

Master Plan Committee Minutes

Wednesday, March 14, 2018, 1:30–3:00 p.m.

Lory Student Center, Room 312

Members: Nancy Hurt, Lynn Johnson, Fred Haberecht, Tom Satterly, Dave Bradford, Kathleen Henry, Doug Max

Additional Participants: Thom Hadley, Bob Kaempfe, Jordan Berger, Britt Mactavish, Jim Dolak, Laura Alexander, Tracey Abel, David Hansen, Jessica Kramer, Julia Innes, Kristi Buffington

1. Aylesworth Newsom Redevelopment – Approval to go to Program Plan

- a. Summary and context to date:
 - i. This project is primarily housing with 2500 sq. ft. dedicated to other uses. There will be a reorientation of Meridian Drive. There will be an ample corridor through the middle of the project to accommodate game days from visual and programmatic standpoint. Will make sure there is parking appropriate for this project.
 - ii. Have answered the question of highest best use, location, character, and extent. Facilities has completed cost validation and worked on schedule. There is a finance plan in place. Before it goes to the program plan phase, this committee needs to raise any further questions and then sign off as approved by Master Plan Committee (MPC).
 - iii. The outstanding issues are being addressed/resolved through outside consultants: how much parking & location of it; alignment of new Meridian; parking lot versus parking structure.
 - iv. 1,400 beds on Aylesworth-Newsom site. Will only net 600 new beds.
 1. Losing 400 beds in Newsom and 400 more beds lost with the replacement of Allison with a total loss of 800 beds.
 - v. Full build out occurs in two phases, with first phase as Aylesworth completed 2021–2022 and then the second phase with Newsom completed 2024–2025.
 - vi. Plan is to build spaces that will interest new and incoming students and upper class students.
- b. Lynn expresses concern about the bubble in the off-campus real estate market potentially affecting on campus housing; concern that HDS will need to become more competitive with prices on campus if that occurs, so students don't move off campus; and wanting CSU to be mindful moving forward.
 - i. Aylesworth site will initially have 700 beds at the most for phase 1. Then Newsom gets replaced with another 700 beds while also needing to address the dining issue on the south side.
 1. 400 beds currently exist in Newsom.
 2. With Newsom coming down, there will still be 400 beds over in Allison. Gives us time to rebuild at Newsom before Allison comes down.
 - ii. Deferred maintenance on both Newsom and Allison is not without significant investment to make functional past 2025.
 1. Jim speaks to the new vibrancy of Aylesworth site corner with the new Alumni Center and Stadium.
- c. MPC recommends signing off on the form as an indication of approval to proceed.
 - i. Tom Satterly makes the motion.
 - ii. Lynn Johnson seconds the motion.

- iii. All are in favor.

2. EVTH – Planning Context & Implications

- a. Need to reconcile Tetrad master plan with the existing South Campus master plan and with Facilities Management's needs.
 - i. There are approx. 6 acres set aside for Facilities Management (FM) in the existing south campus master plan. The original intent was to accommodate lots of the motorpool lot functions: regulated materials building, the bus barn, the regulatory requirement to contain and make safer the salt shed. Then assumed over time other FM functions would go there, knowing space on main campus is not forever. As a service organization, FM needs to be in close proximity to what we use, so we can be responsive.
 - ii. Tetrad master plan for EVTH makes some contrary assumptions about the space.
 - 1. In the existing master plan, Cross Drive would remain and functions would be loaded from Cross Drive versus EVTH master plan where loading occurs from Phemister and connects to Redwing, with some of the area in detention. Thus, 6 acres for FM became a smaller space.
 - 2. Need to understand Phemister Drive, including the grade issues between high ground and lower ground at Phemister.
 - 3. Current functions need to continue, but where? There are several buildings and functions that are vulnerable and need to be accounted for within the current EVTH plan. The current plan removes the salt shed, the Remodel and Construction Services (RCS) carpentry shop, the FM storage yard, and some of the smaller ancillary buildings with a facilities function, as well as function for CVMBS.
- b. Where are the options for where Facilities could go?
 - i. FM functions include:
 - 1. Facilities Management North on main campus – mainly administrative office functions, carpentry, and a lock shop.
 - 2. General Services Building (GSB) on main campus – primarily the project managers for capital construction and RCS, as well as other functions of RCS.
 - 3. Facilities Management South on main campus – a series of shops in the motorpool lot, which include the Grounds/Outdoor Services shop, heavy equipment, the wash bay, motorpool functions, the electric shop, and similar sorts of functions.
 - 4. South campus is more industrial and has a carpentry shop, a paint booth, a plumbing shop, and an electric shop, as well as lots of storage.
 - ii. Strategies:
 - 1. On main campus, considering opportunities for satellite shop locations (as discussed in MPC, February 2018). For example, the proposed Summit Hall satellite shop for Grounds or locations for distributing fleet.
 - 2. Some of the bulk storage at the VTH complex can go to Foothills Campus.
 - 3. Some of the higher value storage items can use the warehouse facilities on International Way run by Steve Burn.
 - 4. The two Center Tech buildings on the corner of Research Blvd. and Center Avenue that have an equivalent type of space as we have in Facilities North and better space than in GSB. If in the next ten years or sooner, FM functions are displaced in project management, planning, and administrative functions on main campus, they

could function well in the Center Tech complex. It is an equivalent space close to campus.

5. Hope to consolidate shops into the motorpool lot.
 6. Intensive shop function and short-term storage associated with it needs to stay on south campus, including the wash bay and larger equipment functions.
 7. Staging is needed for RCS – millions of dollars of projects occurring and project buffer space is needed for short-term storage as project becomes ready for items.
- c. FM Recommendation that the best functional place for the carpentry, paint, plumbing, and electric shops associated with the RCS function is where we have historically shown a facilities holding being on the South Campus master plan. Associated with that, adequate space for transient storage is needed, which is part of their business. Also, incorporating those facilities functions for CVMBS in this same complex, but holding ground for the salt shed and for those kinds of functions. Don't believe the above function could be moved well to Center Tech because it is difficult to implement and not compatible with other tenants. Don't put administrative office functions in this space. Fred Haberecht asks for a vote to keep these kinds of functions on South Campus and to work through the process with EVTH to reconcile the two footprints.
- i. Doug Max thinks that it's an excellent plan. Don't shortchange FM.
 - ii. Goal is to have FM long-term plan that could come back to the MPC, if needed.
 1. Worst outcome would be to be out at Foothills Campus because of the concern for cutting down FM response time and not being able to bring as much value to the campus community. Doug Max comments that response time is important on campus.
 - iii. Thom Hadley is in support of it. He would prefer a single structure. Keep VTH program aspects within the ring road and facilities functions outside of the ring road.
 1. Thom Hadley requests that if the yard is moved to put it behind structures or have a screen or barrier because of their customers.
 - iv. Lynn Johnson asks if it is reconcilable.
 1. Fred Haberecht thinks it is resolvable, but FM needs to have a presence on south campus and each group will not get everything they want.
 2. Need to do an engineering plan to understand feasibility for Phemister to load those buildings from the south.
 3. Tracey Abel represents that EVTH would also like screening for some of what happens on the regulated materials and bus barn, which is why they want the approach to be on Phemister.
 4. Lynn Johnson says it needs to happen and to figure out how to do so without delaying EVTH.
 5. Jordan Berger and Britt Mactavish agree that the two plans can be reconciled and FM has a need to be out on south campus.
 - v. Near term tactical issue: EVTH needs to approve to move forward with design and will need to build in about a year, but there are about a half a dozen buildings within that footprint that need to be demolished, but first need an identified home. It takes about a year to know where the site is, to plan a new centralized facility or facilities, to build it, and to move the people in.
 1. MPC needs to confirm there is a compelling reason that FM stays in the EVTH footprint – carpentry shop is one of the critical pieces. Need entitlement to proceed.

2. Strategically, is this the right move for FM seen through a broader ten-year period?
Needs to be consistent with long-term strategic plan for FM.
 3. **Action Item (FM/Tetrad):** Return to the next MPC meeting with a plan that can speak to this reconciliation.
- d. The general MPC guidance is consent to go forward, resolve this issue, and come back with a plan. There are no dissenters.

3. EVTH – Approval for Project

- a. Waste management was already relocated.
- b. Paddock space mostly needed for walking horses in isolation, changing experience for long-term care. May have opportunity to shift area down.
- c. Image in Tetrad presentation, slide 2 represents phase 1 – took some square footage out due to cost.
- d. EVTH is the only tertiary referral hospital, including the highest level of bio-security in the region that can handle an outbreak of equine infectious disease and still handle standard operations, which sets their program apart. Teaching mission and clinical research is important – implementing classroom to clinical teaching. Aged out of current facility.
- e. Gait Analysis Center will stay.
- f. Will restudy original phase 2 with the firm they bring on board. Get design done so accommodates phase 1 and 2, but just funding for the first phase.
- g. Blue color on slide in paddocks represent EVTH new construction. Shows conflict with current storage.
 - i. Tom Satterly asks, How critical is paddock space to EVTH? How much needs to be built out to support function of phase 1 of EVTH?
 1. A little goes to the teaching animals in the south campus plan; moving will displace the teaching animals, which are maintained 100 percent of the time. Looking at alternatives, such as collaborating with Foothills Campus, but then they have a transportation issue.
 2. Britt Mactavish thinks it looks like a lot of paddock space.
 3. Tom Satterly wants to know the minimum amount needed, which ties back to cost. First component: Demolish existing buildings and relocate some of them. Figure out cost. Second component: Infrastructure and utilities—cost of adding cooling, heating, and the roadways. Third component: Then EVTH and paddocks to be built.
 4. Master planning effort that shows an agricultural feel from the eastern edge from the CVMBS perspective.
- h. **Action Item (Jordan Berger):** Come back next month to MPC with recommended minimum scope and rough budget estimate, so can start programming the funding.
 - i. Jordan Berger will provide cost estimate ranges for solving the relocation for the shops, the right sizing of the shops, and the storage space needed.
- i. Lynn Johnson asks, What are the outcomes of the tennis court and parking lots? How much does the approval of EVTH weigh in on what can be done with those in the future?
 - i. Going to cabinet for the approval of this master plan, but will show everything on the west side of Gillette Dr. as a big bubble. Will not be building specific.
 1. High on the list for CVMBS is a potential hotel to the southwest side.
 2. No associated program with other spots.

- ii. Lynn Johnson recommends not showing the tennis courts coming off or the parking until it is confirmed because a decision has not been made and don't want to misrepresent that.
 - 1. We don't represent it in our overall master plan.
- iii. Alternate Tietz Drive connection will not be bubbled. Will need to figure out how to make that work, but everything north will be bubbled.
- iv. Need to define what the edges of the campus are and say what is in the sphere of influence of CVMBS and the hospital function.
- j. Proceed with initial approval from Master Plan Committee of EVTH project.
 - i. Tom Satterly motions to approve current EVTH program plan as represented.
 - ii. Lynn Johnson seconds the motion.
 - iii. All in favor.

4. Powerhouse Campus Parking Lot Expansion

- a. The Powerhouse Campus needs more parking. The existing parking is small.
- b. There is a 200 ft. buffer between the river and the powerhouse.
- c. The larger parcel behind the Quick Lube is part of the master lease with the City who owns the land. The intent with the original project was to build a large parking lot, but the project couldn't afford it. Only improved the upside down L portion on the original project.
- d. Want to expand parking to this location and would leverage the L parking, modifying it.
- e. Pedestrian access legally is at College Avenue.
- f. The new parking area is currently just gravel as ground cover, no cement.
- g. The main liability in this area is the last 100 years of use, which are subsurface issues related to the river.
- h. Lynn Johnson asks if there is a reason the parking lot can't come out to College Avenue?
 - i. Nancy Hurt doesn't believe it is part of the lease area.
- i. This is a campus project, but not CSU property, so MPC can only give guidance to it. The parking doesn't fall under CSU Parking and Transportation Services.
- j. Because the parking lot is leased from the City, part of the agreement with the City is that any parking that is available is left for after-hour parking for the Aztlan Center. The City doesn't have to participate in the project.
- k. Pedestrian access is supposed to go back to College Ave., though people do go over the railroad tracks. The railroad doesn't want to spend money to build a fence and won't give CSU right of way to do so.
- l. Recommendation to proceed with this parking facility at the powerhouse.
 - i. Lynn Johnson makes the motion for this to go forward.
 - ii. Motion seconded by Tom Satterly and David Bradford.
 - iii. All are in favor.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 11, 1:30–3:00 p.m., Lory Student Center, Room 312