

**MEETING NOTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD
April 22, 2014**

- Members Present:** Nancy Cornwell - Chair, Walt Banziger - Vice Chair, Glenn Duff, Martha Potvin, Kurt Blunck, Michael Everts, Mandy Hansen, Tom Stump, Brenda York, Fatih Rifki, Robert Marley, Levi Birky, Jeff Butler, Julie Tatarka, Jim Thull
- Proxy:** Bob Lashaway for Terry Leist and Chris Fastnow, Victoria Drummond for Allyson Brekke
- Members Absent:** Brett Gunnick, Renee Riejo Pera, Linda LaCrone, Greg Gilpin
- Staff & Guests:** Ritchie Boyd, Bob Lashaway, Victoria Drummond, Carsten Kirby, Josh Soares, EJ Hook, Candace Mastel, Sam DesJardins, Randy Stephens, Allie Wilson, Matt Caires, Robert Putzke, Jason Smith, Jocelyn Larson, James Wilking, Kathy Osen, Elizabeth Brock, Doug Brekke, Kevin Amende, Colin Daniel, Gail Schontzler, Robin Mayer, Mandy St. Aubyn, Laura Anderson, Durward Sobek, Mark Frisby, Nicol Rae, Tracy Ellig, John Paxton, Lesley Gilmore, Butch Damberger, Ian Godwin, Ari Richard, Norm Williams, Margaret Jarrett, James Nielson, Katie Noland, Jesse Arroyo, Reed Powell, Ben Lloyd, Koegg Aytes, Cindy Tirrell, Diane Donnelly, Rob Maher, JM Callahan, Dale Huls, (others not signed in possible)

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

ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes

Everts moved to approve the meeting notes from April 8, 2014. Boyd 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 No. 4 – Informational – College of Engineering Site Presentation and Discussion – 3rd of 3 Presentations

Walt Banziger presented the plan for the new College of Engineering building and the site selection.

The sites that have been considered are south of SUB, west of Hamilton Hall, and north of the College of Business. The forth site that was explored is the current location of Facilities Services. The purpose of this discussion is to recommend a site to the board and take input from public.

The proposed site is the one south of the SUB, bordered by Grant Street, S. 7th Ave and the Fitness Center. The priority issues that are being looked at in selecting the site are sufficient land for a building that may be 120,000 square feet, to expand the College of Engineering neighborhood with possible plaza and presentation hall opportunities, and proximity to the current Engineering buildings. The site next to Hamilton Hall is too small for this size building. Connectivity to campus infrastructure, utilities, transportation, roadways and tunnel systems are also important. Availability of the site to build quickly eliminates the current location of Facilities, based on the timeline to build and amount of time and cost involved in relocating these operations. The timeline for this project is to have the architect on board by the end of June and break ground a year from now. The site north of the Jake Jabs College of Business and Entrepreneurship site is too far from existing College of Engineering facilities.

Banziger further discussed the advantages and challenges of the Grant Street site, including the existing parking lots and tennis courts, and current uses of Gatton Field. These would be addressed as part of the programming and schematic design of the project. The project is currently being advertised for consultant services through the State of Montana A & E Division. Consultant proposals will be reviewed, so that the consultant will be selected and begin the design process in June. Banziger then invited questions from the audience.

Marley proposed a motion that all functions that are on this site be appropriately accommodated. Stump seconded the motion.

Question 1 - Thull asked why the building location can't be pushed further to south, in order to avoid displacing the paid parking lot. Banziger explained that where the building is placed on the entire site has not been determined, and this will be addressed during the programming and schematic phase of the site development with architects, engineers, and transportation consultants. As they are developed, the site layout options will be brought back to UFPB for review and recommendation. Thull explained that his concern is that this could displace the only pay parking on campus and it will be less convenient for the community to visit campus. Lashaway added that the intent is for the project to work with all the involved entities to find a solution that works well. Cornwell noted that it is possible that the building will not displace tennis courts. Banziger explained that the design team will work with Parking operations, Athletics if the tennis courts are impacted, and the Marching Band if the project impacts Gatton Field where they practice. **Question 2** - Blunck asked the timeline of when this will come back to UFPB. Banziger responded that this will probably happen in mid to late September, after students are back. **Question 3** - How many parking spaces are on the considered site; there are 631 parking spaces. **Question 4** - If it is possible to build a parking garage on this site; Banziger said this could be an option to be considered. **Question 5** - Kirby asked if the orientation of the building could be along S. 7th Ave, and then build into the Facilities area; this would depend on the time frame of the development and if there was funding for additional expansion of academic buildings. **Question 6** - York asked if the cost of displaced parking is included in the project; any parking that is relocated will be included in the cost of the project. **Question 7** - Thull asked if it is possible that additional parking will be taken up during construction phase. Lashaway explained that there is not a way to provide temporary parking to compensate for parking used during construction, but it would be compensated to Parking in payment. Banziger added that this will be considered during the design process, and there would be opportunity to have long term staging in a remote location so that less on site space is occupied. **Question 8** - Will solutions to displaced functions be developed prior to construction? There are already some conversations taking place, and the goal is to have these solutions figured out before the functions are displaced by construction. **Question 9** - It was added that the Marga Hosaeus Fitness Center frequently uses Gatton Field unscheduled for Activity Classes for Credit, and has classes on the tennis courts.

Banziger showed the website for this project: www.montana.edu/us/pdc/allPrjs/NormAbjornson. Additional questions and comments after this meeting can be directed to Lauren Sherman-Boemker at 994-5413 or pdc@montana.edu.

Potvin moved to call the vote. The motion passed unanimously.

The vote:

Yes: 17
No: 0

ITEM No. 5 –INFORMATIONAL – Landscape Advisory Committee

Candace Mastel and EJ Hook presented a proposed new committee of UFPB, called the Landscape Advisory Committee. Over the last 8 to 10 years there have been significant site design and improvements on campus and they would like to see that continue. The proposed committee would be similar to UFPB committees such as the Public Art Committee, the Classroom Committee, and others like the Campus Sustainability Advisory Council, that work closely with UFPB to craft recommendations. These committees are able to filter some of the details of projects so that UFPB can review the major issues. This Landscape Advisory Committee would do this for site development and landscape development of the outdoor spaces on campus.

Using the Landscape Master Plan, and the drafted campus design guidelines, the Landscape Advisory Committee would advocate for good landscape design by giving advice on aspects relating to plans, proposals, projects, and activities in the outdoor environment of campus. The committee would be made up of people with an interest in the development of the campus landscape; this membership would be decided upon in the next few weeks and brought back to UFPB for review and recommendation. An example of what this committee would do is with the upcoming new College of Engineering building; they would advise on what happens with the streetscape, pedestrian circulation, and how it relates to the surroundings. The committee would help consider projects that are happening close in location and timeline so that the landscape can be connected and to minimize ongoing costs while maximizing the use of the space; an example of this is the Miller Dining Hall project and the new Residence Hall. Banziger added that additional responsibilities of this committee would include condition inventories of the landscape, propose priority projects as funds are available, and establish guidelines.

Rifki asked for clarification on if this is a subcommittee of UFPB or a separate committee. Mastel responded that this would be a committee that recommends action to UFPB; it might include some UFPB members, and will also have members from other areas. Stump asked if there is currently a committee like this. Hook explained that there is a Campus Tree Committee, which is very specific and is a requirement for Tree Campus USA. Stump also asked how far this would reach on projects. This is not intended to enforce boundaries or responsibility, and another barrier to accomplish projects; instead it should positively influence decisions for projects. Banziger added that this could start to identify how landscape is developed overall,

p:\ufpb\meeting notes\2014 meeting notes\04 april\draft meeting notes 04-22-2014.docx

similar to the buildings. Lashaway asked if another committee is really needed, and Cornwell suggested that the Tree Committee be joined with this. Hook did not think this would be possible, since the Tree Committee meets twice a year and is focused on conditions of trees. Lashaway followed up by asking how this committee would be setup, and how often they would meet, as this could be a large commitment. Hook said that it might meet monthly, alongside with projects. Mastel added that a lot of this work is already being done by a couple individuals, but this leaves out campus and community input which would be an opportunity of the committee. Blunck asked if membership would be voluntary, by organization type or position. Mastel responded that people would be invited to be part of the committee, based on their availability, but would also by organization. Everts asked if there are issues that have happened that are motivating the formation of this committee. Mastel explained that these tasks are getting accomplished, but with changes happening in the future a committee would be a more effective way to accomplish this. UFPB invited Mastel to come to a future meeting with the duties of the committee and a possible recommendation.

ITEM No. 6 – RECOMMENDATION – Commemorative Tribute at Miller Pavilion for Carolyn Thompson

Walt Banziger and Glenn Duff presented the proposed commemorative tribute for Carolyn Thompson to be in the Miller Pavilion. The Commemorative Tributes Committee has reviewed this request and voted in support of putting this memorial up. Ms. Thompson, who recently passed away, was a student, the secretary of the Equestrian Team and a good friend of all the students. This is a student lead effort and the Equestrian Team has put together a shadow box to honor Ms. Thompson. The shadow box is 26 inches wide, 39 inches tall, and 4 inches deep. The two proposed locations for this are above a section of bleachers on the south side of the pavilion, or above the staircase on the south east end of the pavilion. Stump asked if the memorial would be permanently on display in the pavilion, and it will be. Drummond asked if the location above the bleachers is in reachable distance by people in the stands. Duff explained that it would be reachable but most of the students use the other stands and this location is a good height and has good lighting for display. Cornwell asked if there is a code for how far something can extend out from the wall; it was clarified that this location is not in a circulation path since there is not a walkway behind the bleachers.

Lashaway moved to approve the memorial and allow Banziger and Duff to determine the final location. Thull seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The vote:

Yes: 17
No: 0

ITEM No. 7 – RECOMMENDATION -Public Art Committee – Library Mural

Victoria Drummond presented the proposed mural for public art in the library. In November of 2013 the Library identified a space conducive for an art piece, formed a committee and promoted a student art competition; the committee selected the student's art mural. On April 11, 2014 the Public Art Committee (PAC) reviewed a sketch of the mural selected by the Library Committee. The PAC voted unanimously in favor of the recommendation.

The individuals featured in the mural were designated by the University Archivist, and all are persons of significance to the history of the state and Montana State University. The mural will be in full color, and incorporates major themes from the Library's Merrill G. Burlingame Special Collections, which is adjacent to the Burton K. Wheeler reading room where the mural will be located. The project has begun and a \$1,000 gift for art materials was given to the artist, Lara Vaienti. A standard University plaque, costing about \$260, would have the title, year, and the artist's name; it has also been suggested that there also be a plaque identifying the individuals pictured in the mural.

Lashaway asked what surface the mural is being done on; Drummond explained that the PAC had recommended that this be painted on boards so that it could be relocated if necessary, however the work had already begun directly on the wall. The mural will be sealed and will not be removable. Thull explained that the project started before the Board's approval because as a student competition project for the library, the intent was to advertise the special collection behind the wall and understand that in the future it may be painted over. It was noted that there are two bears in the lower left hand corner and concern was that the President and/or others may object to the bears.

The motion passed unanimously.

The vote:

Yes: 17
No: 0

This meeting was adjourned at 4:30p.m.

p:\ufpb\meeting notes\2014 meeting notes\04 april\draft meeting notes 04-22-2014.docx

VCD: lsb

PC:

President Cruzado
Melissa Hill, President's Office
Maggie Hammett, President's Office
Keely Holmes, Provost Office
ASMSU President
Diane Heck, VP Admin & Finance

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
Victoria Drummond, Facilities PDC