

Master Plan Committee (MPC) - Minutes

1/9/2019, LSC 308-310

Members & Ex Officio: Mari Strombom, Doug Max (for Agenda Item 1), Dave Bradford, Nancy Hurt, Fred Haberecht, Jan Nerger, Dell Rae Ciaravola, Alan Rudolph, Leslie Taylor

Additional Participants: Sonia Kreidenweis, Bob Kaempfe, Shelly Carroll, Kristi Buffington, Aaron Fodge, David Hansen, Jessica Kramer, Julia Innes

Women's NCAA Sports Complex

1. The consolidated women's soccer and softball complex is 9 acres and will cost approx. \$6.25 million. This is supported by lockers, a concession building, and new parking lot. Tony Frank is in support of this project.
 - a. Due to environmental conditions, as well as for a better fan experience, softball location is better to the south (where football practice fields historically have been).
 - i. Location of softball is currently in flood path—last year washed out infield twice.
 - ii. The site is constrained. Existing dugouts are too small for size of teams.
 - iii. Built in early 1990s and needs to be renovated and replaced.
 - iv. Having lights on it will allow for potential tournament games.
 - b. This project enables the practice soccer field to be moved to where softball was and have a competition soccer field.
 - i. Soccer does not have a permanent home, even after five seasons. Currently everything is portable; they have to set it up, then tear it down, storing it all in a shed.
 - c. To implement effectively, if everything were to come together, would start around November 2019.
 - i. Could maintain soccer and softball seasons without needing replacement facility.
 - d. Alan Rudolph asks about the name and use of NCAA – how many women's sports teams are there? Is this being built for two teams or for women's sports? How many women's sports teams are on campus? Will it be available to club teams?
 - i. Used by two teams, but built for women's sports. Athletics wanted to make sure it was a NCAA specification facility that meets all the criteria, but it is not exclusive to NCAA.
 - ii. Athletics has 10 NCAA women's teams and 6 men teams.
 - iii. There will also be camps and clinics, as well as sharing the facilities with other entities on campus. Athletics has partnered with the Rec Center and Club Sports before. Priority on scheduling first goes to the NCAA Athletic teams.
 - e. Shelly Carroll asks, Could men's soccer use it?
 - i. They could if there was a team, but Doug Max doesn't see them adding men's soccer in near future.
2. Leslie Taylor motions to proceed the Women's NCAA Sports Complex to program plan contingent on financing.
 - a. Mari Strombom seconds the motion.
 - b. All are in favor; none are opposed.

Foothills Campus Master Plan Status Update

1. Over a year ago Facilities Management (FM) team charged to gain better understanding of Foothills Campus: to find out how it functions, where the deficits are, and to challenge basic assumptions. Met with and received input from 13 diverse sub-holdings, identifying major issues and from those, make recommendations for the master plan.
 - a. Heard common themes of identity, equity, and connectivity:
 - i. IDENTITY – Identity is largely lacking at Foothills Campus. There are some units with strong identities while other units don't feel connected to the university. Identity is pride in their campus and knowing how the campus contributes to CSU. From a planning, administration, and community perspective it is an undervalued campus.
 - ii. CONNECTIVITY – This includes the social connectivity of groups within departments. The Factory, for example, is a group that is separated from other College of Engineering faculty. In college complex is a loss. Concerns related to connectivity back to main campus with lack of transit, as well as two disconnected campuses with the lack of a connector road between the two sides of Foothills Campus.
 1. Lack of connectivity limits food options. There needs to be a critical mass to support amenity.
 - iii. EQUITY – This includes equity in facilities. For example, the ERC is not equitable to most buildings on campus, beyond cosmetic issues. Equity also in having amenity options.
2. Parallel to the master plan process, Parking and Transportation Services and FM held Foothills Campus listening sessions on parking. Parking and access are integral to the success of Foothills Campus.
 - a. Improvements will be made over a three-year period, starting summer 2019. Paid permit parking will come into effect the summer of 2020. Parking fee is not determined yet. Next steps will include PTS and FM meeting with individual groups to understand their parking needs for undergraduates and graduates. Will be investing in parking lots this summer, such as ERC parking lot.
 - b. Alan asks how to deal with grad students paying for parking on Foothills Campus? Any talk of subsidizing parking? Concern that it will affect the research.
 - i. Dave Bradford shares that there have been no discussions of subsidizing, but PTS is considering how to improve access to Foothills by providing choices, such as with better transit service. May partner with City of Fort Collins and Transfort or through another method. Delaying permit requirement for one year so plan is in place to have options available.
3. Foothills Campus Master Plan Feedback
 - a. Research at Foothills Campus is critical to university.
 - b. There is a limited number of classrooms and a need for more. If there were more classroom spaces, there could be more teaching at Foothills. Did not hear need for building classroom facilities for undergraduates.
 - i. For Fisheries, their lab is their classroom.
 - ii. Will have a classroom at Temple Grandin Equine Center.
 - c. Enhanced Transit is critical.

- d. There is a lack of amenities, such as food services, classrooms, conference space.
- e. Sidewalks are needed to make connections among groups.
- f. Open space has value and current use; every area is programmed. Need to tell the story of its current value as well as its potential, so good decisions can be made.
 - i. Christman Field is a unique research resource; should be maintained and perpetuated.

4. MPC Responses to Feedback

- a. Alan Rudolph adds that the feedback is grounded in existing circumstances, so it doesn't mean elements that aren't needed now shouldn't be considered for the long-term future. He believes undergraduate classrooms make a campus. Additionally, Tech Park/Industry engagement was not represented in the feedback but should be considered.
- b. Alan Rudolph agrees there are lots of independent units at Foothills Campus. Research Associate Deans (RADs) are thinking about thematic threads that could be drawn through the campus, elements that could find commonality to build thematic approach to what the campus could be.
- c. Aaron Fodge hopes this planning effort will stimulate a leadership group on the Foothills Campus to build a coalition among disparate departments to advocate on behalf of the campus.
 - i. At the listening sessions, people seemed to feel that they didn't have a voice. When telling the story of Foothills Campus, people need to be behind the story and feel they have contributed to it.
 - 1. Alan Rudolph believes the RADs want to contribute to that group and lead the research side of the story.
 - 2. Sonia Kreidenweis adds that we're running out space on main campus to grow, especially for grad programs. Foothills holds great potential for the grad and research programs. More advocacy can occur when it is clear what belongs at Foothills.
 - 3. Jan Nerger thinks classrooms could be for graduate and undergraduates if built with flexibility, thinking ahead; rooms that could be used for seminars and defenses, as well as larger facilities for conferences and larger classrooms.
 - 4. By identifying these needs in advance, then when projects come forward, can explore if there is potential for these space needs to be built into projects.
- d. Alan Rudolph speaks to the huge competitive advantage in research to comingle with federal partners by co-locating federal agencies and CSU.
 - i. **Recommendation** – Create environment where CSU and federal collaboration centers of excellence are facilitated.
 - ii. 29 federal labs in Colorado. Could be a way to get the state engaged.

5. Foothills Campus Recommendations

- a. Need connector road between LaPorte and Rampart.
 - i. Connector road best on outer edge of campus because of ability to connect the campus at end, so transit is enabled. Transit is more limited without connector road. Two Dead end trips down Laporte and Rampart; could have a circulator with road.
 - ii. Road connection talked about in master plan for many years.
 - iii. This is an improved road with detached multipurpose trail.

1. Nancy Hurt recommends exploring where other modes will connect for the multipurpose trail to the north and south; concern for community/public who is in natural area north, cutting through prime research areas. Need to control the portals into our system, probably at CDC and end of Laporte, and not in between.
- iv. PFA says we need the connection road as well.
- b. Develop transit center at Overland Trail and Elizabeth AND campus wide transit route along connector road needed.
 - i. 4 transit routes currently run on West Elizabeth, touching the main campus. They have a circuitous route, hurting frequency and liability. Transfort would like a turn-around station for buses on Foothills Campus. Would ultimately have a rapid-transit or second MAX line that could run the length of West Elizabeth.
 1. Transit center could provide a turn-around; have engineering for this site.
 2. Tried to go after fed dollars—unsuccessful so far.
 - ii. Dedicated campus shuttle would feed into this area. Route would touch the station every three minutes. Over time, could consolidate the routes to less routes, but running more frequently, such as five or ten-minute shuttle service across campus.
 - iii. Well-received by Jerry Black. Currently, students dropped off across street play frogger to come to Pickett Center.
 - iv. City is in master planning process for city plan. This will be highly prioritized project/corridor.
 - v. Pickett Center parking lot is extremely underutilized. Leverage parking lot so it is used—for instance as a park-n-ride or by providing a reduced rate for people who want to use the shuttle.
 - vi. Last year, 31 percent of students considered transit their primary mode of transportation for coming to CSU.
- c. Construct campus hub at intersection of connector road.
 - i. Possible location at the beam lab.
 - ii. Combined conference area and food venue, possibly a classroom.
 1. Jan Nerger suggests could put brewery/fermentation sciences at Foothills to draw more people.
 2. Leslie Taylor suggests E-sports could go well at Foothills.
- d. Investment in existing deteriorating facilities and construction of new facilities.
- e. Consolidate isolated facilities into integrated campus.
 - i. Certain complexes, such as the Factory, would be better off by the Simons Center. Consider if we keep building where we're building.
 - ii. Vine Drive is not a place to continue investing.
- f. No further investment recommended for new buildings north of Rampart Rd.
 - i. Sonia Kreidenweis agrees that it makes sense to have a critical mass of students and faculty that can interact effectively, rather than being isolated.
 - ii. North of Laporte is great for atmospheric research.
 - iii. There is no sewer north of Laporte.
 - iv. Need to be less dispersed in investment and more focused so we create a campus.

- v. Investment in telling the story of Foothills campus, including possibly tours at the facilities and SOURCE stories so people know what others do.
 - g. Pedestrian connections needed.
 - i. Have a pedestrian loop on the Foothills Campus.
 - ii. Aaron Fodge adds that there is a regionally significant bicycle corridor nearby, so anything feeding into that corridor could lead to federal funding.
 - h. Permit parking on Foothills Campus in phased approach, starting summer 2020.
6. Additional MPC recommendations and questions
- a. Alan Rudolph asks about environmental assessments of the land, concerning what may be in the ground due to research. How much remediation will be required to make site ready for build?
 - i. There are areas north of BRB, but we're not planning to build there. Kristi Buffington is aware of some other areas for animals are buried.
 - ii. Alan asks, Are there concerns with emissions due to more transit? Will a background study need to be done?
 - 1. CSU would defer to the city.
 - iii. Are there issues with water, IT, laying fiber down?
 - 1. North of LaPorte two environmental issues: no sewer and extreme expansive shale soils.
 - 2. Major limitation central to Foothills Campus is overhead electric utilities and reliable power. Need to ground it from the substation.
 - b. Next primary steps are the need for the connector road, incremental investment, and promoting transit.
 - c. Aaron Fodge is concerned that asking facilities to convene the leadership group will lead to a perceived bias. Important to have a different way to funnel ideas, perhaps from Foothills Campus leadership.
 - i. Suggestion to put leadership team together, similar to the redevelopment stakeholder groups. An organized group to synthesize these recommendations and create a vision. Efforts of RADs can feed into it. This will develop good relationships.
 - ii. Convene Foothills Campus Stakeholders group to react to the assessment and give recommendation for how to advance the vision of Foothills Campus.
 - 1. It could be a challenge to get one group to represent the diverse voices and envision what's possible. Possibly start with three groups (education, engagement, research) and then bring them into one group to integrate these diversities.
 - iii. **Recommendation** – The Master Plan Committee affirms that these nine recommendations are critical issues. In addition, the committee sees a need to convene key stakeholders on Foothills Campus to advance and define the vision to move forward within a timeframe of 6–12 months, to be complete before summer 2020.
 - 1. There needs to be a leader who champions the effort. Facilities will be in support of it. This will have to be collaborative. Have a liaison of the effort who comes to MPC and shares info back out with Foothills.
7. **Recommendation** – The Master Plan Committee recommends putting a structure in place to build a communications plan. There needs to be a way to communicate with the people who work at

Foothills Campus. Need resources from the university that are dedicated that the campus has a way to communicate with each other.

- a. Mail services don't have list of names to match mail to.
 - b. HR doesn't know who works at Foothills Campus.
 - c. ACNS – ran out of options for how to identify people from IP address who work at Foothills
 - d. Put together short-term accurate email list based on the people who came to the PTS sessions (not all did so). Those were entered into Excel spread sheet. ACNS will set up an email list from it, but there is no mechanism to add and delete emails and no owner of the list for adding or taking people off.
 - e. Need to have a field in the HR system and to emphasize the importance of filling it in so ACNS can pull from it. Even if they work on multiple campuses, it is important to have that identified.
 - i. Are undergraduate students included on the list serve?
 - f. Safety Discussions – need to have a way to alert people in Foothills campus buildings.
 - i. Could there be text alerts for Foothills?
8. **Recommendation –** The recommendations should be prioritized.
- a. Some will have to happen before others. Will need to move on recommendations for connector road and transit (recommendations 1, 2, and 3) more expeditiously.