

**MEETING NOTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD
February 23, 2016**

Members Present: Walt Banziger – Co-Chair, Jeff Butler, Brenda York, Neil Jorgensen, Kurt Blunck, Tom Stump, Kathy Marcinko, Bob Lashaway, Chris Fastnow, Fatih Rifki, James Thull, Julie Tatarka, Kyle Glose, Michael Everts, David Singel

Proxy: Walt Banziger for Kregg Aytes

Members Absent: Charles Boyer, Chris Kearns, Allyson Brekke

Staff & Guests: Randy Stephens, Candace Mastel, Matt Caires, Steve Erickson, Brett Gunnink, Kristin Blackler, Rebecca Gleason, David Kack, Victoria Drummond, Bill Mackin, Jim Dolan, Ryan Diehl, Bill Mackin, Frank Parrish, Robert Putzke, Brad Daws, Sam Des Jardins, Brett Gunnink, Erik Grumstrup, Noah Bosworth, Emma Bode, Dave Roberts

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

ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes

Glose moved to approve the draft notes from November 17, 2015. Fastnow seconded the motion. The meeting notes were approved unanimously. York moved to approve the draft notes from January 12, 2016. Blunck seconded the motion. The meeting notes were approved unanimously. Jorgenson moved to approve the draft notes from January 26, 2016. Glose seconded the motion. The meeting notes were approved unanimously.

Draft notes from February 9, 2016 to be distributed before next meeting.

ITEM No. 2 – Executive Committee Report

Banziger updated UFPB on the temporary location of storage units associated with the Miller Dining Hall project next to McCall Hall and the Yellowstone Hall site; these units are no longer in use and have been removed.

ITEM No. 3 – CONSENT AGENDA

a. Update on Request for Student R&R Building Fee Funds for Tietz Engineered Systems Upgrades

On January 26, 2016, UFPB reviewed the request for \$500K in support of the Tietz Hall Engineered Systems Upgrades from the Student Building Fees Fund. Upon further discussion with the Provost's Office, the Office of Research & Economic Development, and Business and Finance, funding from additional sources has been identified and the amount that will be used from the Building Fees Fund has been reduced to \$180K. Shared funding will come from the Provost's Office and the VP of Research & Economic Development. This request does not need to go to ASMSU for resolution. UFPB voted unanimously in favor of this change.

ITEM No. 4 – RECOMMENDATION - Outdoor Recreation Bouldering Rock Site Location

Candace Mastel presented the proposal to install a bouldering rock near Yellowstone Hall, between the new building and Mandeville Creek. Outdoor Recreation has received some funding from ASMSU for this project, and the plan is to collaborate with Langlas, who is currently on site for Yellowstone Hall, to do the site work. The bouldering rock will be built by Stronghold and be similar to the existing bouldering rocks at Langohr Park and Bozeman Pond. The structure will be about twelve feet tall.

A group consisting of people from Outdoor Recreation, the School of Architecture, the community and students will hold a design charrette in March. Outdoor Recreation will be responsible for maintenance of the structure. The structure will have a textured surface and climbing features, but there will not be any mechanical holds attached to the structure. Erickson added that since there are no moving parts, maintenance will be relatively low. There will be fall protection around the base, and ADA accessibility is being developed. Everts added that the outcome of the charrette will include a diagram of how ADA access will be addressed.

Butler asked if there is a plan for removal in future due to deteriorated condition; Diehl responded that a statement to that effect could be included in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). York asked if there will be a path for access to the structure; Mastel showed the plan for a path from the bridge and sidewalk to the structure, with a potential for a transition area around the structure. This is to be explored further at the design charrette.

Stump moved to recommend installing the Bouldering Rock in an already existing recreation area. Glose seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The vote:

Yes: 16

No: 0

ITEM No. 5 – RECOMMENDATION - New Surface Parking Lot

The following are comments from the public that were heard prior to the presentation and discussion:

David Kack, from Western Transportation Institute (WTI) and a member of PTAC, explained that he voted against the new parking lot in PTAC vote. A recent comprehensive parking study showed at peak time there are about 850 spaces available on Campus. He brought up options that could cost less than the parking lot, including an on-campus shuttle, and incentives to park further from the core of Campus. Kack also brought up the Climate Action Plan (CAP) that has been implemented and successful; he explained that transportation to Campus and the amount of parking spaces being added should be addressed.

Mastel summarized comments on behalf of EJ Hook (attached). Hook prefers the location on north side of the proposed site because it follows the Long Range Campus Development Plan (LRCDP) in moving parking to the periphery of Campus, it is close to W. College Street, and adjacent to the existing shared use path. His second comment is “it is unfortunate that the pace required to develop this plan did not leave adequate time for an inclusionary process. Because of the short time allowed the plan addresses only one mode of transportation, vehicles, rather than look at the University’s transportation needs holistically...It seems the design/construction of this lot is likely to proceed at the prescribed pace. In cognizance of this time table [Hook] would ask that UFPB consider approving further design development of the north site with the caveat of including a multi-modal improvement as part of, or complementary to, the proposed parking improvement.”

Mastel added her own comments; she asked UFPB to consider providing parking only for that displaced by the New Dining Hall construction. She also suggested using remaining funds to develop or implement goals and objectives of the Bicycle Master Plan and the Parking and Transportation Plan. Lastly, she recommends consideration of the benefits of reducing demand on existing parking, by being progressive and developing alternatives that promote multi-modal transportation opportunities for the entire Campus community.

Rebecca Gleason, from WTI, thinks the University is missing an opportunity to use all the tools that are available. The CAP outlines tools to reduce parking demands, including guaranteed ride home programs and priority parking for carpool vehicles. There are also low cost opportunities for disincentives, such as increased parking fees, distance-based parking fees and parking meters.

Kristin Blackler, the Director of the MSU Office of Sustainability, reminded the Board that two goals of the Parking and Transportation Plan are to improve multi-modal connectivity between the Campus and off-campus destinations and to reduce the number of single occupant vehicles on and around Campus. She encouraged UFPB to make the approval of the parking lot conditional on using a portion of the funds for multi-modal planning.

Victoria Drummond, MSU Associate University Planner, said she thinks there is momentum at MSU to develop multi-modal transportation. She suggests that we continue with the new parking lot project but set aside some funds to mitigate the need for parking and provide benefit to bike users.

Kyle Glose read a letter on behalf of Bradley Jones, ASMSU Senator and representative on PTAC (attached). The letter addresses Jones’ concerns about the lack of opportunity for students and the public to comment on the activities of PTAC, and proposed the new parking lot be presented to the ASMSU Senate.

Emma Bode, President of the student club Sustainability Now (SNOW), stated that she opposes the proposed parking lot because encouraging more biking would be more in line with the CAP. Noah Bosworth, also from SNOW, voiced his support for Bode's comment.

Robert Putzke presented the proposal for the new surface parking lot as a recommendation from the Parking and Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC). This project has come up because the location chosen for the New Dining Hall may affect about 40 to 50 parking spaces. This parking lot is intended to make sure there is no net loss in parking spaces and to alleviate the general lack of parking in the north east quadrant of Campus. With the increase in enrollment, Parking Services is seeing the parking lots in this area of Campus filling up more quickly. Putzke acknowledged that there are unused parking spaces at peak demand times at the Stadium.

The timeline for this project is tight, due to the schedule for ground breaking on the New Dining Hall in Fall 2016. The budget for the new parking lot is \$500K and this will have a constraint on the amount of parking spaces that will be provided (about 184 parking spaces). The area being considered is north of the Family & Graduate Houses, between Glacier Court and College Street and South 13th and South 15th Avenues.

The PTAC reviewed the proposal for the new parking lot on February 22, 2016, and recommended to UFPB that a new surface parking lot be located in this area, either on the north or south portion of the site. Kurt Blunck responded to the letter from ASMSU Senator Bradley Jones; an email went out to every member of PTAC the week prior to the meeting on February 22nd, as soon as it was known that the PTAC meeting date would be changed, announcing the agenda item. He also noted that PTAC did not meet during November, December and January due to holidays and a lack of agenda items.

Walt Banziger gave some background on the site for the New Dining Hall; all three of the site options that were being considered would have affected parking in some way. The site that was recommended to President Cruzado is north of the Chemistry Biochemistry Building. Prior to approving a site, Cruzado has tasked CPDC with addressing the dislocated parking and functions of the Chemistry Modular Buildings. The urgency of the new parking lot is based on the schedule of the New Dining Hall to break ground by October 2016 and be open for Fall 2018. If this schedule is not met, the Dining Hall will not be able to open until Fall 2019.

Thull asked where the funding for the new parking lot is coming from; \$50K will come from Parking Services and the remainder is still being identified. Thull also asked if any alternatives to a parking lot have been discussed. PTAC did discuss other options, including a shuttle, which can cost about 250K per year to operate; Blackler noted that there may be some ways to decrease this cost. Butler added that running a shuttle could be net addition to emissions.

Fastnow asked why it is proposed to add parking in this area of Campus instead of just replacing what is dislocated by the New Dining Hall. Putzke responded that the demand in that area is very high, and that the majority of complaints are from parking in this area.

Singel asked what type of permit types the new parking lot would provide (housing, commuter, etc.) and what type of parking is being lost. Blunck responded that the type of permits in the new lot has not been determined and the parking that is being lost is reserved (R6) parking and E parking in the lot by the Chemistry Biochemistry Building (East Linfield Lot). There will also be some E spaces lost on Harrison Street. Singel would like to have a clear idea if there is going to be a decrease in student (living in the Residence Halls) permits in this area. Blunck explained that he has had a significant amount of complaints from commuters (staff, faculty and students) regarding parking in this area. The East Linfield, West Linfield, Greenhouse, Deer Street, and Antelope lots are all mixed-use lots. Recent surveys showed that the mixed use lots closer to housing are about 50% full with E parking permits on average. Stump added that discussions with students that live in this area have resulted in hearing that they are interested in parking in the parking garage at night.

Glose commented that it has been an ongoing trend that we add parking spaces as enrollment increases, but MSU continues to have problems with parking. He asked if this is really a solution to the problem of transportation to the core of Campus. Blunck responded that the increase in parking is in response to the increase in size of University and many things are affected by the increased enrollment.

Stump proposed that we view the agenda item today as an informational item, and come back to the next UFPB meeting for a vote on the recommendation. This gives time to present this to ASMSU, IFC and RHA. The additional information requested for the next UFPB meeting is (1) information from peer institutions on parking spot to student and staff ratio (this has been presented to UFPB in the past and some information can be taken from the Parking and Transportation Plan), and (2) a plan that shows cascading parking permit types (E, R, SB, etc.) moving to the new parking, or sense of priorities (we will try to get some information on this).

Lashaway motioned proposed that this item be viewed as an informational and will come back to the next UFPB meeting as a recommendation item, Stump seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The vote:

Yes: 16
No: 0

ITEM No. 6 – RECOMMENDATION - Site for Relocation of Chemistry Modular Buildings

The following are comments from the public that were heard prior to the presentation and discussion:

Erik Grumstrup, from the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, and is representing colleagues Bern Kohler and Rob Walker, who have labs in the Chemistry Modular Buildings. Currently 50% of their research group travel between the Modulars and the Chemistry Biochemistry Building hourly each day. If the Modulars are moved a long distance, this will not work for their operations.

Dave Roberts, Ecology Department Head, stated he has two research faculty with labs in the Modulars and he is concerned about where they are going to be relocated.

Victoria Drummond commented that the need to relocate the Modulars came up quickly, and we are trying to meet with individuals that are occupants of the Modulars.

As noted in the previous agenda item, the site for the New Dining Hall has not yet been approved, and Cruzado has tasked CPDC with addressing the relocation of the occupants of the Modulars and the relocation of the ADA instructional lab. Singel asked for clarification that this item is to address the Modulars not the occupants of the Modulars. Banziger noted that the solution will include moving the occupants with the Modulars or to another space on Campus and Drummond is working with the occupants and the Space Management Committee (SMC) on this.

Sam Des Jardins presented the proposal to relocate the Modulars to a location that is better suited for the type of operations that the Modulars are used for. The four potential locations that are being proposed are in Research Court, off S. 5th Avenue. Site A is next to building #630, known as the Kellogg Center. Site B is the current location of the Aquatic Science building (#220), which is currently not in use and there are utilities to the site. The Aquatic Science building would be relocated to the east of building #211. Site C is a vacant lot, next to building #533, which is where Joe Shaw's operation is located. Site D is also a vacant lot, next to building #534 and near the atmospheric gaging windmill.

Supplying utilities to sites C and D may be more difficult than Site B. Sites C and D are also in close proximity to Shaw's observation, which looks east to northeast and to Cobleigh Hall, but the height of the Modulars should not affect his research. From a planning perspective, site B fills in that corner with the neighboring buildings once building #220 is moved and has adjacencies to the existing utilities.

Glose asked if the Aquatic Science Building would need to be connected to utilities; Des Jardins responded that this is not an immediate need. Singel asked if this proposal would this work for the current occupants; Roberts responded that Research Court is not ideal but could be used because there are not many other options.

Singel suggested that this item also be changed to an informational item, and work toward a solution that also informs about the relocation of the occupants to bring back for recommendation in two weeks. Marcinko seconded the motion. Lashaway explained that the relocation of the occupants will be addressed by SMC and UFPB is recommending a location to move the Modulars. SMC will also discuss the temporary nature of the Modulars and assignment of space in them. Banziger added that Cruzado would like to be presented options for locations for the Modulars so UFPB should eliminate any options that are not acceptable. Lashaway expressed that this project needs to move forward more quickly than the new parking lot.

The group discussed if there are any other site options for the relocation of the Modulares. Brett Gunnink commented that for the College of Engineering use, any of the locations in Research Court would be as good as the current location. Drummond is also currently meeting with the all the occupants of the Modulares; what she has heard so far is they cannot think of any other appropriate locations, and this would be an acceptable location if the only other alternative was along or off S. 19th Avenue. Banziger stated that CPDC has not found any other appropriate locations east of S. 11th Avenue. Butler added this is a solution to get these temporary facilities out of the core of Campus, and into an area where there are other temporary facilities. Based on this discussion, Singel withdrew the motion.

Singel moved to recommend sites B, C or D, with the caveat that the occupants of the Modulares be addressed in an appropriate and satisfactory manner. Blunck seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The vote:

Yes: 16
No: 0

ITEM No. 7 – RECOMMENDATION - Lincoln Sculpture Site Proposals

This item will be moved to the next meeting.

ITEM No. 8 – RECOMMENDATION - Sonny Holland Sculpture

This item will be moved to the next meeting.

This meeting was adjourned at 5:10p.m.

CM:lsb

PC:

President Cruzado	Heidi Gagnon, VP Admin & Finance	Julie Kipfer, Communications
Amber Vestal, President’s Office	Jennifer Joyce, VP Student Success	Jody Barney, College of Agriculture
Maggie Hammett, President’s Office	Linda LaCrone, VP Research Office	Susan Fraser, College of Agriculture
Julie Heard, Provost’s Office	Tony Campeau, Registrar	Robin Happel, College of Agriculture
ASMSU President	Robert Putzke, MSU Police	JoDee Palin, College of Arts & Arch
Pam Schulz, VP Admin & Finance	Becky McMillan, Auxiliaries Services	Victoria Drummond, Campus PDC

New Surface Parking Lot-EJ comments as Environmental Services Manager and member of CSAC

Comment 1: I strongly prefer the north location for the lot because—

- It most fully captures the intent of the Design Guidelines as a peripheral location
- According to the LRCDP 10 and 25 year projected build outs the northern location remains a viable space for parking longer than the southern location.
- It places the lot closer to the College Street multi-modal path system.
- The irrigation infrastructure and 13th Street Recycle location were developed assuming the northern location

Comment 2: It is unfortunate that the pace required to develop this plan did not leave adequate time for an inclusionary process. Because of the short time allowed the plan addresses only one mode of transportation, vehicles, rather than look at the University's transportation needs holistically.

The University is currently developing a Transportation Master Plan and a Bicycle Master Plan which both have goals of increasing mode share. Both plans have been presented and commented on by multiple stakeholder groups who, in general, accept the idea of increasing and encouraging mode share. This plan presents an opportunity to continue progress towards the multi-modal goal. I do not think we should let this opportunity to incorporate multi-modal improvements pass us by. This is a chance to set the stage for the future of transportation and transportation management on our campus.

It seems the design/construction of this lot is likely to proceed at the prescribed pace. In cognizance of this time table I would ask that UFPB consider approving further design development of the north site with the caveat of including a multi-modal improvement as part of, or complementary to, the proposed parking improvement.

It would have been best to have fully developed multimodal option for consideration but there hasn't been time to do so. I can only offer my ideas for multimodal improvements that could be part of, or complementary to, the project—

- Include adequate pedestrian/bicycle access from the proposed parking lot to campus
- Widen and improve Animal Bio bridge over Mandeville Creek to safely accommodate bicycles and pedestrians as well as increase the efficiency of snow removal operations.
- Improve bicycle/pedestrian access to east end of Mall from 7th Street
- Improve utilization of south parking lots documented as under-utilized in the Transportation Master Plan study

TO: University Facilities and Planning Board

FROM: Bradley Jones, ASMSU Senator, Representative to PTAC

SUBJECT: New parking lot west of Antelope Lot

DATE: 23 February 2016

As the ASMSU representative on PTAC, I have concerns about the lack of opportunity for students and the public to comment on the activities of PTAC, particularly yesterday's vote regarding the proposed new parking lot west of Antelope lot. During this academic school year, the only PTAC meeting prior to February 22 was held on October 28, 2015. The following meetings were cancelled:

- September 24, 2015
- November 25, 2015
- December 2, 2015
- January 27, 2016

An agenda was not circulated with the rescheduling of the PTAC meeting, so I was unaware that there would be a vote to recommend spending \$500,000 on a new parking lot west of Antelope lot. I would presume the public was equally unaware of this considering that the date was moved forward and location of the PTAC meeting was changed. I'm also concerned that the new parking lot was listed on the agenda under Informational Items rather than Action Items, implying that there would be no vote on the item, only a presentation.

I am concerned that the students and the public voice are being overlooked in the rush to approve this parking lot. I would propose that UFPB postpone voting on this expenditure and ask that both UFPB and PTAC consider presenting to the ASMSU Senate in order to hear the voice of students and the public on this expenditure.

Bradley Jones,
ASMSU Senator At-Large