

Master Plan Committee Minutes

**Wednesday, December 13, 1:30–2:30 p.m.**

Lory Student Center, Room 376–78

**Members:** Nancy Hurt, Fred Haberecht, Tom Satterly, Mike Rush, Rick Miranda, Doug Max, Lynn Johnson, Ellen Fisher, Blanche Hughes, Leslie Taylor

**Other participants:** David Hansen, Shelly Carroll, Kristi Buffington, Tracey Abel, Julia Innes, Mari Strombom, Laura Alexander, John Hayes, Mark Paschke, Seth Webb

1. **Mountain Campus Master Plan** (David Hansen/HDS representatives)

- a. Charrette occurred between HDS, Facilities, WCNR on 2/14/17 to develop future vision for mountain campus. The group also met in July on site. The last rendition of the mountain campus master plan is from 1996.
  - I. Mountain Campus is an incredible facility that has impact, but could fulfill more of its potential with this newer master plan; programs could also evolve and maximize the impact of the campus.
  - II. Crafted a collaborative, shared vision across the programs.
  - III. Strong effort to generate donor contributions to advance the broader vision for campus.
    - i. There is a donor identified to help with a teaching facility or teaching/research building.
- b. 5 keys items were identified as liabilities on mountain campus:
  - I. Beloved Student cabins – character and quality
    - i. Potbelly stoves in middle of wood cabin is a concern.
    - ii. There is a new cabin that potentially is a replacement model for the older cabins with a similar wood character, but newer amenities and a safer way to heat.
    - iii. Student cabins are possible deconstruction location for new facilities, and faculty/staff cabins are similar in age, challenges, and disrepair.
  - II. Need to expand dining hall facility/expansion of kitchen
    - i. Ability to host is currently a staged process because of their limited capacity, but with expansion they could host larger groups without having to stage.
    - ii. Bed/group capacity far outweighs seating capacity, leading to staged meal periods and ushering people out of the dining center. Kitchen is not modern. Dining (traffic, food, and dish) flow limits groups of larger sizes, which affects how long they can serve meals.
    - iii. Relocation of administration offices to another facility to assist with more floor space.
      - A. John Hayes notes that, functionally, there are no faculty offices currently and they have to meet with students in the cafeteria or in their lodging spaces.
  - III. Lab and classroom spaces needed
    - i. The old classroom is the original classroom from 40s (?)—very outdated. The new classroom dates from late 50s to early 60s, and is lacking in current amenities.
    - ii. A lot of classes spill over into the conference space; would like to return this space fully to conferences.

- iii. The lab building is the only bldg. that can be used all year long based on septic and water service allowing it to function.
      - A. Has small wet lab.
      - B. Apartment style rooms inside it.
    - iv. Classroom space is an issue when accommodating needs for more activity and classes; how to provide adequate lecture and small sub group indoor space simultaneously when there are needs for many different breakout spaces for academic needs.
    - v. The classrooms don't have the amenities the students deserve for quality education.
    - vi. The research building is primarily used for staff housing. Would like to advance research, but don't have fundamental infrastructure to do this.
  - IV. Waste water treatment plant
    - i. The current use maxes out the operation of this system. It is tied up in state code and regulation. The waste water treatment plant facility would have to expand first for the other facilities on campus to expand.
    - ii. Requested state controlled maintenance money to start design on project. Then will request next phase of state money with HDS partnering to construct new facility.
    - iii. Hired engineering firm to look at alternative designs; should get report in early Jan.
    - iv. Recently received letter from state that still not meeting discharge limitations in nitrogen mostly. Needs to be mitigated.
    - v. This plant was built in early 70s when conference center was built.
  - V. Lack of I.T. for student, staff, and faculty—the ability to talk back to campus
    - i. Students need to use Canvas; loading simple research data back and forth is a problem.
    - ii. Students leave the campus on the weekend, just to get reconnected with technology.
- c. New master plan configured in similar pattern to the way it is currently.
  - I. Currently there is parking in middle of campus.
    - i. Consideration to move all parking to the north end; people coming in could unload in the middle, but then move car back to north end.
    - ii. Logical trail network in consideration of that remote parking.
  - II. Move offices out of dining center.
    - i. Potentially put visitor center or main office right at main entry point as a greeting/check-in place.
  - III. Larger housing with multiple beds tied to an adjacent classroom facility.
  - IV. Need to take the whole mountain campus master plan to the County for approval process and to get entitlement.
    - i. With approval of master plan, the build out of water treatment plant would allow 551 students for campus population.
    - ii. Currently mountain campus is under 300 students.
  - V. Master plan could be part of marketing effort to reach out to potential donors.
- d. Design concepts for classroom/lab building
  - I. Accommodates a large classroom, 3–4 offices, visiting faculty space.
  - II. Combine two uses—teaching and research facility—into one building with the lower level having a lab function and the upper level with a classroom function.

- i. Would be 2 million–3 million most likely.
    - ii. Place for students to do lab-based work using samples collected in field; dual use that accommodates teaching, as well as resources for researchers.
    - iii. Classroom that can accommodate 60–80 students
    - iv. Flexible arrangement, so there could be multi-use depending on programs.
- e. Nancy asks, with the new water treatment would it allow additional bldgs. To be open year round?
  - I. That’s the plan because then the lines can go deeper.
  - II. More space would be usable.
  - III. Workshops could be held in off season
- f. Rick asks, what kind of county approvals are needed?
  - I. We would be subject to their location and extent review (similar to SPAR on campus) with a primary focus on sanitary sewer and impacts of trips on their roads. (Similar to what we had to do for ARDEC and foothills buildings and the one prototype cabin at mountain campus.)
    - i. They need to be informed.
    - ii. They need to know it will not be overwhelming their roads.
    - iii. They need to know we are prepared and in line with the sewer needs, so it won’t be detrimental to the community.
- g. Lynn asks, do we anticipate problems with the approval process? What triggers asking for approval from the MPC?
  - I. No, we do not anticipate problems; they’ve been receptive in the past. It behooves us to get approval now and have entitlement moving forward to do a build out over a number of years.
  - II. First we will meet with the county informally to see what they want and if they are receptive. Then we will come back and show a condensed version of this presentation and ask for the committee to approve the master plan. The assumption is that the buildings in the master plan would then come before MPC for approval over a period of years.
- h. We are not going through the facility program plan process just yet, but we are designing buildings. This comes before the building plan, and then if the donor is receptive to the offer, we would go through the funding approval process. Lynn agrees that this was needed to come first.

2. **Griffin Property** (Fred Haberecht)

- a. Griffin property is CSURF land expressly held for the benefit of CSU.
- b. What is the future of this property? Should we sell it, keep it, or keep it in part? CSURF would like input because they keep getting inquiries.
  - I. Master Plan shows future use in the area behind the Hilton for future club sports fields (15–20 years for rec center), but because it is in floodway, there could be no restroom facilities in the lower floodplain area.
- c. Site is defined by two apartment buildings facing Prospect. It is also a highly visible, open site from east and south. The site has the Mason outfall pond, a storm water facility managed by the university for the benefit of the university.
- d. Space in between has access off Prospect between the two apartment buildings; an entitlement we need to have for access to our property.
  - I. It would be difficult to do construction staging there.
  - II. Too far away from campus and hidden for remote parking.

- III. One function that resonates is to leverage the property with club sports in mind. We could have a central building with restrooms and enough parking to support activities, developing a trail connection directly to the soccer, rugby, and lacrosse fields. Maximize the value of the low area (20 acres), by using this section for staging purposes out of the floodway is the highest value and potentials of the site.
  - i. This would require negotiate an easement or land purchase through the state wildlife. Is probably possible in time.
  - ii. Could not put structure on floodway or floodway fringe. The red polygon in the presentation could have a structure with buildable land. Carrying capacity: 170 parking spaces could potentially fit and a building.
- e. If CSU gave up a portion of this property, it would be the eastern part that is extremely exposed to the mason trail; if we kept the entire property, we would need to put a buffer there regardless.
- f. Fred says the property is not valuable today, but could be in the future to help realize specific goals associated with the 20 acres below.
- g. Lynn asks if there is something pressing the decision?
  - I. Nancy says the immediate request, which has been ongoing for ten years, is to lease the space for parking for those adjacent apartments or for them to purchase part of it. If we lease it for parking, it will be perceived as permanent, even if we considered it just temporary. We could sell part of it or we can continue to decline the requests of the owners of the two apartment buildings.
  - II. City is going to fight a lot of traffic coming in and out there. It's not in our interest to have traffic coming in and out there.
- h. Lynn asks, could you get access off of Center Avenue? Lynn doesn't think it's a good idea from a transportation perspective; won't be able to turn left on Prospect. Is there an easier connection to the north?
  - I. Nancy clarifies that we would only be able to connect to Bay Drive, not Center.
  - II. Division of wildlife office would like to move; if they relocate, they'd be willing to get rid of their property. (Buildings will have to go away once division of wildlife moves because they are in the floodway.) You could potentially get entry out on Bay Drive.
  - III. Prospect access is valuable in that this is our high ground.
- i. The lower green space would be connected with Campus Recreation.
- j. Lynn asks, when would campus rec center expand and need space?
  - I. First step will be to make three of the rec center fields on main campus artificial to get more use out of them.
  - II. Second step will be to offload aggressive field uses to this area off main campus.
- k. The east edge of this property is direct connectivity with the MAX and we would like to preserve that for the future.
- l. Lynn would only want to do a temporary deal—If, however, that would set it up as a permanent perspective, then she is against it. Does not want to cut off future opportunities.
- m. Rick would not want to sell the property.
- n. Seth agrees that there could be uses in this space for youth sports events in the summer.
- o. Doug thinks the property could help conference services, opportunities for revenue generating with those fields.
  - I. Fred repeats can't have structures down there, but sports fields are okay
  - II. Lynn asks, Do you need more than storage and restrooms? Concessions? Picnic pavilions?
    - i. Definitely restrooms

- ii. Overhang for lightening
  - p. Mark thinks acquiring the division of wildlife property could be very helpful.
  - q. Tracey proposes the ability to negotiate parking from NRRC on weekends.
  - r. The lot behind Hilton can be used offseason, but it is in the floodplain too.
    - l. In the agreement, if we paved it, then we would have entitlement in non-monsoon (Sept. 15–April 15) season, but would have to create buffers to creek and storm water improvements to sue it. Depending on improvements and how it is managed, we could talk about day time use in off season. But won't allow overnight parking – would have to be actively managed and towed if cars were left.
  - s. There is consensus by the committee to hold on to the Griffin property and to maintain ownership. No one is against this decision.
3. **Campus as Arboretum** (Fred Haberecht)
- a. We have many different horticultural facilities on campus: Heritage garden, Annual Trial Gardens, Perennial Garden, Arboretum, New Horticulture Center, as well as talk of enhancing Monford Quad.
  - b. We have joined the American Public Garden Association. We are an official garden and arboretum.
  - c. Potential for increased tree diversity on campus. College frontage could be a potential display garden highlighting the university as an arboretum from Laurel Ave. to the Health and Med Center. That front lawn of the university speaks about permanence and quality of institution, the historic character of campus, and can be a learning/living opportunity.
    - l. In 2020, it will be CSU's 150 anniversary and we are leveraging this to potentially plant 150 trees along the frontage.
  - d. Lynn asks, would this designation as an arboretum create limitations for us down the road?
    - l. No, just tension between what could be a long-term feature and the mature trees. But as we redevelop, we wouldn't put a building that close to street on the College frontage anyway.
  - e. Most valued green spaces at CSU are the College Ave. frontage, the Oval, and the Great Green.
  - f. Lynn doesn't see problems going forward with an arboretum. No one else voices concern against.

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, January 10, 1:30–2:30 p.m., Lory Student Center, Virginia Dale Room 388A