MEETING MINUTES

Date:       Feb 2, 2012, 3:00 p.m.
Location:  MSU CoB Reid Hall, Room 415
Subject: MSU-College of Business Building – Work Session 1 Open House Information
Meeting – day two

Attendees: Susan Dana, MSU CoB Interim Dean, sdana@montana.edu
          Walt Banziger, wbanziger@montana.edu
          Frank Kerins, fkerins@montana.edu
          Russ Katherman, rkatherman@mt.gov
          Joe Triem, jtriem@mt.gov
          Audrey Lee, CoB Marketing
          Perry Solheim, CoB Faculty
          CoB Freshman Student
          Jackie Sather, MSU Foundation
          Hilerie Erlert, MSU Foundation
          Brenden Packwood, MSU ITC
          Adam Drake, MSU ITC
          Brett ?, Bozeman Green Build
          Katie Chandler, MSU Exponent
          4 staff from MSU FPDC – (not identified)
          Kevin Thane, Facilities and Univ. Council
          Tim Eddy, Hennebery Eddy, Teddy@henneberyeddy.com
          Jon McGrew, Hennebery Eddy, JMcgrew@henneberyeddy.com
          Kathleen Kavanaugh, Programming Consultant, kvkavanaugh@gmail.com
          Ben Lloyd, Comma-Q Architecture, ben@commaq.com
          Kim Everts, kim@commaq.com

Submitted:   Kim Everts

The following items were discussed at the 1st MSU College of Business project Informational Open House meeting:

Introductions:

We are starting out the project with the first phase – PROGRAMMING.

What goes in the building, how big is the building and where is the building - are the three main objectives in Programming Phase.

The Design Team Goals are:
LISTEN & LEARN
ESTABLISH A COMMON LANGUAGE
DEVELOPE EVALUATION CRITERIA

Gave a quick summary of the ideas discussed in the four different Sub-Committees:
Classrooms & Community Spaces, Faculty & Research Offices, Student Services & Institutes.

Discussed the goal of establishing a set of project criteria or values with the following:

The four favorites that the Building Committee selected are:
Community of Professionals
Creation of Knowledge & Exchange of Ideas
Celebrating it’s Place
Multiple Uses
Reviewed the Site Selection slides and discussed them as follows:

**Planning and Policy** – A cohesive plan on the campus expansion. Will use this and refer back to it when evaluating sites. Masterplan talks about increasing density, using building mass to create well defined outdoor space, like Romney Oval. Site and scale, Orient main building entry toward prominent open space. Then the nature of time (changes) looking out 10 years and 25 years.

**Multi-model user access** cars, bikes, peds, visitors, community/ staff and students, relationships to the rest of campus and other buildings. Parking.

**Experience and Environment** – Reid hall is in the perfect site. Views, on the mall, across from MT Hall, adjacency to Library. How do we find the next best spot? Opportunities in the landscape?

**Staging the Action** – heard this building wants to be hub, bring in visitors/community, creating successful public spaces. How do we do this, people are hard to herd. What kind of other campus activities do we want to consider adjacent to the building (outdoor spaces) Seeing the activity happening increases people’s interest in joining in.

**Utilities and energy** – the services for the building are important when looking at the location of the building.

The Site Selection Committee narrowed the sites down to 6 possible locations that the Design Team will now analyze. In summary they are: at the current Paylot south of Grant, Next to Hamilton Hall, North of Willson Hall, North of the new Chemistry Building, and at the Wool Lab site.

**Kathleen asked the attendees their thoughts about the Site or Building?**

Student – Concerned about removing parking, hard to find parking now. Relocating parking was not an issue.

Kevin – did we consider the green space between the Pay Lot and the Phy Ed building? Walt noted that this area is generally being reserved for athletics.

FPDC staff – the site north of Willson is most exciting, start implementing the Master Plan corridor running from up to MT Hall.

**Kathleen asked What Role should the Building Play for MSU?**

Perry – The building needs to assist in developing partnerships with other disciplines and community businesses.

Student – parking should not be an issue – do we really need parking at this building, or quantify the exact amount.

Jackie – are there site that will allow for expansion. Yes all but the Hamilton Site.

Kathleen asked what is it about Gaines Hall that people like?

Student – Gaines is inviting from the street because of the open glass entry.

FPDC Staff – The entry is great, but missed out on other street level opportunities and lack of windows to the south.

Walt – that area of Gaines did have windows into the Auditorium, but they were value engineered out for other amenities in the building.

Brenden – Windows are a serious problem for the AV use inside the auditorium space.

Tim – Auditoriums don’t have to be windowless.

FPDC Staff – Campus really needs better bike parking areas – always an issue for students and staff.

FPDC Staff – having breakout spaces in buildings for coffee and sandwiches is really important to the students and staff to have positive interactions.

Katie – Natural light, views and windows are very important priority for the students. (really dislike the rooms in Willson)

Susan – like the idea of transparency in this building, seeing out and seeing in, want it to foster professionalism.

Student – have been to Kelly Hall at the Univ. of Oregon and really like how open and inviting it is.

Perry – Gaines has good transitions spaces coming out of the teaching spaces, have as many positive interactions with the student walking out of class as inside class.

FPDC Staff – Views are a priority and transparency at the first floor level.

Tim Summed up that in the next few weeks the Design Team will be reviewing all the information gathered in the meetings held today and tomorrow. We will return at the end of the month with more defined information on the sites and spaces to review with the committees and the community.

The above represents the Architect’s understanding of the discussions and decisions communicated during the meeting. **Please bring any revisions or additions to the Architect’s attention within five (5) business days of receipt of these meeting minutes.** Thank you.