WELCOME

CSU Master Plan (MPC) Committee Meeting

November 14, 2018
Today’s Agenda

Geothermal Exchange - Project Approval – Fred Haberecht/ David Hansen

Regional Detention Pond and Lagoon Revitalization - Project Approval – F. Haberecht/ D. Hansen

Women's NCAA Sports Complex - Master Plan Verification – F. Haberecht/ D. Hansen

Clark Charge Approval – F. Haberecht

Campus Wide Inclusivity Standards for Commuter Showers & Break Rooms – Jessica Kramer
Great Green Projects:
- Geothermal Exchange
- Regional Detention/ Lagoon Revitalization

Project Approvals
Field Use 2018
**Moby Geothermal Exchange (GeoX)**

- **Why?** Moby HVAC (1960s) and district utility steam piping (1950s) at end of life, replacing avoids repairs and replacement costs of $21M

- **What?** GeoX provides heating and cooling system that transfers sustainable energy (heat) to or from the ground, represents significant energy savings *(nearly 1/2 utility costs)*

  - $19.1M - $23.3M project, energy savings offset portion of payment and operations
  - 2-acre well field beneath sports fields; 550 wells @ 400 ft. deep
  - Research and Teaching opportunity
  - Low emissions – reduces carbon footprint by 200 MT/yr
District Heating Master Plan - Final - 2024
Moby Geothermal Exchange (GeoX)

Financials

- Project Budget: estimated $21.3M with State controlled maintenance funding of $2.2M contributed to project
- Resulting in an annual bond payment of $19.1M at 5% for 30 years = $1.2415M / Yr

Potential source of bond Payments:

- Moby complex estimated energy savings / Yr. $245K
- Reduction in steam and condensate line loss / Yr. $175K
- Contribution from Energy Reserve Fund fund/ Yr. $100K

Total Contributions $520K

Remaining bond payment: $721.5K / Yr.

When: Construction could start as early as Spring Summer of 2020
Motion Needed:
Project Approval to move forward with an RFP as early as January 2019?
Regional Detention/ Lagoon Revitalization

Project Approval
Lagoon Basin – Regional Detention
Stormwater Management: Regional Detention Pond Study and Analysis of Alternatives at Rec Fields

Option 1: Stormwater Detention at Fields 7, 8 and 9

Option 1 Disadvantages:

- Conflicts with utilities
- Limits field use because of steep slopes
- Smaller capacity
- Expensive option
Stormwater Management: Regional Detention Pond Study and Analysis of Alternatives at Rec Fields

Option 2: Stormwater Detention at Fields 1, 2 and 3

Option 2 Disadvantages:
- Conflicts with utilities
- Limits field use because of steep slopes
- High water table = smaller capacity
- Expensive option
Stormwater Management: Regional Detention Pond Study and Analysis of Alternatives at Rec Fields

Option 3: Series of ponds

Option 3 Disadvantages:

• Conflicts with utilities
• Limits more recreational field use than other options
• Expensive option
Stormwater Management: Regional Detention Pond Study and Analysis of Alternatives at Rec Fields

Option 4 Advantages:
- Minimal conflict with utilities
- Lagoon health is improved
- No field use impact
- Less expensive option

Disadvantages:
- Removal of berm which has physical use benefit to community
- Flood risk mitigation will require several sidewalk and wall modifications to occur

Option 4: Stormwater Detention at and near the Lagoon
Conceptual Design Approach

- Remove Berm and lower grades
- Modify grades and revitalize Lagoon Pond
- Improve water quality
- Reconstruct Outlet Structure and Pipe
- Raise weir grade To mitigate flood risk
Lagoon Conceptual Layout Plan

Pond edge treatment
Regional Detention

Why?

- As we build more impervious surface on campus, we need to detain more water to mitigate flood risk
- IGA with City of Ft Collins regulates the amount of stormwater CSU can release
- Detaining water on campus reduces/eliminates fees we owe the City of Ft Collins
- Lagoon has much deferred maintenance and requires renovation

When:

- Currently finalizing design based on Option 4
- Construction during Summer 2019

Budget:

- Project Budget: estimated range $2M - $2.5M ($1.6M has been secured for the project)
- FM has requested balance of $900k from VPUO
- Budget Shortfall result of unforeseen site conditions (Outlet structure and pipe as well as high water table resulting in more physical structure needing to be built i.e. site walls, hardscape modifications to mitigate flood risk)
Motion Needed: Project Approval to finalize design, bid documents and proceed with construction?
Women’s NCAA Sports Complex

Masterplan Verification
Proposed Field Use

Great Green - Field Use Masterplan
Motion Needed:
Meets the intent of the Master Plan, proceed with further design planning and cost verification?
Clark Redevelopment: Draft Charge

Request for Approval of Stakeholder Committee and its Charge
Clark Building Redevelopment Charge: Stakeholder Committee

The Master Plan Committee approval process for capital construction projects can involve the empaneling of a stakeholder committee for projects that are sufficiently comprehensive to benefit from multiple stakeholders.

The intent of the stakeholder committee is to ensure that diverse and sometimes conflicting thoughts about the scale and programmatic elements of specific development projects can and need to be voiced openly and in a facilitated setting. The desired outcome is a consensus recommendation from the stakeholder committee to the Master Plan Committee indicating the highest best use for the development site from a scale and programmatic perspective. If consensus is difficult to achieve, a range of relevant options is also acceptable and responsive to this charge.
Clark Building Charge: Stakeholder Committee

The stakeholder committee will be chaired by the key stakeholder dean, in this case by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and will be facilitated by the University Planner with Facilities Management team support in compiling inputs/data, processing data, and preparing the committee report. The key stakeholder dean is selected on the basis of funding, current use, proximity, and likely program plan leadership.

The other stakeholders will include members from:
• Vice President for Advancement
• Vice President for Student Affairs
• Dean of Natural Sciences
• Provost Office
• Vice President for Research
• Space Manager for Facilities Management
Clark Building Redevelopment Charge

• Expectation the committee will work collaboratively to develop consensus recommendation.
  o Committee members will seek input from other constituents to inform the group as needed.
  o Recommendation needs to be grounded in funding realities, including potential donor opportunities and a realistic look at non-donor opportunities.
Clark Building Redevelopment Charge: Specific Outcomes

1. Through walk-through and discussion (supported by circulation of “State of Clark” documents):
   a. Review current/recent enrollments, student credit hour generation, percentage occupancy, tuition generation, ongoing physical plant maintenance needs;
   b. Review and affirm student, faculty, staff feedback on studying/teaching/working in Clark;
   c. Review central place of Clark on academic spine and as anchor of Monfort Quad;
   d. Review central place of Clark for liberal arts and university-wide teaching/learning/support, and centrality of liberal arts to mission and values of university;
   e. Review revitalization of Clark in context of other campus development projects and needs.
2. Assuming phased development:
   a. Identify and prioritize approximate current gross sq. footage needs of CLA and current gross sq. footage needs of non-CLA occupants;
   b. Identify phased development of A and C wings;
   c. Consider models of revitalization offered by university architects;
   d. Identify resulting gross sq. footage increase of A;
   e. Identify resulting gross sq. footage increase of C;
   f. Identify programmatic opportunities in revitalized A;
   g. Identify programmatic opportunities in revitalized C;
   h. Discuss and prioritize options for B wing: demolition, partial demolition, other.
Clark Building Redevelopment Charge: Specific Outcomes

3. Review Clark’s place in estimated growth of student enrollment to 35,000 and thus increased needs for classroom/seminar/collaborative/research/office space for CLA and for AUCC courses:
   a. Identify and discuss teaching/learning synergies with other units such as Psychology and campus interdisciplinary initiatives;
   b. Identify increased research capabilities for CLA:
   c. Identify potential increase in laboratory and exhibition space for Department of Anthropology, and office/seminar space for Sociology and Economics centers/institutes;
   d. Identify collaborative possibilities for college interdisciplinary programs housed in revitalized Clark;
   e. Identify increased space for student success offices, namely, for CLA, the Academic Success Center;
   f. Identify the impact of revitalized Clark in the recruitment of new students and faculty.
Clark Building Redevelopment Charge: Milestones

- Committee start: **November 2018**
- Committee completion: **February 2019**
- Report to Master Plan Committee: **February/March 2019**
- VPUO/Provost/OC Review: **March 2019**
- President/Cabinet Approval: **April 2019**
Clark Building Redevelopment Charge: Recommendation/Report Out

- The product of this effort will be a recommendation to the Master Plan Committee describing the desired content of the redevelopment project, under the assumed constraints.

- The stakeholder committee report will include assumptions; description and rationale of criteria used; recommendations (several, perhaps based on different mixes of tenants and/or funding); tables summarizing criteria used in developing recommendations; outreach table of inputs; and planning documents (site plan, yield studies, existing/proposed floorplans, potential patterns of development).
Motion Needed:

Approve the stakeholder committee and its charge to return to the Master Plan Committee with report and recommendations.
Campus-wide Inclusivity Standards: Commuter Showers & Break Rooms

Request for Approval of Locations of Commuter Showers and Break Rooms
Inclusive Physical and Virtual Campus Policy

• Approved May 2017

• CSU actively fosters the inclusive environment by removing barriers, proactively planning, and anticipating inclusivity needs.

• Equitable access to University resources and facilities supports teaching, learning, living, commuting, working, visiting, and engaging in discovery.

• The University commits to the continual enhancement and systematic review of our virtual and built environments through the creation and implementation of inclusive design standards and best practices.
• All gender restrooms
• Lactation rooms
• Commuter showers
• Break rooms
• Reflection rooms
Inclusivity Standards: Commuter Showers

Key points:

• All commuter showers will be open to staff, faculty, and students
• Building decal with approved shower symbol on exterior door(s) of buildings
• Clear wayfinding signage with approved shower symbol
• CCure key card unit to unlock the shower facility
• Deadbolt to lock shower room from inside
• Emergency pull cord in shower stall to notify first responders in case of emergency
• Shower will be located ideally on ground floor of building
Inclusivity Standards: Commuter Showers

Key points:

• Commuter showers shall be available within approximately 1/8 mile from one building to another (less than a 5 min walk)

• New construction shall include two commuter showers if a building within a 1/8 mile does not exist with a commuter shower as determined by the Inclusive Physical and Virtual Campus Committee (IPVCC)

• A building remodel or addition that increases the square footage of the building shall include one commuter shower if a building within a 1/8 mile does not exist with a commuter shower as determined by the IPVCC (A building remodel that reconfigures more than 500 square feet in a building shall include two commuter showers within the same parameters)
Keycarding – We hope to provide Ramcard access to all campus users with a valid card during business hours.

Need Keycarding – While these exist and are currently open to campus users, CSU PD has asked we don’t public acknowledge them until we have keycarding to control access.

Special access would have to be granted to get to the shower as it requires a keycard to get into the building before accessing the shower.

Inclusivity Standards: Commuter Showers
Inclusivity Standards: Commuter Showers

- Plan to communicate these showers to the campus community
- Include the shower symbol on the building decal
- Include shower locations on the online map: maps.colostate.edu
Inclusivity Standards: Break Rooms
Inclusivity Standards: Break Rooms

Key points:

• ADA and CSU design standards require sink and countertop height and accessibility.
• Provide accessible furniture that meets a variety of accessibility needs.
• Full-size refrigerator – *Full size refrigerator eliminates the need for energy-consuming mini-fridges in employee workplaces*
• Microwave, sink, paper towel dispenser, trash and recycling
Key points:

• New construction shall include at least one break room.

• A building interior remodel that reconfigures 8 or more existing rooms of a building and includes a change in use of existing space, OR an interior remodel that includes approximately 25% or more of the building square footage, shall include at least one break room (unless an exemption is made through a review process).
Request for Approval for locations of commuter showers and break rooms today.