

Master Plan Committee (MPC) – Minutes

December 12, 2018 / LSC 328-330

Members & Ex-Officio: Tom Satterly, Dave Bradford, Fred Haberecht, Mike Rush, Doug Max, Rudy Garcia, Tom Biedscheid for Leslie Taylor, Christa Johnson for Alan Rudolph, Rick Callan for Nancy Hurt

Additional Participants: Shelly Carroll, David Hansen, Jessica Kramer, Julia Innes, Kristi Buffington, Seth Webb, John Hayes, Sam Martin, Michael Manfredo, Nick Lobejko, Bob Kaempfe, Lon Kendall, Aaron Fodge

1. Mountain Campus Learning Center

- a. Identified two potential sites for the learning center when brought to MPC previously.
 - i. Northern location is current preference, but this location is not confirmed/decided.
- b. Through master planning process, Warner College of Natural Resources (WCNR), Housing and Dining Services (HDS), and Facilities Management (FM) crafted a collective common vision for the mountain campus.
 - i. Classrooms at mountain campus are rustic. While people love the rustic character of the mountain campus, it also has provided an excuse for inadequate facilities.
 1. Number of students at mountain campus have doubled in the last decade, pushing the capacity of the facility.
 2. New classes are being taught at the mountain campus. There is a need for new teaching facilities.
 3. A huge opportunity to advance the university's research mission: The infrastructure for research has not been developed at the mountain campus. New instrumentation put in over the last year can provide base data, which many different researchers need and expect. Even with instrumentation, there is a need for space and capacity.
- c. Identified a donor, Dona Hildebrand, whose parents were at mountain campus in 1940s. She's passionate about the mission; agreed to provide core gift for creation of new building named in honor of her parents.
 - i. The building would involve significant teaching space, as well as space for research activities.
 - ii. Currently there is no office space for faculty to meet with students. Would like to build office space into this building.
- d. Cost & Funding
 - i. Cost estimate is \$2.6–2.9 million.
 - ii. Received \$150,000 in cash from donor. Donor included Warner College in her estate – to provide \$1 million or 50% of the estate (whichever is greater). In interim, have quasi-endowment with permission to pull funds from the account to self-finance until the estate is distributed. Funding also includes Warner College contribution and other possible sources.
 1. Plan to go to UFFAB with proposal to ask for contribution.
- e. An additional external step is to go to the County for Location and Extent of overall master plan, which will include a traffic study.
- f. Mike Rush adds that the Learning Center goes well with sanitary sewer treatment infrastructure plan, in terms of capacity.
 - i. Sanitary Sewer Treatment Facility project has some state control maintenance dollars.
 - ii. Gives mountain campus more flexibility in off-season.
- g. The Learning Center is a critical need for academic side of mountain campus operations.
- h. Doug Max motions to proceed to program plan based on preliminary finance review.
 - i. Rudy Garcia seconds the motion.
 - ii. All are in favor. None are opposed.

2. 222 Laurel Site Development Plan

- a. 222 Laurel is on north side of Laurel across from Guggenheim and Preconstruction.
 - i. Property owned/used since the 1940s.
 - ii. Classroom addition added four years ago, driven by donor and needs of expanding program.
 - iii. Gravel parking lot in the rear, underutilized by campus community.
- b. Neighborhood is single family housing and rentals transitioning into apartments. Mixed residential and commercial area.
 - i. This is the only parcel university owns within this block.
 - ii. It's subject to the City site plan advisory review.
 1. Development plan involves conceptual review by city staff, neighborhood meeting, incorporation of staff comments, and planning and zoning hearing.
- c. What is the highest best use of this property? Will the university hold onto this property forever? Does the university have interest in acquiring adjacent properties long term?
 - i. Program has needs and a donor who wants to contribute to it. Uniqueness as small site is a hinderance and an advantage.
 1. Unit can create identity.
 2. Donors can give discreet amount of money with a lot of impact.
 - ii. There is not a desire to keep or expand the parking.
 - iii. Master plan does not speak to acquiring more property in this location. Not a high priority because of the difficulty and high expense to acquire properties on that block. Acquisition philosophy is to acquire enough property to make large moves for the university.
 1. Examples of acquisition areas are Health and Medical Center location and Blevins Ct. location.
 2. Alternate examples are the commercial properties at University Services Center and 555 Howes were set up to serve the university.
- d. Programmatic needs to maximize site
 - i. Expansion of space from donor occurred to support graduate programs and build classroom.
 - ii. Now have 9 programs; 8 are graduate programs in tourism, plus the undergraduate program. Typically have steady enrollment.
 1. Launched online component of undergrad program this year.
 2. Tourism is the biggest economic driver in CO.
 3. Needs for space will double with more students participating in these programs.
 4. 222 Laurel provides learning community in homelike setting.
 - iii. 2 phases: 1st accommodates current needs, 2nd accommodates growth after approx. 5 years.
- e. Assume the university wants to maximize site while keeping the character of the place. Does this proposal maximize the potential of the site? Is this the place that is best for this program? Will the program outgrow the space? Will this site become not adequate for the program in future?
 - i. They plan to consolidate all tourism into one facility, move bulk of operations and faculty into the site, and will free up some space on main campus.
 - ii. John Hayes thinks the use of space would be very high value. It's a unique opportunity to create identity for the program; this would take it to another level. The impact of expanding and transforming space would heighten profile of program and will create new pipeline for other resources that come in.
 - iii. Rick Callan states that we wouldn't do a more intense or vertical development in this location without being able to assemble the surroundings.
 1. When the surrounding properties are ready to go more vertical, will this site be better to sell to invest those funds somewhere else, so the property is not so isolated?

- iv. The living room affect is appropriate for students and their subject matter.
 - 1. Michael Manfredo thinks the location is perfect for the tourism program. Not necessarily perfect for the conservation program because that belongs closer to the other WCNR programs. Confident that tourism can stand apart from the campus because it signifies something important to the economy of CO.
 - 2. If it became vertical in the future, would it still have that feel? It could do that.
 - 3. Seth Webb agrees about the feel. Having the program off-campus creates the sense that students are immersed in the industry and connected to the heart of Fort Collins, but they still have access to the main campus and WCNR building.
- f. Where do the student spark, if there are 200 students? Won't know until conceptual review and meeting with the City stakeholders.
- g. Shelly Carroll asks if we hold onto the property longer, would it likely be more valuable?
 - i. Real estate trends say yes, but it depends on what happens with what surrounds it. The increase in value is in the higher intensity and in going vertical around it, in what the future use of the land is. Groups are assembling and holding the properties around it. The value comes from what they do there. Not from what were currently doing or what we would do.
- h. Mike Rush adds that there will be additional opportunities for redevelopment of the existing house that can facilitate growth of property in next 20 years.
- i. Rudy Garcia motions to proceed to conceptual scope and budget, and to schedule conceptual review with City of Fort Collins planning.
 - i. Dave Bradford seconds the motion.
 - ii. All are in favor. None are opposed.

3. South Campus Animal Research Facility

- a. The South Campus Animal Research Facility is in support of TMI, replacing the space in VTH that currently holds research animals. Roughly 12,000 sq. feet will hold a variety of animals.
- b. Funding will be shared through a bond paid by Central, VPR's office and CVMBS.
- c. Location has been there quite a while; infrastructure should be in place. It's the location indicated in adopted south campus master plan, fulfilling established facilities in exact location on master plan.
- d. TMI needs this research facility; it's critical from a research perspective.
- e. Rudy Garcia motions to approve project and proceed to development phase.
 - i. Doug Max seconds the motion.
 - ii. All are in favor. None are opposed.

4. Environmental Health/Physiology Redevelopment

- a. These two buildings are redevelopment opportunities. The site is a cornerstone opportunity for the university. The site is one of four redevelopment sites that would yield over 200,000 sq. ft. that would benefit from a stakeholder group.
 - i. There is a need from CVMBS for their growing program
- b. To determine the path of this redevelopment, we ask:
 - i. Is it likely there is a single entity that will largely fund, manage, and programmatically direct this development site?
 - ii. Or is this a large project that could have implications to general assignment classrooms? Is it a front face of the university with other units that could benefit from that?
 - 1. Bring a stakeholder group together to discern if there are other needs that would be missed by having a single college or entity going forth with development.

- c. Doug Max motions to approve formation of a stakeholder committee and a draft charge.
 - i. Rudy Garcia seconds the motion.
 - ii. All are in favor. None are opposed.

5. Campus Wide Inclusivity Standards for Reflection Rooms

- a. All the other inclusivity standards are advancing through Facilities for final review and approval.
- b. Reflection rooms are flexible space where a person can take pause from the day to pray, relax, or refocus in their day.
- c. Have begun to put reflection rooms in buildings; most are single use and key carded.
 - i. Feb. 2018 in LSC 1900 uses in a month. Key carding allows for tracking the use.
- d. Met with stakeholders. Feedback received included:
 - i. Thankful for facilities we have. People were using bathrooms to pray and wash their feet; were using hallways to pray. Uncomfortable situation for various reasons and having facilities for this purpose relieves that situation.
 - ii. Desire for communal spaces for interfaith and single faith gatherings, flexible spaces that are a little larger. Often prayer times are predictive, so can schedule in advance.
- e. Spaces shown in presentation include:
 - i. Michael Smith WCNR Building
 - 1. Well used, has lock, not key carded. Didn't have standards in place at time of creation.
 - ii. Morgan Library
 - 1. Key carded.
 - iii. Still Point Reflection Space at the Health and Medical Center
 - 1. Communal space.
 - iv. Lory Student Center
 - 1. Key carded.
- f. Trying to be as flexible with limitations of various needs that exist.
 - i. Of all our inclusive features, reflection rooms are the least represented on campus.
 - ii. Need for flexible, adaptable spaces for groups that convene, often those with religious affiliation.
 - iii. Standard space is sized for prayer rug or yoga mat to be rolled out, including a place to take off coats, shoes, etc.
- g. Assumption that CSU will be more progressively diverse campus moving forward.
 - i. CVMBS on south campus is interested in building a reflection space.
 - ii. Reflection rooms are another way to help recruit students.
- h. To take offline existing reflection rooms will need review through the Inclusivity Committee.
 - i. In future will consider the likely locations and the geographic distribution.
- j. Would a reflection space have use/designated as such a space 24/7?
 - i. Can contact building proctor to put students on schedule or to reserve space in advance.
 - ii. Keep space flexible and scheduled ahead of time, then allow for flexibility of other possible uses.
 - iii. Reflection use would be given preferential scheduling over other uses.
 - iv. Facilities determines the process for how to schedule in advance.
- k. Will there be funding to support refurbishing space to make spaces more flexible?
 - i. Opportunities for this is when a building is built or during tenant finish.
- l. Rudy Garcia motions for approval for the concept of different reflection spaces and locations of reflection rooms.
 - i. Doug Max seconds the motion.
 - ii. All are in favor. None are opposed.