

Master Plan Committee Minutes

Wednesday, November 8, 1:30–2:30 p.m.

Lory Student Center, Room 312

Members: Nancy Hurt, Fred Haberecht, Dave Bradford, Doug Max, Mike Rush, Lynn Johnson, Rick Miranda, Tom Milligan, Blanche Hughes, Kathleen Henry, Tom Satterly

Other Participants: Jessica Kramer, Dave Hansen, Julia Innes, Shelly Carroll, Hanna Johnson, Anthony Taylor, Josh Silva, Jim Dolak, Mari Strombom, Rick Callan, Bob Kaempfe, Thom Hadley, Jordan Berger, Greg Lattig, Shawn Diederich, Ellen Fitzsimmons

Topic 1: South Campus Master Plan

1. CVMBS is looking for direction on the updated south campus master plan, so they can build donor materials for marketing.
2. Goals that inform the strategy for the south campus master plan are:
 - a. Goal 1: Start going through process of recommending a new name for the south campus into a veterinary medical center. It aligns with the direction of the college and the future of veterinary medicine, as well as human medicine. Will go through process to get name approved, but needed to tie it to the long-term strategic plan for south campus.
 - b. Goal 2: Develop south campus into a world class veterinary center.
 - i. Various stakeholders need to start operating as a unit, as a medical center; important to take advantage of the Translational Medicine Institute (TMI).
 - c. Further goals include:
 - i. Help physical environment match the program goals and visions, so the campus presents as a world class program from all sides of the building.
 - ii. Create environment that inspires/excites donors to give to south campus—a lot of the projects are driven by donor funding.
 - iii. Highest best use of land and physical constraints
 1. Plan for expansion
 - iv. Improve circulation and wayfinding
 - v. Infrastructure planning
 - vi. Security
 1. Lighting on campus at night
 - vii. Amenities
 1. Dining options
 2. Workout places
 3. Break spaces for long shifts
3. Began process by understanding the visions, goals, and needs by individual departments; then met with leadership and facilities biweekly; numerous program meetings; input from many stakeholders, etc.
 - a. Began with CSU master plan document.
 - b. Tetrad's goal was to create the physical campus framework to try to achieve all needs and make it a functional campus.
4. Functionality and Character
 - a. Critical adjacencies—working efficiently and effectively, as well as a front door/back door dynamic that needs to be addressed.
 - i. There are many first time visitors and repeat visitors who don't understand where the front door is.

- ii. Visitors with large vehicles coming through.
- iii. Members of the public who bring samples to the diagnostic lab may encounter a large animal carcass during their visit. How to make this work better?
- b. Focus public facing and community facing facilities along the south and the west while securing the back of house.
 - i. The dotted lines on the eastern side are secured or controlled access for those who work on campus and routinely deliver to campus and could key in.
 - ii. Maroon lines are gated entrances to control/limit back of house access.
 - iii. Niswender Rd. which currently goes to TMI is shown as moving to the north to give more contiguous ground and allow for adjacencies to the paddocks.
 - 1. Important to keep the name Niswender Rd.
- c. Lynn Johnson heard comments/criticisms around circulation scenarios for large trucks pulling trailers—how do they get in and turn around?
 - i. Currently, you would come in Research Blvd., turn right to come to Gillette Dr.
 - ii. The EVTH design has two breezeways.
 - iii. Funneling back out to Drake is the right solution. The city is putting a median at Drake at some point, and then drivers can do a left in ($\frac{3}{4}$ movement), just can't do left out onto Drake.
- d. Lynn Johnson asks, what does this plan indicate for the Gail Holmes Equine Orthopedic Research Lab?
 - i. It stays; it is just connected to EVTH.
- e. Other relocations/changes
 - i. SCVMA would be relocated.
 - ii. The Facilities Remodels & Construction Services woodshop currently exists within the EVTH footprint, so we would have to decide what would happen with that.
 - 1. What are the existing holdings and long term holdings for Facilities?
 - iii. The expansion plan assumes tennis courts are gone as well.
 - iv. The chemical storage and bus barn are shown as remaining.
 - v. The existing gait lab comes down and gets replaced with the new horse barn.
 - vi. Dog day care facility is identified as important to students.
 - vii. Chill plant will be expanded with EVTH, double size of footprint.
 - viii. Long term this campus would be programmed with VTH functions. Facilities and Athletics has to justify existing staying on this site for existing functions and future plans.
 - ix. Light grey = new facilities; dark grey (except for EVTH) = existing facilities and under construction.
- f. Geothermal looked at briefly - the challenge for making this work is to find enough space that won't have a building on it; it hasn't been investigated further, but there would need to be some additional area set aside for it.
 - i. To meet the city's requirements, the storm water ponds (not there today) are areas where we can't build in the future.
- g. For access, Research Blvd. is the signalized light. Currently, going to VTH, you have to go north to the middle access road to come back south again and the issue is how to address a more direct out.
 - i. A less intensive option in terms of infrastructure is to keep Gillette Dr. as is and extend it more formally around the hospital to provide access to the Jensen Road for the back of house and dog day care. It creates a connection to Phemister Rd. to keep back of house functions away from front of house functions.

- h. Dave Bradford asks, are there plans to do traffic studies for what that does to the parking lots on either sides of the road with what would become increased traffic flow of trucks and trailers in the parking lots?
 - i. Ellen F. says that Tetrad's preferred option for front door access to the existing hospital and to the proposed community practice building is a connection to Tietz Drive off of Research Blvd. That is a short distance (about 300 feet) between Drake and Research—in planning, it is considered a walkable urban block. The city says we will need to look at traffic volumes.
 - ii. The city requires about 600 ft. Today we are stacking vehicles south bound that would preclude this being functional. The stacking is generated by how the light must function at Mason and Drake—the light is red longer and this is not something that will change.
 - iii. The benefit of this option, however, is that it creates additional frontage for the cancer center and for future development and it provides direct community access with a prominent front door.
- i. The main change for the restructure is that Gillette has gone from being a more circular route to a straighter north-south route.
 - i. From a south campus perspective, this creates a strong western frontage that will primarily be new facilities, which focuses attention and access to TMI and EVTH and the other major facilities.
 - ii. By moving Gillette to the east it creates more contiguous future land for developing. However, it does require piping the Larimer County Ditch #2, which requires more investment in infrastructure.
- j. Lynn asks, what are the additional costs for piping and other infrastructure?
 - i. Currently working on getting prices and then will have that information as a final deliverable.
- k. Need to consider phasing. Could implement everything within the interior boundaries and then phase in the road at a later point, if preferred, or could do it in the first phase.
- l. The grade of the ditch is higher than Gillette Road.
- m. Storm sewer pipes along the lagoon are a constraint for building closer to Drake at the parking lot (south).
- n. Lynn asks, do you have to pipe the whole ditch?
 - i. Yes. Moving the ditch accomplishes three things. (1) It provides a front door concept to the entirety of the VTH complex, keeping with the notion of a medical center. (2) It facilitates a new access point. (3) It buys developmental land in a land-poor environment. Fred thinks you would have to pipe the whole ditch.
 - ii. There could be an expensive option to put a siphon in the ditch and it may not be allowed by the ditch company, but CSU would be responsible for maintaining the siphon if it were allowed.
- o. The east side of campus upholds the agricultural heritage of a veterinary campus while maintaining the functionality of the drain way; adding storm water detention; improving the lagoon; looking at fencing. Making sure people on the Mason trail and on transit see the agriculture character and history of the campus and of CVMBS. West side would be the contemporary veterinary medical complex; western buildings are not planned beyond square footages to understand potentials.
- p. Need to look at traffic studies and the future of surface versus structured parking.
- q. The Gillette corridor would be a recognizable research campus.
 - i. Maintains green buffer on Drake that is part of the overall master plan.
 - ii. It keeps service uses to the north on Phemister Rd. and Bay Rd.

- iii. Can walk to the amenities and shared facilities.
- iv. This plan helps achieve that control of the east side for biosecurity and back of house security. Secured access would be at Niswender and Booth Road.
- r. 3D images show significant addition to current VTH
 - i. Moving primary care components out of the existing facility into new facility.
 - ii. Every user group needed access to VTH—they all want dedicated entrances for bringing animals in.
- 5. This is a big vision for VTH and we do not have all the details worked out to incorporate into the master plan. However, marketing materials are needed to move forward.
 - a. Need to ask, where do existing functions go in the broader master plan?
 - b. Need traffic study to validate circulation assumptions.
 - c. Assumptions:
 - i. A VTH that eliminates internal parking and moves it to the perimeter to facilitate security and operational prerogatives (i.e. Codify back of house).
 - ii. A VTH hospital complex that puts effort into front door and image through building facades and proximity of a road and circulation (i.e. uniform image on the east edge, and for the EVTH on the north edge and south edge).
- 6. Timeframe for the hotel becoming more of a reality
 - a. Thom Hadley says that it is worth studying; he is seeing interest/demand from private sector, which raises the question if a hotel could be profitable and if creating a partnership could produce a revenue stream.
- 7. The 2nd year community practice impacts main campus as well.
 - a. They are using this for education of 2nd year DVM students.
 - b. There is a significant undergraduate growth in the college.
 - c. This will help address the need for looking at long term space issues.
- 8. Tom Milligan asks would it be feasible to have relocation of tennis courts funded by revenues over a certain course of time?
 - a. Thom Hadley believes that anything they displace has to be built into the revenue stream to displace it.
 - b. Jordan says that EVTH would need to be moved up north first to make room for other changes.
- 9. Lynn asks, what they are looking at in terms of marketing materials.
 - i. Top goal is a naming opportunity for the college and possibly south campus. In order to sell that level of \$100,000,000, will need a vision that can attract those types of donors and the vision needs to align with a vet med center and human MD program.
 - ii. Costs depend on contacts—haven't explored enough of who will go after yet.
- 10. Rick M. thinks it is an attractive vision that was presented.
 - a. Yes, it is the recommendation of the committee to validate these assumptions with a traffic study (sooner than later) and to go forward with the rendering and marketing materials.

Topic 2: Aylesworth Newsom Redevelopment Update

1. Why a redevelopment? The University enrollment growth over the last ten years is at approx. 1.25%, and it is anticipated that we will grow further and that we will need more student housing.
 - a. Need to house all freshman who want to live on campus and will therefore need more undergrad housing on campus.
 - b. Student success—Housing on campus produces student outcomes of higher GPAs and graduating on time.

- c. Condition of current facilities (Newsom – 1955, Allison – 1955)
- 2. The entire site will be redeveloped into internally focused residential housing with a village main street concept, which when completed will result in an integrated South Residential Life Housing District from Ingersoll (Shields St.) to Braiden.
 - a. This project will include dining.
 - b. This will be a phased redevelopment, with the Aylesworth site being the first phase.
- 3. To pull off the amount of growth anticipated on campus, we need to gross approx. 1400 beds on site. That is a net gain of 600 beds (subtracting the beds from taking away Allison Hall and Newsom).
 - a. Replacement of Newsom after Phase I – minus 400 beds
 - b. Removal of Allison after Phase II – minus 400 beds
 - c. 1.25 % growth = reaching 35,000 students on campus in 18–19 years, our growth ceiling.
- 4. 4240 put together two concepts
 - a. Hub and spoke concept
 - b. Tower concept
- 5. This will necessitate a new alignment for Meridian, which will likely be between Braiden and the redeveloped Aylesworth.
 - a. Realignment of Meridian Avenue realizes the goal of:
 - i. The promenade/visual/pedestrian connection to the Great Green
 - ii. Don't want multiple crossings of this pedestrian zone
 - iii. This is a critical connection for transit, bikes, and service vehicles and that is a necessity.
- 6. There is a need to accommodate a direct pedestrian connection from the Great Green to the new stadium on axis with the field.
- 7. The pedestrian access will be wide enough to achieve a view corridor to the new stadium from the Great Green and allow for 100 ft. wide zone for programmed tailgating in tents.
- 8. The program plan accommodates for a limited (20–25,000 square feet) of non-residential life programmed space.
 - a. To add more than that detracts from beds that can be accommodated on the site and is negative to the mission of what is trying to be accomplished.
 - b. Adding other functions there because of the type of construction/the scale of the project is economical, but can it be supported?
- 9. How does parking play into this and where?
 - a. 30 percent of freshman bring a vehicle to campus (= approx. 400 parking spaces needed).
 - b. The project will result in the loss of both 'A' parking and residence hall parking, and it is the understanding of HDS that on site or close proximity parking will be required for the redevelopment to be viable.
 - c. Is there structured parking on site? Are there other types of parking with it? Is there on street parking in close proximity to take some of the load? How much parking is needed for all of those areas—Alumni Center, Stadium, Aylesworth, Visual Arts, classrooms?
 - d. High turn-over parking internal to campus is a concern.
 - i. High turnover parking in library is consistently backing up traffic to Shields. How do we address that?
 - e. It is suggested that a traffic study further inform this aspect of the planning.
 - i. For example, does half of parking at library become static?
 - ii. Does Hughes Drive become a two-way street?
- 10. The 1400 beds are for a flex population. HDS is hoping to accommodate the growth of new students, but it will also allow for more returning students to live on-campus.
 - a. Parking is more critical to returning students; in order to attract returning students, need to provide parking in close proximity for those returning students.

- i. Parking in Aggie is very popular. There is a demand.
11. We do not yet know who will be paying for parking. Need to come back to the master plan committee with a parking and circulation study specific to this redevelopment.
 - a. Dave Bradford says, there is a steady decline in permit sales for the rest of campus. What is the reason behind that? What's the difference in needs between commuter versus apartments versus residential halls?
12. Dave B. recommends that we don't get stuck on one idea of which way Meridian goes.
 - a. It shows as going through the library up to University, but he is not a big proponent of this option because University Ave. is a very heavily-used bike and pedestrian corridor; it may not be the best option.
 - b. Reroute the buses?
 - c. The corridor has to move; no longer in same zone.
13. Fred suggests HDS goes forth with planning, but we need an approved circulation and parking plan to go with it. Agreed.
14. Josh asks regardless if it is moved, would Meridian be closed to regular traffic?
 - a. Yes, between Hughes and Plum.
 - b. We are seeing continued growth in bicyclists and pedestrians in this area.
15. Anthony says there's been an effort to push parking to the exterior perimeter of campus.
 - a. Yes, it was a concept from the master plan of the 1950s that internal parking lots will become building spots as campus grows.
 - b. The 1996 master plan also shows parking structures along the perimeter so the interior of campus has social spaces of engagement.
 - c. Working on a plan to codify service vehicle and cart movement in this area.
 - d. We also talk about what campus experience zones/university centric zones are that value pedestrian engagement.
16. Anthony asks, will parking be kept close to student housing?
 - a. Fred asks, how much parking do we allow central to campus and what is the character of that parking—for example, if there is no turnover?
17. Hanna said initially they wanted to do an extension of the SPOKE with this redevelopment. If the university is pushing for less parking and there is a shift in responsibility for students to find other ways to get around, then we need to make sure there are adequate resources to make that shift.
18. Anthony feels there does need to be some student parking near housing.
 - a. Mari shares that HDS is trying to study what percentage needs to be available for medical reasons, as well as for other reasons. It's not a question of whether to provide parking, but just a question of how much.
 - b. Can some buildings have less parking associated with them? Does every building need to allow for 30% parking?
 - c. Knowing also that this is their home rather than with students who are simply driving to go to class.
19. The most beneficial place to have this housing is as close to core as possible, in alignment with other housing, and close to other types of student facilities.
 - a. There is a tension between the proximity of facilities and the immediacy of parking.
20. Tom M. asks if there are residential areas that are better suited for parking/vehicle need?
 - a. Mari says we need to be very careful with that concept. Can't segregate people for health needs. It is important for the multiple residential learning communities to be accessible to all.
21. Mike Rush reiterates the committee agreed last time that with Meridian moving to the east, the site is for housing primarily, 5–6 story buildings potentially, with some density similar to Aggie, and we

still need to work on parking. There is also a visual pedestrian connection from the Great Green accommodated within this project.

a. The pedestrian connector between the stadium and the Great Green is not the exclusive domain of HDS, but is a community asset for game day.

22. Josh asks, what happens with Allison Hall?

a. It goes away, and potentially it may be a learning and living community for the College of Business.

b. It's a standalone, that is not associated with a district.

c. There are lots of good possibilities for the Allison area.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, December 13, 1:30–2:30 p.m., Lory Student Center, Room 376–78