

Master Plan Committee (MPC) Minutes

Wednesday, April 11, 2018, 1:30–3:00 p.m.

Lory Student Center, Room 312

Members: Leslie Taylor, Doug Max, Blanche Hughes, Rick Miranda, Alan Rudolph, Rick Callan for Nancy Hurt, Kathleen Henry, Tom Satterly, Tom Milligan, Jan Nerger, Lynn Johnson

Other Participants: Robert Peters for Mike Ellis (for agenda item 1), David Hansen, Shelly Carroll, Laura Bently, Bob Kaempfe, Jordan Berger, Tracey Abel, Julia Innes

1. LSC Phase 3 Redevelopment – Approval to go to Program Plan

- a. LSC Renovation Phases
 - i. Phase 1: Theater on south end
 - ii. Phase 2: Middle and south section in 2013
 - iii. Phase 3: North section, starting 2019
 1. 20% of people visiting LSC come in from the north entrance by the transit center.
- b. Hope to procure the Adult Learner and Veteran Services (ALVS) addition project, to be done in sequence with the LSC Renovation Phase 3.
 - i. Don't know where addition will be located yet.
 - ii. Preliminary program plan done for conceptual design purposes.
 - iii. The department is currently doing fundraising for donor funds. If they secure the funds, will try to do the two projects in conjunction with each other.
- c. LSC bridge improvements and canopy removal will also, possibly, be done in conjunction with the LSC Renovation Phase 3.
 - i. Funding approval in process.
 - ii. Don't yet know timeline.
 - iii. State architect has asked us to hold off on progressing with this. The funding was originally set aside for removal, but MPC recommended keeping the bridge. State legislation needs to take place before redirecting the funds to the change in scope. Believe that will happen.
- d. Primary focus of LSC Renovation Phase 3:
 - i. Making the aesthetics of the north end match Phase 2 south end renovations
 - ii. Plumbing, electrical, and mechanical upgrades
 - iii. Possibly upgrades to the Aspen Grill kitchen
 - iv. Transit center in some capacity, including update to restrooms.
 - v. Possibly modifications to loading dock.
- e. Here to get approval to move to program plan for LSC Renovation Phase 3.
 - i. Intend to procure the project with Design Build GMP contract.
 - ii. The program plan is cash-funded by LSC. Will eventually go out for bonds for the rest.
- f. Intending to release RFP for the first phase, around June–July 2018.
 - i. 15.5 million total development cost.
 - ii. AVLS 8–10 million for their portion.
- g. Tom Milligan asks, Do you proceed even without AVLS, if funding fails to materialize for AVLS?
 - i. Anticipate proceeding with LSC renovation.
 - ii. AVLS is a standalone, add-on component.
 - iii. Blanche adds they are going to SFRB for fee increase as an option.

- h. Motion to proceed to advance the project into the program plan phase of the work.
 - i. Dave Bradford motions to move forward to program plan.
 - ii. Doug Max seconds the motion.
 - iii. No objections.

2. EVTH/Facilities Management Master Planning at South Campus

- a. Asked at the last MPC meeting to reconcile the two master plans into a consolidated plan for south campus.
 - i. Prior to TMI/EVTH projects, the master plan was updated in 2015. It included a six-acre area held for Facilities Management (FM). Some of those functions exist there today with some ground held for future needs.
 - 1. This six-acre area was also represented in the previous master plans, prior to 2015.
 - ii. Tetrad made an update to the master plan with a shared-shop facilities building that could be shared by FM and some EVTH functions (such as their outdoor maintenance group and hay storage area).
 - 1. Plan represents a loop road that would connect Phemister Rd. to Redwing Dr. that doesn't exist today.
 - 2. Parking and access represented as to the north side.
 - 3. Challenges include icy conditions to manage in winter and potential issues with connecting to Phemister Road based on leases/legal language connected to NRRC.
 - 4. Carpentry shop in immediate proximity of EVTH and salt shed for ice melt (regulatory need based on the chemical stored in it) need to be moved.
- b. Revised plan
 - i. Access to area would come off Cross Drive rather than Phemister Rd. Goal is to keep access to the west.
 - ii. Push carpentry shop as far north as we can, so there is access from the south side and we don't have winter conditions issue.
 - iii. Turn the orientation of the salt shed; have access to it from the bus barn area as shared lay down area and for joint use of ground for access.
 - iv. The entire area would be enclosed with secured fencing.
 - v. Enclosed storage area for Remodels and Construction Services (RCS) for equipment and materials in a building to eliminate the visual clutter of pods/trailers that exist today.
 - vi. Heavily screen with vegetation.
 - vii. When the tennis courts were constructed a storm swell was created and electrical duct bank. Will utilize that for the storm sewer pipe system. The development plan wasn't representing that alignment for the storm sewer.
 - viii. Outdoor Services use mulch and other types of materials; would have a bulk storage area to accommodate that need.
 - ix. Currently building under the EVTH footprint, which is used by the College of Veterinary Medicine. The users deal with outdoor animal pens and have some degree of a receiving function for materials for the facility. Currently represented in the plan as outside the fence, but still trying to work through the best approach for the building.
 - x. Horse trailer drop off can come through a breezeway. The design is to not impact parking and access needs.

- c. Connecting of a loop drive/creating an outer rim road has been part of the master plan goal.
 - i. Niswender Road on the east side of facility – may have opportunity to slide it up for a connection point to create outer loop road.
 - ii. Bay Farm Road – hard to envision that being a main road because of the difficult turn by Drake and the substation.
 - iii. The loop road would eventually have a secured access. The goal is to increase security and awareness on south campus.
 - iv. Everyone primarily coming in off Drake at Research. Three-way intersection with City. No left out on Drake.
- d. Storage yard elements are currently being relocated to Foothills Campus and the International Blvd. Warehouse.
- e. Tom Satterly asks about the revised cost estimates for the facilities to the north.
 - i. Range of \$2.2–2.3 million would include regrading, storm pipe, the new RCS shop, the VTH shop, fencing, landscaping, utilities, paving to the gate and off Cross Drive, relocation of salt shed. Doesn't include the fourth facility in top right corner of the map.
 - ii. **Action Item (Jordan Berger):** Tom Satterly requests that Jordan get a cost estimate for the RCS storage facility future phase.
 - iii. We need approval for relocated facilities because they are under the footprint of EVTH, and thus there is a sense of urgency.
- f. Motion for approval of this modification to the plan, so we can finalize. The next step will be for the EVTH/Facilities Management Master Plan at South Campus to go to the President's Operations Committee.
 - i. Tom Milligan makes the motion.
 - ii. Doug Max seconds the motion.
 - iii. All are in favor; none opposed.

3. Shepardson Revitalization and Addition

- a. Created a program plan about two years ago, before the formal process for approval (i.e. the flow chart) was in place.
 - i. The program plan identified a full revitalization of the Shepardson building and an addition about doubling the size of the building for \$42.8 million dollars.
 - ii. Made state request for the past 6–7 years. This year they funded the first phase. Funding = 4.5 million, intended for design work; funding to arrive when the long bill is signed (May or June 2018) to begin this project.
- b. The intent was to look at demolition of Shepardson, but the price exceeded substantial renovations to the existing and exterior additions.
 - i. A revitalization and addition aligns with College of Ag's strategic plan, creating a home base for the College. Would primarily be located off Monford Quad. This would help with the recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students.
 - ii. History of the building important to the College – built in 1938 as part of the Public Works Administration.
- c. Went through extensive process for the program plan, engaging student groups, Horticulture and Landscape Architecture, as well as other groups within the College of Ag. Deficiencies identified were:
 - i. Classrooms were too small for current class offerings, but fully scheduled.

- ii. No learning and collaborative spaces – currently happens in hallways before and after classes.
 - iii. Floor to floor heights currently limit lab or classroom spaces because they are substantially lower than current standards of what we build to today. The inadequate space limits academic growth potential for the college. Lab and studio spaces are needed for the exact curriculum occurring, such as for design processes, etc.
- d. Users and Space
- i. Soil and Crop Sciences, Horticulture, and Landscape Architecture are in the building today. Desire to get the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics (DARE) out of the Clark building and into this building. The Student Success Center would move into this facility as well.
 - ii. Floorplan
 - 1. Basement level would have mechanical systems and a proposed auditorium.
 - 2. First floor would have student access and the dean’s suite. Two large classroom spaces on the south sides near Monford Quad, two off the north side of the building.
 - 3. Second floor would have Horticulture and Landscape Architecture and DARE, and several labs and teaching spaces. Plan to leverage visibility to the old facades (existing exterior of building) of the architecture within the building.
 - 4. Third floor would have Soil and Crop Sciences. Potential green roof on south side of building.
 - iii. Alan Rudolph inquires if any of the research space is intended to have Biosafety Level 2 or 3. The College of Ag has increased the number of faculty in plant pathogen work. Any work associated with needing special hoods or HVAC considerations?
 - 1. In the program plan, it was the existing lab people doing soil research who gave feedback on the needs.
 - 2. Recommendation by Alan to consider research infrastructure needs and to build a space that can accommodate for future research.
 - 3. **Action Item (FM):** As this moves forward, include VPR in programming conversations. Alan recommends including the Research Associate Dean of the College or department heads who are doing significant research in the College in the conversation. Will benefit the outcome to have the people who are planning a decade of research out to participate in these discussions.
 - iv. By dropping the basement level, can align floor to floor with the existing building itself. The intent is to have taller ceiling spaces to accommodate labs and classrooms. This was a big point of the architectural study.
 - v. Will bring portion of the building out to University Ave. with a new entry.
 - 1. Will resolve slight offset of sidewalk with the Administration Bldg.
 - 2. Will bring the look of the existing roof into the design of the additional building.
 - vi. Set up prominent entry off Monford Quad.
 - vii. Outdoor plaza student spaces outside.
 - viii. Separation of old building to the new: allow light into the atrium/trying to bring natural daylight into the building.
 - ix. Floodplain through Monford Quad is a logistical piece worked on with civil engineering. Have come up with solution to figure out if need to detain more water on site and how to manage water quality.
- e. Jan Nerger asks if the College of Ag will vacate more space than just in Clark, such as the Soils lab in NESB or other units?

- i. Only the one department (DARE) is identified in the program plan as vacating a space.
- ii. Because this is a major renovation, Lynn Johnson recommends that this go through space committee.
 - 1. **Action Item (Kristi Buffington):** What is the current sq. footage they have? What is the new sq. footage that they will have? Do a comparison of how much they are growing. Will it make sense for them to vacate more space? Provide layouts of space that is being vacated in Clark by both units (VPER and DARE).
 - 2. Alan adds, Does the green house space that we currently have accommodate this growth? Is there a need to correlate with other space assets that would be aligned with a growth of this size? Sometimes classes have projects in greenhouses. If expanding space, it's worth asking what other secondary effects, space evacuated greenhouse and ancillary spaces, are needed for teaching or research?
- f. This is an informational agenda item. The state moneys have aligned. There is a \$9 million cash component. Central is picking it up.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, May 9, 1:30–3:00 p.m., Lory Student Center, Room 312