

**MEETING NOTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD
October 8, 2013**

- Members Present:** Nancy Cornwell - Chair, Walt Banziger - Vice Chair, Kurt Blunck, Allyson Brekke, Jeff Butler, Linda LaCrone for Anne Camper, Michael Everts, Greg Gilpin, Mandy Hansen, Bob Lashaway for Terry Leist, Ritchie Boyd for Martha Potvin, Fatih Rifki, Tom Stump, Julie Tatarka, Jim Thull, Cara Thuringer, Brenda York
- Proxy:** Chris Fastnow carried by Ritchie Boyd
- Members Absent:** Glenn Duff, Robert Marley
- Guests:** Jeff Hix, Maureen Michaud, Andrew Kaltenbach, Gavin Lommatsch, Aaron Grusonik, Andrew Stulz, Tyler Fagenstrom, Stephanie Beeman, Max Hamberger, Jamin R. Adkins, Paige Wetzen, Daniel Lee, Sydney Jaramillo, Blake Stemen, Michael Townshend, Ryan Diehl, Nicole Duggan, Candace Mastel, Tracy Ellig, Carol Schmidt, Darryl Curfman, Tammie Brown, James Tobin, Jeff Bondy, Steve Erickson, Victoria Drummond, Billy Dubois, Shaydean Saye, Andrew Gregory

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

ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes

There were no notes to approve.

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 – Potential Sites for Future Residence Hall

Tom Stump opened up the discussion and recognized Tammie Brown, the Chief Housing Officer, who can also answer questions. Thuringer presented a letter from Ryan Diehl of the Outdoor Recreation Program. He requested that if site F was selected that the design compliments his structure and the recreation opportunities in that area. He would like to see exploration of providing more infrastructure for biking and that the building be built up, not out. He has some outdoor storage space and wants to make sure there isn't a future issue with security. Thuringer added that student priorities are: parking, proximity to campus and dining services, and having a community atmosphere. If green space is selected students would like to see it preserved as much as possible. Max Hamberger, Interhall Residence Hall Association (RHA) President, talked about comments received from residents. He solicited a vote for the top three locations and site F had the most votes, followed by sites G-west and C. Sites B-south, G-east and K received the lowest votes. Concern with site K was the distance from the dining halls and not being a part of a campus housing neighborhood. RHA recommends building on site F because it's already in an existing campus housing neighborhood, has close access to Miller Dining Hall, doesn't disturb any parking lots, and doesn't require any remedial work. He submitted the final letter summarizing their findings. Banziger recapped where they have got over the course of a few weeks meeting with UFPB, ASMSU, RHA, Outdoor Recreation, Steve Erickson, Dean of Students Matt Caires, Residence Hall staff, and CSAC. CSAC did not recommend a site, but did recommend criteria for the building design to consider many sustainable aspects. A series of analysis was done by Facilities Planning staff in conjunction with the Auxiliaries staff to identify priorities. All the sites were included in the Meet & Greets. Three Meet & Greets were set up in the SUB, two in Miller Dining Hall, one in Harrison Dining Hall, and one in Hannon Dining Hall where they solicited feedback from people passing by. From the SUB site F was the most popular followed by sites D, A and H. From the Residence Halls site F was the most popular followed by sites H, C, D and K. Residence Hall staff favored site F followed by C, A and K. People were also asked to take a survey of importance. They were asked to give in order very important to least important their expectation of what they thought the residence hall needed to be in terms of proximity to a dining hall, proximity to other residence halls, proximity to academic core of campus, proximity to student services, proximity to parking, and minimizing the impact to green space. Predominantly from the very important and important categories proximity to a dining hall was the highest ranked followed by proximity to parking, campus core, minimizing impact to green space, and proximity to student services and other residence halls.

Public questions and comments:

- There was a question if the plan was still committed to limiting the height to six floors. Banziger replied the selected site constraints will determine four to six floors – but maximum six floors.
- If site H is chosen would the building on that site have to be relocated? Banziger replied that the project has to pay for relocation of a building or parking if it displaces them. Site H will impact the budget of getting to 400 beds because a building would need to be relocated. Sites H and I are limited financially because of existing buildings.
- If site F is chosen would there be consideration given to realigning the service drive to the North Hedges Suites parking lot farther west? Banziger replied that it would be a consideration in the programming study and schematic design study. They would go out a little further than the site in the programming stage to ensure that the building is not restricting the ability of other sites to be developed or existing buildings to be modified in the future.
- Is there service infrastructure for site F? Butler replied there is for water and that sewer is close.
- If site K was chosen where would residents park? Banziger replied that the students would start parking in the SB lots and displace the day use people further out. Blunck added that they would have to redesignate a portion of those spaces as E for the use by residents.
- It was questioned if they could keep McCall Hall on site H and build the residence hall behind it with a smaller footprint. Banziger replied it would be unlikely to keep McCall Hall and fit a 400 bed residence hall unless a big tower was built, and it would be bigger than the Hedges Towers, which they are trying to avoid. They would like to stay within six stories.
- Erickson questioned the programming. Banziger explained that a building committee will do the programming and that there will be charrettes and public forums.
- RHA was very opposed to site K because it was too far away from dining halls and it's isolated from any residential neighborhood. They were also worried about parking changing the atmosphere of that area.
- College of Engineering and Athletics supported site K.

Butler commented that site C would have problems with utility infrastructure. He expressed that if site C was chosen and they do not address the future needs for electrical primary, then they wouldn't be able to address it in the future because that's where that area would need to go. If it is addressed during construction, it would be a range of a half million to a million dollars. It would be part of the criteria. Banziger gave a brief overview of the cost analysis that was performed. Everts questioned if the three dollar signs in the parking column equal three dollar signs in the utilities column and Banziger replied that they are relatively close. Stump reminded UFPB that sites F and G-west were already decided on, but that they can be reconsidered or UFPB could add to them. Banziger suggested giving the President a variety of options and not just similar sites. York questioned what the consensus was from the Meet & Greets and Mastel commented that site F was the most popular. Site K was also favorite for those wanting to live near the Marga Hoseaus Fitness Center. Sites D and H were a favorite among people who wanted a more urban high-rise experience or close proximity to the community. Brown added that there was a shift from site D when people realized it would take up parking on that side of campus. Everts questioned to what degree at the Meet & Greets was the Master Plan and the long term vision of the university presented. Mastel replied that they had it up the whole time and people saw that board first. Banziger explained that there isn't a building on site F in the Master Plan, but it would better define the play fields. Stump commented that in the Long Range Campus Development Plan the university has embraced parking garages. So parking is addressed differently than the reality faced now. If G-west was chosen, parking would likely shift to green space, which could go on site F. Banziger explained that if the building was built on sites B, C, D and E, which are parking lots, it's likely we won't be able to afford to build a parking garage in the near future, so site A would become parking. Blunck questioned if it is strictly a freshman residence hall and Brown replied it is because of the programming needs. Banziger clarified that the building will only be a portion of the site. They will minimize the footprint of the building and the parking impact on whatever site is chosen. Everts questioned how many parking spaces would go with the new building and Banziger replied that it's undetermined and guessed it could be a three to one ratio. Blunck commented that there is less impact to the southwest quadrant. Lashaway added that PTAC will look at impacts to parking once a site is selected and make a recommendation to UFPB. He suggested a small group of UFPB members attend that meeting. Brekke expressed that she was uncomfortable making a recommendation without knowing where parking was going to be. Banziger explained that there will be a building committee for initial programming as well as several public forums and charrettes to influence the program development.

Thuringer moved to remove G-west, and add A, and then H, D or K. Butler moved to scratch the original motion and start over. Brekke seconded the Motion and it was approved unanimously. **Butler moved to approve site F. Blunck seconded the Motion and it was approved unanimously.** Brekke moved to approve site D. Cornwell seconded the Motion. Blunck commented that parking would move west, likely to site A, and would be a long way away. Lashaway commented that the advantages and disadvantages of each site can be sent to the President. Cornwell commented that the sites all have different

challenges, which may have some value, and her only appeal to site D is the commercial strip, which is a distinctly different direction. Brown commented that having retail on the first floor of a residence hall is more of an upper classmen model rather than a freshmen model. She also expressed concern that site D is the front door in many ways to campus and she is not sure if a residence hall is the first thing people should see as they come to the university. Raffensperger also added that the Wool Lab would have to move. Rifke commented that unless those issues are resolved site D is highly disadvantageous because we would be taking up space that could become a mixed use building that the long range plan envisions. Thuringer would like a residence hall there in the future, but only when we have a relationship with those community businesses on campus. She doesn't think we can get that partnership done in three years. She would like to reserve site D for the future. Nine opposed site D, so the Motion failed. **Blunck moved to approve site G-west. Everts seconded the Motion and it was approved.** Thuringer moved to approve site A. Thull seconded the Motion. Gilpin commented that site C would be the logical choice out of the group of sites in that area of campus. Lashaway commented sites A and F have similar issues. 11 opposed site A, so the Motion failed. **Gilpin moved to approve site C. Lashaway seconded the Motion and it was approved.** Thuringer moved to approve site K. Blunck seconded the Motion. 11 opposed site K, so the Motion failed. Butler moved that enough sites were chosen for the President. Rifke seconded the Motion and it was approved unanimously.

The votes for approved sites:

Site F: Yes: 18
 No: 0

Site G-west: Yes: 11
 No: 7 (Banziger, Brekke, Cornwell, Hansen, LaCrone, Lashaway, Thuringer)

Site C: Yes: 11
 No: 7 (Blunck, Butler, Everts, LaCrone, Rifke, Thull, Thuringer)

ITEM No. 5 – Recommendation – Timber/Logger Sports Club Location

(Presented prior to Item No. 4)

Victoria Drummond gave a quick overview of the process of obtaining a location, which was required of the student club at the previous UFPB meeting. Facilities Planning received confirmation from Recreational Sports and the Dean of Students in favor of the new location. The new suggested location is the triangular area southeast of the track. Jeff Hix, Assistant Director of Recreational Sports and Fitness introduced student Gavin Lommatsch and explained that the club is looking for approval of their activities at the proposed location. Lommatsch summarized the activities the club will be doing. He explained that the collegiate level focuses on the history of the sport. Initially, they need a place to practice, and then storage in the future, making it clear that the request is one for approval to use this location. Butler questioned where in the area they would stage the practices. Lommatsch replied that they will be towards the southwest area of the lot so they are out of the way. He believes the roads that are already there should be sufficient. They will haul equipment to the site with pickup trucks until they can get a storage shed. Stump questioned how much noise they would produce and Lommatsch replied that only two out of 22 events include machinery, so there isn't as much noise. An event will be a fundraising event where they saw and split logs for firewood to sell. Stump also wanted to know if Sports Facilities was asked and Jeff Hix replied that Melanie Stocks released liability of the area. Drummond also added that Matt Caires endorsed the club and that he intended to be present to voice that endorsement. Stump questioned weed control and Butler replied Facilities Services will take care of it. Cornwell questioned if this is a permanent allocation for use and Banziger and Butler both replied that like all other uses, this can be used for Timber Sports until it is superseded. Hosting competitions is a possibility for the future and they will need to contact Safety & Risk Management before these events are scheduled. Cornwell questioned what the liability issues are and if it's covered by our liability policies. Hix replied that it works like the other club sports. Hix added he likes the plan that Lommatsch has set forward and they have an association that they work with that is pretty strict. He believes the club has a good plan to protect themselves. Stump wanted an understanding of where the equipment would be so it's not in the way of where snow would be put, and explained that the university will get some complaints about noise. Blunck moved to approve the location as suggested. Butler made a friendly amendment that any future permanent structure and host competitions come back to UFPB. Thuringer seconded the Motion.

The vote:

Yes: 18
No: 0

This meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

p:\ufpb\meeting notes\2013 meeting notes\october\meeting notes 10-08-2013.docx

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