

Master Plan Committee Minutes

Wednesday, February 14, 2018, 1:30–2:30 p.m.

Lory Student Center, Room 312

Members: Fred Haberecht, Dave Bradford, Mike Rush, Robert Peters for Mike Ellis, Tracey Abel, Tom Satterly, Nancy Hurt, Ellen Fisher, David Bradford, Kathleen Henry, Doug Max, Leslie Taylor

Other Participants: Jim Dolak, Kristi Buffington, Jessica Kramer, Shelly Carroll, David Hansen, Baylee Lakey, Julia Innes

1. Lake and Shields Redevelopment

- a. This property is between Lake St. and James St. Will be approved by a city process.
 - i. Property in blue in graphic is owned by CSURF
 1. Would have to go through type 2 review.
 - ii. Property in orange in graphic is owned by Board of Governors (BOG)
 1. Would have to go through site plan advisory.
- b. In Aug. 2016, MPC considered potential day care facility (based off Sunshine House floorplan and exterior play spaces) that could occur on Shields Street side of property. In addition, there might be supplemental parking that could occur or other building set backs off Lake Street.
 - i. Tried to maximize as much parking as possible.
 - ii. Would entail land acquisition with a trade of land between CSURF and BOG.
 - iii. Generally, MPC was receptive in 2016, except for one person; consensus was that the day care is a central university need. There is a large unmet need in the campus community, and this would be in support of that need.
 - iv. This is a likely project. Looking for confirmation that this is still a good idea to proceed with and that it would go forward to BOG in May.
- c. A new component to the plan is a proposed small facilities support building (prefabricated building with bathroom) to stage out of for Grounds activities in housing areas.
 - i. With lack of/diminishing space in the motor pool lot, FM is trying to think broadly about how to hold neutral to response times and ability in providing services, and to find supplemental/replacement areas for these needs.
 - ii. Just a notion currently; don't have the funding yet. In space and programming of the physical campus, FM is looking for opportunities for future facilities support.
 - iii. It is compatible with the aesthetics of the university and would be disconnected from the day care.
 - iv. Asking BOG to approve a swap of the orange BOG property (at top of graphic) or the blue CSURF property (where the facilities support bldg. would go).
 - v. Most is CSURF land, but within campus boundaries.
 - vi. The 924–928 Lake St. properties are not owned by the University, and those properties could coexist with this proposal.
 1. There is not value or a compelling reason to buy those two properties. Owner wants an excess of \$1 million for both.
 - vii. Estimated cost of facilities shed is about \$225,000. Concrete floor, heated bathroom, tied in to sanitary sewer, and computers.
 - viii. What else could go on that property?
 1. Probably not a bldg. for university use because the lots are extra thin and it's a small footprint.

- 2. May need to look at the nooks and crannies on property for facilities support.
 - 3. Previously talked about would we sell the property off or would CSURF make into student housing? No.
- ix. May need more storm water detention.
- d. What is the urgency and reason for putting facilities in that location?
 - i. Will provide efficiency in workday.
 - ii. Not crossing campus in equipment. Cut down on emissions.
 - iii. Will improve safety.
 - iv. If we move the central utility to the motor pool lot, it gets ready for the next project.
- e. Minus 16 spaces overall.
 - i. Will facilities vehicles occupy those parking spaces?
 - 1. FM vehicles will probably not occupy these spaces. FM gets charged for the spaces.
 - 2. The facility will be there mainly to support mowing operations.
 - ii. Supervisors and student hourlies would report there.
 - 1. Right now very limited parking for personal vehicles in the motor pool lot.
 - iii. Parking for day care, besides the limited staff, is mostly drop off, pick up, and midday events. Those south spots would be dedicated to the day care.
 - 1. Parents can't park in the parking spaces to the east of the daycare.
- f. Will there be issues with vehicles backing up traffic?
 - i. Shown as two-way traffic.
 - ii. Don't anticipate vehicles backed up like they did in the past because it's easier to get to Lake Street by going past the Stadium.
 - iii. At peak hour approx. 400 cars came from library parking lot previously, but the parking adjacent to the day care is not primarily turnover parking like library.
 - iv. City may ask for entry to be open on north side (gated currently), so traffic goes northbound on Shields without having to come back on Lake.
- g. Is this land swap the highest best use decision for university? Is the proposed day care an appropriate use in lieu of selling that parcel to the university for some other use?
 - i. Answered latter question in Aug. 2016.
- h. Ellen is the chair of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women Faculty. She shares that day care certainly comes up as major issue of keeping this university from becoming a family friendly university. Accessible and affordable daycare is a critical need for faculty and staff, so she is a huge proponent of this moving forward.

2. Whitcomb Prospect Turn Lane

- a. Private student development happening around corner on Lake Street, driving conversation about needing a turn pocket lane, due to additional traffic that it will bring about. Additionally, it is a potential benefit for the university, given the future redevelopment that will occur on campus.
- b. Graphic In the presentation:
 - i. Blue = the new turn lane
 - ii. Yellow = rerouted sidewalk
 - iii. Redline = new retaining wall
- c. This will go to BOG for granting of Right of Way (ROW). Have already granted the city ROW as part of the redevelopment of the parking lot. There will be additional ROW granted with this effort.
 - i. It is a net benefit to university on game days and long term, especially with redevelopment of Aylesworth/Newsom and other projects.

- ii. In context, there will be 1200 new beds with access off Lake Street.
 - iii. Developer to pay half of the turn pocket with the City paying the other half.
 - iv. City asked if CSU is interested in making deal to grant ROW and how much university will charge for it.
- d. Ellen asks if it will be a problem for traffic for basketball game days if there isn't a turn pocket and there is an addition to where people turn into the day care from the north before people turn into the Moby parking lot from Elizabeth.
- i. If not required to do traffic impact study, then probably minimal numbers and not a concern.
 - ii. Probably would come in on James Ct. if driving northbound. Don't have the trips coming into that zone. Turn pocket more likely not needed there.
- e. It is 1550 sq. ft. (to avoid trying to touch the enclosure), which is a smaller ROW-request than previously asked for.
- i. The committee concurs that this is in the best interest of the university to grant ROW.
 - 1. The University is not being asked to pay for any of it.

3. 626–624 Prospect

- a. Two parcels of land where Mortenson was set up/staged. Property is owned by CSURF. University is interested in this property, which has been reflected in master plan documents over last 15 years.
- i. If in the long-term, Blevins Ct. came into university ownership, there are many opportunities, such as parking structure, university building, etc.
- b. The two parcels could be parking in support of the university. Could yield approx. 115 spaces, is a little over an acre.
- i. Believe the City will ask for it to be exclusively accessed off Lake Street, but this is not viable without the removal of the house.
 - 1. CSU would have to buy the house from CSURF.
 - ii. In quarter mile walking distance, it could potentially be in support of parking for Aggie Village (which has a parking lot waiting list); the Stadium and Alumni center; the Aylesworth/Newsom redevelopments; or Richardson.
 - iii. If Parking and Transportation Services (PTS) managed the parking in that area, they would make the decision of who it would be in support of, based on many factors. Dave Bradford believes all those examples could work and PTS thinks it would be good to have this property in the PTS inventory.
 - iv. The plan would accommodate a sidewalk.
 - v. The parking is embedded in a neighborhood, but within 5-minute walk of multiple campus destinations with a parking deficit.
 - vi. A good placeholder for the area to the east, should it become available in the future.
 - vii. Traffic study from Newsom/Aylesworth could inform this.
- c. Doug Max is in support of this property being used for parking; believes it is a very functional space and useful for access.
- d. This property would potentially be surface parking, roughly for 15 years. If acquisition of sufficient Blevins Ct. property, then it could have further opportunities for use.
- i. Due to rules, CSURF can't build a parking lot on this property, but the University has different rules, so they could.
 - 1. CSURF is asking University to buy these parcels because CSU wants the property for eventual expansion, so they are just sitting there vacant right now.

- ii. Would cost about 1.3 million to acquire, which is what CSURF has paid for in acquisition and demolition of the houses that were there.
- e. Tom Satterly believes parking is a good use of the property.
- f. Kathleen Henry thinks it's a good use because it maintains flexibility for the future; it's a transitional use.
- g. Doug Max makes the motion to proceed exploration for the feasibility of acquiring and building a parking lot in this zone.
 - i. Tom Satterly seconds the motion.
 - ii. All are in favor.
- h. Next step is to talk to the City to ask what will be allowed.

Action item (Julia): Add to the next MPC agenda, an update to controlled maintenance state funds for the repairs to the LSC/Engineering Bridge topic.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 14, 1:30–2:30 p.m.*, Lory Student Center, Room 312

**MPC meeting time will potentially extend from 1:00–2:30 or 1:30–3:00 for future meetings.*