

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TWIN CITIES
FACILITIES AND SUPPORT SERVICES
DECEMBER 14, 2010
Weisman Room 111

[In these minutes ~committee business; biomedical discovery district update]

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Lyndel King (chair), Kevin Upton, Bernadette Corley Troge, Anthony DeAngelis, George Wilcox, David Crane, Jeremy Todd, Gary Davis, Troy Velie, Keith Carlson

REGRETS: Mathew Pensyl, Lorelee Wederstrom, Laurie Schiech, Joseph Jameson, Stephan Roos, Gregory Cibuzar

ABSENT: Michael Berthelsen, Denny Olson

GUESTS: Rick Johnson, Capital Planning and Project Management, Departmental Director

Lyndel King called the meeting to order and welcomed those present. She asked the committee members to introduce themselves.

Ms. King provided the Subcommittee on Twin Cities Facilities and Support Services (STCFSS) members with the document “Higher Education Buildings National Comparative Construction Cost.” Capital Planning and Project Management Associate Vice President Mike Perkins forwarded this document to Ms. King following his presentation to STCFSS in September. Ms. King commented that in terms of pure construction it appears the University of Minnesota is doing comparatively well, but she noted that the document did not include a comparison of soft costs. She stated she would contact Associate Vice President Perkins for this information. Professor Kevin Upton stated that because the document compared such a wide variety of buildings it was not particularly useful. Ms. King pointed out the buildings that were similar. She also indicated she would ask Associate Vice President Perkins whether the construction cost numbers included land costs.

Biomedical Discovery District Update

Rick Johnson, Capital Planning and Project Management Departmental Director, gave a power point presentation on the history and progress of the Biomedical Discovery District. He noted that he presented to the committee a year ago and at that time the project was in the pre-design phase. He stated that currently the design development phase is being completed and construction would start on March 1. He noted there was a

slight funding difficulty that slowed down the project, but the University would break ground by March and have the building finished by May of 2013. Mr. Johnson stated the program is a \$292 million funding program between the State and the University to fund research facilities. The University issues the bonds and the state pays the University 75% of the principle and interest. The University pays 25%. The project was initially conceived as four buildings: the Center for Magnetic Resonance Research (CMRR), Cancer Research, Cardiovascular Research, and Infectious Disease Research. The initial timeline was 2008 to 2013. Mr. Johnson stated that this has all slightly changed. The CMRR expansion will be finished in July of 2011. The cancer and cardiovascular research buildings were combined into a single facility to take advantage of program efficiencies. There will not be a fourth building. Instead, there will likely be a future lab renovation program. \$38.5 million was set aside for the potential lab renovation.

Next, Mr. Johnson showed the committee a map of where the buildings are located in relation to the rest of the University. He noted that the Lions McGuire Translational research facility is complete and the Wallin Medical Bio-Science Building opened in 2009. The next phase of the project is the Cancer-Cardiovascular Facility on the corner of 6th Street and 23rd Avenue.

Mr. Johnson stated from a functional standpoint, the site was organized with clusters of research buildings, West, East, and Southeast. A central core support area primarily composed of the CMRR supports these buildings.

The next slide demonstrates the site organization concept - creating a district not stand-alone buildings. The blue area is a faculty-staff connection and the red indicates a research connection. The facility is planned to allow for additional buildings in the future. Ms. King asked what the difference was between an office connector and a research connector. Mr. Johnson stated the research connector is used for moving research animals. He noted the sensitivity in the research community about mixing the movement of individuals and research animals. He stated that unlike classrooms, the bio-medical district buildings have a high level of security and it is a challenge make the buildings available for the public, but also keep them secure from a research standpoint.

Professor Upton questioned why the slide depicted Granary Road when the City of Minneapolis denies that this road will be built. Mr. Johnson replied that Granary Road is not necessary for the biomedical discovery district plans to work but it is a challenge to design the north side of the district without it. He further noted that the University would like the road to be built, but it is not high on the city's list of priorities.

Mr. Johnson's next slide showed the organization of the site. He highlighted the plaza, lobby, office, and laboratory sections located along 6th Street and 23rd Avenue. He also pointed out the research commons that includes: animal holding, imaging, and the truck dock. Mr. Johnson stated that ideally this would be below grade, but that cannot be done due to the high water table at the site. He stated the research commons would connect to the Medical Bio-Science Building and they would share facilities such as a loading dock. He also pointed out the surface parking lot, which will be a contract lot. He next noted the diagram of the first floor with the public commons, 150-seat seminar room, and café. The floor plan for the second floor includes labs, lab support, offices and collaboration

spaces. This is primarily the cancer chemistry program. Level three is a mixture of cancer and cardiovascular research programs. Level four is dedicated to the cardiovascular program. Mr. Johnson acknowledged that separate buildings were initially envisioned, but explained that combining the buildings eliminated the need for multiple loading docks, lobbies, and vivariums. He noted that the building is sized so that two more labs can easily be added.

Next, Mr. Johnson discussed the exterior materials being used. They are primarily brick except for the office section that will be glass. The brick will tie in with the rest of the district. There will be a plaza in the front. Mr. Johnson also noted that the landscaping on 6th Street from Oak Street to 23rd Avenue would be improved and the new design would handle storm water in a more attractive way

Next, he showed STCFSS a video “fly through” of the completed facility. He noted there would be a green roof on the top of the research commons. Jeremy Todd asked if the green roof would support plant life. Mr. Johnson responded that it would, and Mr. Todd expressed concern about potential leakage, and maintenance and care costs involved with green roofs. He also noted that a green roof had been considered and rejected for the STSS building. Mr. Johnson reassured him that the roof would be constructed in a way to avoid leakage. Mr. Johnson pointed out that the lobby is open to the top and would be an area to display research and activities that are taking place in the building. Bernadette Corley Troge asked how the atrium would be lit. Mr. Johnson responded that had not yet been determined. Ms. Corley Troge cautioned against placing the lights at a height that would make it difficult to access them. Professor Upton asked about the security needs for the building. Mr. Johnson responded that they are developing a security concept that involves four zones. Zone 1 would be the most public. Zone 2 would require an access card. There would be higher security as you move up and into the building and in the animal areas. Committee members discussed security measures that are used in other buildings such as thumb print access for keys and record keeping for you accessing particular locations.

Ms. King asked if construction was beginning in March and if Mr. Johnson expected any further funding issues. Mr. Johnson confirmed the construction start date and stated he did not expect any further funding issues. He stated the bonds have been issued for the CMRR building and funding was released for the Cancer-Cardiology Building. The total project cost is approximately \$200,300,000. \$53.2 million will go to the CMRR, \$38.5 million to future lab renovation, and the remainder to the Cancer-Cardiology Building. Mr. Johnson noted that infrastructure lines must be extended including electrical, ductwork, steam lines, and chilled water lines, and these are part of the project costs.

Mr. Johnson stated the building design development is completed. This involved a series of workshops with faculty to receive their input on labs, offices, support rooms and to provide information on the equipment in the labs. Construction documents are being completed on the first bid package that includes site preparation, underground utilities, excavation, and foundation work. Everything else in the building from structure, to mechanical, electrical, and the interior will be in the next bid package. Construction documents on the second bid package will be finished by August. A construction manager at risk delivery system is being used. The guaranteed max price proposal is due

in January. Mr. Johnson will review this in February. The construction manager is MA Mortenson. This company worked on TCF Stadium, the CMRR and several other buildings at the University. Architectural Alliance is the architect of record. ZGF Architects is the associate architectural firm.

Mr. Johnson pointed out that lab buildings cost more per square foot than classrooms and offices because of their HVAC systems. He noted that HVAC is 40% of the project cost and that the construction cost will be \$450- 460 per square foot.

David Crane asked if there would be a chiller plant. Mr. Johnson responded that instead of a standalone chiller plant, there is a small central plant that chills the biomedical district buildings and has space for additional chillers to be added. He stated that by linking the buildings, excess chilled water capacity could be moved from one building to another.

Mr. Crane asked if the operational costs for laboratories are also different than those in classrooms. Mr. Johnson replied that the new buildings will meet the D-3 sustainability guidelines, but noted that there are new more stringent energy guidelines requiring the new buildings to be 15 to 20 % more energy efficient. CPPM is working to identify strategies for meeting these requirements, but it is a challenge because the laboratory buildings require so much air movement. One way the new energy efficiency requirements are being addressed is working with faculty to change energy consuming behaviors.

Professor Tony DeAngelis asked if the old cancer and cardiology laboratories would be renovated when their occupants move to the new facility and who would be moving into the old lab space. Mr. Johnson responded that they would be renovated, but he did not know who would be moving into them. The Cancer-Cardiology Building is designed for 63 principle investigators and their staff. 50% of these individuals would be coming from the University and 50% would be new hires. It has not yet been determined what will happen with the vacated space and how the money set aside for labs will be utilized. Decisions about these funds will likely be made in 2011-2012. They are waiting to involve the new president and the new senior vice president of the medical school.

Troy Velie asked how planning is done for labs that use research animals. Mr. Johnson replied that in the pre-design phase of the building, the lab programmer talks to the faculty about which animals are being used, then ratios are used to determine the number of cages. Ms. King thanked Mr. Johnson for his presentation.

Resolution

Ms. King led a brief discussion of the resolution the committee is drafting regarding the concerns Associate Vice President Perkins expressed about simplification of construction processes and procedures. Ms. King noted her concern that the material Associate Vice President Perkins had provided the committee was more operational than strategic. She stated she would work to craft a resolution that is more general and strategic and would use Mr. Perkins points as examples.

Committee Structure

Mr. Todd asked Ms. King if she had received any further information on the proposal to combine STCFSS with the Classroom Advisory Subcommittee. She stated that she had not heard anymore about this proposal. But she indicated she would speak with Professor Russell Luepker, chair of the Finance and Planning Committee (F&P). Ms. King asked Dawn Zugay, University Senate staff, if she had any further information about this. Ms. Zugay stated it was her understanding that STCFSS would become a part of its parent committee F&P. The committee members asked several questions about this proposal.

- Whether F & P would be enlarged to include former members of STCFSS?
- If there would be a system for prioritizing facilities issues so they are not lost among the other finance issues?
- Whether F& P would include ex officio members with experience and expertise in facilities and support services?

Ms. King commented that either clear lines should be drawn between F&P and STCFSS so that they are not considering similar issues, or STCFSS should be absorbed into F&P. Mr. Todd noted that there is value in STCFSS. He stated it looks specifically at the Twin Cities facilities and their support structure. Additionally, there are many committee members with specialized knowledge about facilities who bring institutional knowledge and the ability to question design plans. Ms. King stated she would submit the committee's questions to Professor Kate VandenBosch, chair of the Senate Consultative Committee, and Professor Luepker. She asked Ms. Zugay to look into inviting Professor VandenBosch to an upcoming STCFSS meeting.

Hearing no further business, Ms. King adjourned the meeting.

Dawn Zugay
University Senate Office

Follow up: Following the committee meeting, Ms. Zugay informed Ms. King that Professor Luepker would be the appropriate person with whom to discuss the committee's status rather than Professor VandenBosch. Because STCFSS is a subcommittee of F&P, F&P will ultimately determine STCFSS's status rather than the ad hoc committee of the SCC that has been reviewing the Senate committees.