

MassArt Board of Trustees  
**Special Committee on Tower**  
June 24, 2019 2:00pm-4:00pm Alumni Room

**MINUTES**

**Members present:** Linda Snyder (Chair), David Lee, Bill McQuillan, Peter Nessen, Pamela Parisi. David Nelson (Ex-Officio). **Trustees absent:** none

**Visitors/Staff:** Howie LaRosee, Bob Perry, Kym Pinder, Cam Roberts, and Susana Segat (Board Secretary). DCAMM: Sarah Felton - Project Manager. Ayers Saint Gross (**ASG**): David Duxbury - Associate Planner. Leggat/McCall (**LM**): George Cole - Sr. VP, Duong Huynh - Assistant Project Manager. William Rawn Associates (**WRA**): Cliff Gayley - Principal, Samuel Lasky - Principal, Sindu Meier - Senior Associate, Adam Weber - Senior Associate

Call to Order

Chair Snyder called the meeting to order at 2:15pm. She welcomed the participants and asked for a round of introductions. She explained that at the end of the meeting, she would like to reserve some time for everyone's thoughts about the strategic capital challenges presented during the meeting.

Approval of the Minutes: May 6, 2019

On a motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

**VOTED: to approve the minutes of May 6, 2019**

Galleries Update

Chair Snyder said that Rudy Barajas from City Point Partners would not be in attendance because there is nothing new or concerning to report about the galleries project. Chair Snyder reported that the project looks fantastic. AVP LaRosee gave a brief update and reported that the building is scheduled for occupancy on July 9<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Snyder agreed with President Nelson's recommendation for the flow of rest of the agenda: an ASG report; WRA's thinking on moving forward; LM on managing the project; and then closing comments from DCAMM.

Ayers Saint Gross Report

David Duxbury presented slides that identified the project team, summarized the process, provided observations and existing space distribution data, assessed outcomes for space needs, and summarized next steps. He said that the goal would be to wrap up the work by late fall/early winter 2019.

Planner Duxbury said that the issues related to instructional space include size disparities across our disciplines, room geometries that inhibit flexibility, and space allocation policies that reinforce departmental boundaries. The issues related to instructional equipment include a culture where departments use similar but unshared equipment, which creates underutilization and redundancies. As for building systems and support, the lack of storage and support space inhibits flexibility and there is unbalanced and inadequate airflow, particularly in Tower. The issues related to event and collaborative spaces point to assembly spaces that have unique challenges in accessibility, site lines, and flexibility, as well as pockets of student lounge space that are not well utilized due to lack of location and furniture curating.

Planner Duxbury described the key themes heard throughout the listening sessions on space concerns:

- first year students have unique space needs;
- faculty apprehension regarding interdisciplinary shift is due to current facility constraints;
- students are able to find collaborative pathways;
- centralization of space allocation will be a challenge with many academic departments;
- community building and collaboration are key to both the departments and the college; and
- high demand for ventilated space for studio work but very little of it is available on campus.

He showed campus space by use (classes, studios, offices, library/study, assembly and exhibit, student centered) and remarked that it was notable that more than 50% of our space is used for instructional purposes. His comparative analysis, based on head count, showed MassArt using 170ft<sup>2</sup>/student, MICA using 198ft<sup>2</sup>/student, Ringling using 200ft<sup>2</sup>/student, RISD using 269ft<sup>2</sup>/student, VCU Qatar using 350ft<sup>2</sup>/student, KCAI using 427ft<sup>2</sup>/student, and the average art school using 278ft<sup>2</sup>/student. He then showed a chart of enrollment by head count by department at MassArt from 2009 through 2019.

Planner Duxbury listed his assumptions and key areas to address: inequity of space within programs; consistency of student experience; space inefficiency due to lack of space management policies; and “just because they have it now, does not mean they need it in the future”.

He then discussed the outcome on space needs. Currently, the existing net assignable square feet (NASF) total is 353,754. The difference between this existing space (353,754) plus post-South usage (377,891) and the proposed NASF (406,244) yields a deficit of 28,353 NASF. This deficit (28,353) plus the 14,000ft<sup>2</sup> that are not being used efficiently produce a total need of 42,000 NASF. These 42,000 NASF could be classified as follows: 25% mainly studio space; 19% offices; 15% physical plant; 14% assembly; 10% library and study space; 9% student centered spaces; 4% IT support; and 4% exhibit space.

Trustees discussed the assumptions used to produce the data, including the amount of space needed per discipline; the standards used; whether the peer institutions used for comparison actually have it right themselves; our ability to change policies on space use; that space needs were based on current enrollment; whether we would need 173ft<sup>2</sup> for every new student; and whether this current 7% space deficiency is in fact significant. Trustees agreed that over all, the data would be useful for community discussions on better space utilization. Project Manager Felton added that deeper data analysis would soon be available on the ASG’s on-line platform.

Chair Snyder summarized her understanding of the report: that would be that space needs based on current enrollment point to a 7%-10% shortfall on space. Project Manager Felton said that the scope now would be to look at different enrollment scenarios. Trustees agreed that they would like to deliberate on what it would mean to grow and what policies, scheduling, and other strategies would be needed to affect the 42,000 NASF.

Mr. Duxbury ended his remarks with a summary of proposed next steps: campus-wide space reallocation strategies; Kennedy and Tower building replacement programs; and swing space opportunities (in MassArt, in COF, other) to enable the projects. Chair Snyder thanked ASG for their presentation and yielded the floor to WRA for their remarks.

#### William Rawn Associates Report

Principal Gayley reported that his contract with DCAMM to provide services was now operational and then introduced his project team. He noted that his team had useful experience in construction during occupancy and in working with peer institutions in MassArt’s neighborhood. He described their style of working, which includes active listening, creating physical models, and implementing transformations within budgets. He said that he saw this project as creating a campus in a tower: either a new tower in Kennedy or a renovated tower in Tower. Principal Lansky provided examples of the importance of a building’s base in showcasing the life of the school as well as engaging the public realm, open spaces, Huntington Avenue, and our students and mission.

Principal Gayley said his charge was to review three options:

1. Kennedy – a new study
2. Full Tower – using past peer reviews
3. Partial Tower – using past peer review and may be considered as phase 1 of an eventual full renovation

He explained that this review would include construction elements (such as programming, efficiency, urban design goals, and 50-year vision); required swing spaces (which are a concern for all scenarios); revenue opportunities, net costs; and the number of years to occupancy. He said that the planning group would be meeting biweekly to develop multiple options for the Kennedy scenario.

#### Leggat McCall Report

Sr. VP Cole explained that his team’s goal was to set up various real estate hypotheticals once the other teams provide their recommendations. Chair Snyder noted the importance of valuing the real estate since it is MassArt’s main asset.

Chair Snyder thanked everyone for their participation and opened the meeting for closing remarks from each person around the table. She then announced that the next committee meeting would be held on August 13<sup>th</sup> at 2pm.

#### Adjournment

On a motion duly made and seconded at 4:10pm, it was unanimously **VOTED: to adjourn.**