the list of sites. Stevenson commented that it is a long way from sewer. It could also impact parking because of the size and it's a long distance to food services. Gilpin questioned the challenges for site F. He believed that "displaces intramural" and "loss of fields" were the same issue. Banziger clarified one was loss of space for the campus community and the other (loss of fields) affected the local community. Stump added that the fields could be reoriented and there would only be some cost in irrigation. It would be minimal challenge. Thull commented that site F has the least impact and the least cost associated with it. **Site F was approved unanimously.**

Blunck commented that G-west and G-east displaces parking and the new parking wouldn't be far from the site. Gatton Field would displace less parking, but the new parking would be further away. Lashaway added that Gatton Field would be the hardest site for E parking. Banziger commented that it also does not serve the high priority of proximity to food services. **Thull moved to approve G-west, Fastnow seconded the Motion.** Stevenson believes G-west may lose efficiency in its development if the creek is opened up and have more displaced parking. Lashaway commented that if G-west is chosen there is a responsibility of opening up the creek because that is what the Master Plan envisions. Thuringer expressed concerned about disturbing the creek and having the building surrounded by parking. Banziger added that the architect would be tasked with the programming of what would happen with sites F, G-west and G-east regardless of which one of the three were chosen. Gilpin commented that it seems the next best alternative to site F is a far distance away in terms of cost and accessibility. The challenges seem to be mounting with each site and coming up with three is a challenge. He didn't know the cost of putting in a sewer line versus opening up the creek. Stevenson commented that you could put a lot of money into the ground. You wouldn't see the infrastructure for Gatton Field, but you would have a valuable amenity if the creek was opened up on G-west. Thuringer brought to the Boards attention that students are concerned with moving too fast and that there is an importance of doing it right rather than cheaply. She would like the Board to look at the benefit to students rather than the least worst option. Gilpin commented that sites F and G-west have the benefit of being larger than the other sites and there is the potential of opening up the creek and putting in grass. That may not be the case for the other sites because we may feel more constrained with the building shape and fitting it into the area. **Site G-west was approved unanimously (Thuringer left before this vote).**

Thull believes Gatton Field is too far from food services and questioned what the utility factors are for sites B and C and if one was better than the other. Stevenson replied that from an infrastructure perspective he doesn't like either. He would like to take a district approach to infrastructure issues that exist in that area. If site B or C was selected that opportunity would go away. Thull questioned which of the remaining four sites had the best infrastructure and Stevenson replied site G-east. Thull also questioned which site had the least impact to parking and Blunck replied site B, but also believes it's the worst selection because it's surrounded by parking. Butler moved to approve only two sites and Thull seconded the Motion. Stump reported that the President would like to have three sites to choose from. LaCrone felt it would be a disservice to the President if a third site was picked knowing it was a bad decision to add to the list. Lashaway believes the sites should be taken to students for feedback because they may influence the negatives and positives currently and might lead the Board to a third site or away from a third site. Fastnow moved to rule out Gatton Field, Boyd seconded the Motion and all opposed because they wanted to wait for feedback from the students. Gilpin commented that from a cost perspective G-east is not much different from G-west and could be a potential third site. Brown proposed that the Board should hear from the students now. Fastnow suggested that there should be a variety for the President to choose from and that G-east and G-west are too similar. Lashaway commented that the current USDA site reservation (site E) runs through September 2016. He believes it's possible to end that site reservation and work through another site reservation so the President has more variety of sites. The Board came to the consensus to wait to hear from the students for the third recommended site. All sites and the entire process will be presented to Interhall RHA and ASMSU at their next meetings.

Vote for Site F:

Yes: 14
No: 0

Vote for Site G-west

Yes: 13
No: 0

This meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

VCD:lk

PC:

President Cruzado

Jayson O'Neill, President's Office

Maggie Hammett, President's Office

Allen Yarnell, President's Office

Lisa Duffey, Provost Office

Diane Heck, Provost Office

Victoria Drummond, Facilities PDC

ASMSU President

Heidi Gagnon, VP Admin & Finance

Jennifer Joyce, VP Student Success

Linda LaCrone, VP Research Office

Bonnie Ashley, Registrar

Robert Putzke, MSU Police

Becky McMillan, Auxiliaries Services

Julie Kipfer, Communications

Jody Barney, College of Agriculture

Susan Fraser, College of Agriculture

Robin Happel, College of Agriculture

JoDee Palin, College of Arts & Arch