

Mater Plan Committee (MPC)

Minutes 11/14/18

Members and Ex-Officio: Rick Callan for Nancy Hurt, Fred Haberecht, Kathleen Henry, Blanche Hughes, Doug Max, Don Rojas for Jan Nerger, Leslie Taylor

Additional Participants: Bruce Ronda, Tonya Malik-Carson, Alex Bernasek, Shelly Carroll, Jessica Kramer, David Hansen, Tracey Abel, Julia Innes, Kristi Buffington, Julia Murphy

1. Geothermal Exchange – Project Approval Request

- a. Great Green
 - i. Fields 1–13 managed by Rec center for intermural field use. Blue dashed area on PowerPoint presentation managed by Athletics. Forms our 62-acre campus community park.
 - ii. This area has the benefit of flood detention, recreation fields, and great view corridor in and out of campus.
- b. When represented to MPC in September, initially thought geothermal would go in fields 7, 8, 9. With further investigation, quite a bit of utility conflict in those three fields. Now considering fields 1–6 with fields 4, 5, 6 first and, if and when needed, fields 1, 2, 3 for expansion of system.
 - i. Immediate need for geothermal wells is to provide service to Moby. Has aged infrastructure in Moby with district utility piping that brings steam to that side of campus.
 1. This project would take that steam line offline.
 - ii. Meets sustainability goals of campus to lower emissions and carbon footprint.
 - iii. Steam plant is next to railroad tracks by Oval. There is a significant amount of loss in pushing steam utility to Shields. For many years have been planning to terminate steam service at Meridian. This project is the realization of that.
 1. Allows to back fill steam system for future projects in the campus master plan.
 - iv. Meridian Village project could potentially tie into geothermal wells also.
 - v. Fields 1–6 still have the same function.
 1. After well field is drilled with new irrigation and top soil, the fields should be more functional at end of project. Irrigation currently dates from 1960s.
- c. Half million accounted for, but outstanding bond payment amount not accounted for. Not sure where other payment source will come from yet.
- d. Tom Satterly and Lynn Johnson met. Direction was to take to MPC so could begin planning for it as early as Jan. 2019.
- e. Some piping is needed back to Moby, but not significant.
 - i. Will be kept out of playing surface.
 - ii. Will go into Moby A.
- f. Likely scenario is for planning to commence Jan. 2019, construction 2020.
 - i. If Aylesworth/Newsom is brought on board with this project would have to do it summer of 2020. Because Aylesworth built to open in 2021.
- g. Doug Max motions to accept the plan to proceed to RFP.
 - i. Blanche Hughes seconds the motion.
 - ii. Committee approves; none are opposed.

2. Regional Detention/Lagoon Revitalization – Project Approval Request

- a. There are basins on campus that manage flood inundation and water as it comes onto campus.
 - i. Black lines on PowerPoint represent the basins/ponds.
 - ii. Blue represents water coming onto campus from west of Shields. Works its way through campus—multiple outfall points along College and South Campus/Prospect.
 - iii. As University has taken on considerable amount of water from the west from Avery Park, improvements done from Lagoon basin have manifold affects downstream.
 - 1. Over-detaining in lagoon basin has direct benefit to buildings on the Oval.
 - iv. Lagoon identified in 1996 as prime location to detain water on campus to mitigate floods.
 - 1. 100-year flood has occurred 5 times in the last century.
 - v. Need to develop detention that accounts for growth needs in impervious surface and is least disruptive to activities going on in the fields.
- b. Explored a series of options (advantages and disadvantages defined on PowerPoint slides).
 - i. Option 4 is preferred option – Will remove berm and lower area; regrade area around lagoon; improve lagoon by having more naturalistic way to clean water as storm water comes in and off campus; no field impacts; and several risk mitigation actions to do including adjusting grades of sidewalks and potential floodwall by lagoon and also grade adjustment by Eddy/Braiden.
- c. How often will there be water in the new pond?
 - i. In 100-year event, the pond will fill up and will spill through engineering parking lot.
 - 1. Likely an event will fill the pond.
 - 2. Major impacts for campus have been somewhat mitigated by the City through improvements for water coming onto campus, under 900 CFS.
- d. Project is needed because the growth of campus is driving the need for more detention. Also, CSU has IGA with City of Fort Collins regarding how much water we release off campus; this reduces/eliminates fees owed to the City.
- e. Blue line in PowerPoint represents new lagoon pond, which will be half the size of what exists today. This helps with evaporation issues. Scaled down, can change site slopes and make more usable with more naturalistic character.
- f. Finalizing design in option 4. Goal to have drawings out to bid over winter with construction to begin summer 2019.
 - i. Project meets our volume needs for campus and builds in some growth. There will still be water detention for individual buildings, but this project is most cost-effective way to move forward.
- g. Blanche Hughes motions for project approval to finalize design, bid documents, and proceed with construction.
 - i. Doug Max seconds the motion
 - ii. Everyone is in favor; none are opposed.

3. Women's NCAA Sports Complex

- a. Athletics has been using existing fields for years—they are three football-sized fields.
 - i. Put in synthetic field in early 2000, but it needs to be replaced. Now would like to take off synthetic turf, expand out, and put in grass field. Already has drainage system.
 - ii. PTS added parking lot on south side – helpful for faculty and staff.
 - iii. Existing softball field added in early 90s. Needs revitalization: field needs to be expanded, dugouts need to be redone.

- iv. Added soccer five years ago and soccer team has been without facility since then.
- v. Have restrooms and concessions in north side by parking lot.
- vi. Worked with Sports Recreation; they can share the space.
- vii. Existing softball is in flood plain and it's been flooded out. Grass field will be beneficial.
- b. Added new bike path on the northside of complex, from Shields underpass to Rec Center.
 - i. Concessions, lockers, and restrooms are all under one roof, as well as field support, on north end.
 - 1. If storm event occurred, people would have building to go to.
 - ii. Expand field a little.
 - iii. Opportunity to make fields more visible from Shields by pushing soccer to the west.
 - iv. Will require new lighting system, which doesn't exist today; could allow for expanded schedule.
- c. Fields are a long-term asset with detention east of Arthur's ditch.
 - i. Fields 10 & 11 would become artificial fields, allowing extended hours for Campus Rec, would take wear and tear off natural grass fields. If funded, could potentially occur at same time as NCAA project.
- d. Leslie Taylor asks is they've thought about where sand volleyball would fit into campus. Athletics has not discussed this. FM has given it some exploration without any conclusions.
- e. Kathleen Henry makes the motion that this meets the intent of master plan, is an appropriate use of space. Proceed with further design planning and cost verification.
 - i. Doug Max seconds the motion.
 - ii. Everyone is in favor; none are opposed.

4. Clark Redevelopment Draft Charge

- a. Empanel stakeholder group based on charge to look at future of Clark in existing footprint and future potential expansion. Greater potential for:
 - i. Use of sq. footage
 - ii. Campus identity
 - iii. Function of College of Liberal Arts (CLA) and other units that inhabit the space
- b. Intent is to have a process for large redevelopment sites (of over 200,000 sq. ft. of existing or potential space) to have multiple voices in discussion. Expectation that stakeholder committee looks at potential of site in context of the other redevelopment sites on campus, then recommend highest best use of site.
- c. Dean Withers would lead this stakeholder committee.
 - i. Julia Murphy will be a representative of Classroom Review Board on stakeholder committee.
- d. Bruce Ronda shares that CLA plans for 3 stakeholder committee meetings.
 - i. Meeting 1: Walk building/site to get sense for issues and how spaces are used. Then review data assembled about student use, building's financial impact on campus and tuition generation, ongoing facilities challenges, and think of how Clark is central to CLA and CLA is central to the university.
 - ii. Meeting 2: Committee input on phased revitalization of the two Clark wings, including discussion on future of B-wing. Look at possibilities for revitalization.
 - iii. Meeting 3: Discuss role Clark will play in campus of 35,000 students. Project the needs, including how many students in classrooms, as well as type of education and spaces needed in 21st century, how Clark is integral to the vision of the university.

- iv. Look into budget and finance. Report out.
- e. Tracey Abel asks, Will documents that come out of this committee help to inform future program plan?
 - i. Committee will give recommendation or options of recommendation.
 - 1. For example, possible recommendations could be to realize master plan goals and potential of Clark, there may be strategic phased additions to A and C wings. There may be internal reorganization of space based on criteria.
 - ii. If MPC agrees, then next steps would be to develop further materials, including preliminary high level finance plan. Then if approved, could go to program plan.
 - iii. The stakeholder committee will be very high level, giving a framework that defines what the project could look like and to have some idea of cost.
 - 1. Committee would consider framework for future development—affirmed or modified by MPC.
 - 2. Ultimately consultant would create program plan. Program plan process has a feedback loop to make sure it meets expectations.
- f. Kathleen Henry motions to approve stakeholder committee moving forward with charge to return to MPC with report and recommendations.
 - i. Blanche Hughes seconds the motion.
 - ii. All are in favor; none are opposed.

5. Campus-Wide Inclusivity Standards – Commuter Showers & Break Rooms

- a. Commuter showers (details provided on PowerPoint slide)
 - i. All the hot pink icons on the slide “Inclusivity Standards: Commuter Showers” depicts commuter showers that are key carded for everyone, but some people have found they don’t always work for everyone to get in. These are in the process of being updated.
 - ii. Communication plan to come out in SOURCE to discuss the inclusivity initiatives.
 - iii. Shelly Carroll asks, Who cleans the commuter showers?
 - 1. Facilities Management custodial will clean them as part of their maintenance.
 - 2. Don’t know the cleaning schedule.
 - 3. Some have soap dispensers, but that is optional and not required.
 - 4. People bring their own towels.
- b. Break rooms (details provided on PowerPoint slide)
 - i. Not requiring dishwashers, is optional.
 - ii. Want at least one break room and at least one gender-neutral restroom in each new building, possibly more depending on size of building.
- c. Asking for letter of support from MPC once all inclusivity standards have been presented to committee.
- d. Next steps include securing one-time funding for modifications to buildings, including identifying where and priorities.
- e. Inclusivity standards only apply to RI buildings, not HDS or auxiliary buildings.
- f. Blanche Hughes motions to approve locations of commuter showers and break rooms.
 - i. Kathleen Henry seconds the motion.
 - ii. All are in favor; none are opposed.