

Master Plan Committee (MPC)

6/13/18, LSC 308–10

Members: Alan Rudolph, Lynn Johnson, Leslie Taylor, Jan Nerger, Kathleen Henry, Fred Haberecht, Mike Rush, Tom Satterly, Rudy Garcia for Kim Tobin

Other Participants: Jessica Kramer, Julia Innes, Shelly Carroll, Kristi Buffington, Claire Fenton (ASCSU), Yuval Rosenthal (ASCSU), Mark Stetter, Colin Clay, Thom Hadley, Bob Kaempfe, Sandy Quackenbush, Tracey Abel, Edit Szalai, Gregg Dean, Sue VandeWoude, Jac Nickoloff

1. Science Quad Sub Area Master Plan

- a. Next round of development will be redevelopment of sites on campus. Criteria for tearing down buildings include:
 - i. Condition of the building – what does it take to keep it up?
 - ii. Highest best use of site / site potential
 - iii. Consideration of services of the University (such as parking, pedestrian accommodation, bike parking, transit, utilities, etc.)
 - iv. Consideration of where to relocate people and programs in interim.
- b. The Physiology and Environmental Health discussion will center around:
 - i. Context of the site (opportunities and liabilities)
 - ii. Space potential/carrying capacity of site
 - iii. Programmatic potential
 1. August MPC meeting – talk more specifically about programmatic ideas and initiatives for this site.
- c. *Site Context*
 - i. Site is associated with central green space with intent to retain this space. It's a prime corner on campus with two south sequential gateways to campus (a vehicular, then pedestrian entrance to campus). Master Plan says that this corridor must maintain a large enough build-setback to see the mountains.
 - ii. For the long term, Physiology and Environmental Health are identified as buildings that do not meet criteria of reinvestment to an extensive degree, condition issues with both buildings.
 - iii. Influences on redevelopment
 1. Transit stop immediately across the street
 2. Bike network planned to loop through
 3. Pedestrian spine associated with it
 4. Parking in proximity (over 1,400 parking spaces within quarter mile walking radius)
 - iv. Constraints
 1. Arthur's ditch is a long-term feature on campus.
 - a) In 20–30 years possibly won't have it, but currently it exists in an enclosed box running through science quad and which we are liable for maintaining.
 2. Need for fire lane through science quad.

- a) Question asked about fire lane access – could there be a pass through such as with Yates? Yes, with proper clearances and if operationally it was always open.
 - 3. Major utility corridors through the site from east to west.
 - 4. Consider flood map in building.
 - 5. Delivery to A/Z because of dock area—Tracey Abel says it takes up a little more of the site because fire lane and avoiding Arthur’s Ditch.
- d. *Potential building space of the sites*
 - i. Comparison of site for Biology (vs. Physiology site) and Chemistry Research (vs. Environmental Health site) – can have carrying capacity of more than 200,000 sq. ft. while maintaining view corridor along Pitkin Street.
 - 1. Suggestion to place just short of current north-south orientation to have wider portal and not be constrained.
 - ii. Environmental Health is single story bldg., not originally built for people, has bad ventilation. Both buildings are not suitable to the work that goes on there.
- e. Need process to discern and study highest best use programmatically.
 - i. Alan Rudolph sees clear potential to replace the infrastructure/functional needs for what is there now. He recommends that we need a process for driving consensus around and justifying how the space will be designed and defined. What do we envision for next 10–30 years in a science quad? Develop business case around future research revenue and productive use to help indicate how much sq. footage and how many stories are needed in the building.
 - ii. As pure space potential, we currently use projections of university growth, number of available sites, and surfaces associated with sites. Additionally we consider it through an aesthetic lens. Does it support identity and future attractiveness of the university? If it is a gateway bldg. in a developing district with 4–5 story buildings, then it would realize that over time. From the programmatic perspective, give ourselves the option of being able to grow into it.
 - iii. The goal in today’s meeting is master plan verification that these two buildings are not keepers over the long term. Their potential suggests that the site could be used for more than 200,000 sq. ft. between the two areas. This will not be independent of programmatic discussion.
 - 1. Lynn Johnson explains that the approach is to move away from a stakeholder envisioning a building and claiming it as their space. Instead will take the approach of getting input from everyone on campus about what we need, and given the site location will consider what makes the most sense. Then we can better address needs across the entire university.
 - 2. Jan Nerger asks about more classroom buildings.
 - a) Lynn responds that we would like to accomplish this with the Glover redevelopment. Understand the needs, the other opportunities if can’t be solved in a certain building, and the timeframe for getting there.
 - 3. How high can we build? Glover could potentially go 5–7 stories. However, not all sites are equal. Baseline is typically 4–5 stories. More than 4–5 story building would push it at this particular site, especially in the context of entering campus. With a

fifth story, it would need to be set back to some degree from the building. We are historically a horizontal campus with views.

f. *Programmatic potential in this space*

- i. CVMBS is currently spread across all three campuses with no central hub that brings the college together to leverage the relatively separated activities that occur. The new building would be more than a replacement for the existing buildings, would help the college to compete as an academic unit in biomedical education and research. CVMBS to develop a program that distinguishes them from their competitors and this facility could accommodate that vision—can't achieve in current facilities they have.
- ii. Major programmatic elements to include:
 1. Switching the structure of undergraduate education programs from individual majors to an umbrella program in biomedical sciences with concentrations. The purpose is to leverage what CVMBS is currently doing individually as majors and to engage students in CVMBS as early as possible through courses, experiences, and a variety of research opportunities, as well as to create a sense of community.
 2. Currently have to turn away students that are highly qualified; would like to be able to accept all applicants.
 3. Engage in pedagogy and continuous curricular evolution, including longitudinal curriculum consideration and laboratory innovation. Currently have bottlenecks centered around how to move students through lab experiences. Back away from creating an even larger bottleneck and re-envision how to develop those competencies.
 4. Collaborative research space needed – departments are currently in siloes. Integration of research efforts in innovative state of art space. Vertical integration of all degree programs: undergraduate and graduate (Masters, PhD, DVM). Create a hub of activity for CVMBS on main campus to bring together these elements, must co-locate essential elements to create community and attract students. Create interactions/environment/opportunity across degree programs to interact with academic advisors, mentors, faculty, and staff.
 5. Convergence research - partner with public or private entities. Focus on societal needs and integrate the knowledge and methods and expertise from wide disciplines.
 6. CVMBS public engagement needed.
 - a) Don't currently have a location where CVMBS can communicate their science and engage in public outreach and K-16 collaboration.
 - b) Focus on student recruitment and advancement, bringing donors into a location so they can see what CVMBS does.
- iii. The vision presented above will integrate and build on the programs/disciplines/functions that already occur in the current buildings. For example, toxicology anticipates new concentration in biomedical sciences undergraduate degree and this new facility would allow the program to significantly grow.
 1. Consider what programmatically make sense in the building, then free up other spaces. Determine what goes in and what doesn't. Programmatically decide what

we want to do, then what goes into the building, and then determine how to accommodate those who don't fit in there.

2. MB education – If the program grows, this building could help accommodate that.
3. Biomedical sciences is one of the cap majors at CSU; there is a cap and an index.
 - a) We know CVMBS is turning away lot of qualified students, but want to allow them to come. Due to the bottleneck issues, it is difficult to make significant headway around diversity and inclusion, but this is another programmatic goal that is important.
- iv. Lynn Johnson says we will consider university-wide how to take advantage of the space, circle back to leadership to get their perspective. Will be methodical in how we work through these redevelopment areas, ask questions and explore possibilities in advance.
- g. The committee gives consensus that the Physiology and Environmental Health area is a redevelopment site of much more intensity.
- h. Final Discussion – at the end of the meeting
 - i. Alan recommends we look at business considerations from student-tuition perspective (given discussion on caps), and how the current occupied space drives revenue streams. Consideration of discussions around research revenue for Painter and the animal facility planned for south campus. Recommendation to take step back and look at the whole quad.
 - ii. **Action Item (FM):** Tom Satterly recommends that Facilities comes back to MPC for approval with a process for how to approach this.
 - iii. Master Plan Committee is strategic. To date MPC hasn't been strategic in programmatic elements because, in the past, we have been faced with a single entity with a single program for the most part. How much classroom facility is embedded? What are the synergies between groups, and do we understand the connections that need to be made? We don't have a rigorous process for this. In part, who has the money has driven these discussions.
 - iv. Need to look at the research revenue that drives the program as well and how much research is generated in the space. Need forward planning.
 - v. If there is a sizable piece of sq. footage, then Lynn wants us all to define it and understand the needs, to not be so isolated in how we look at a facility as we replace a building.

2. Diversity House

- a. Project located at corner of Laurel and Shields. Is limited in scale – 2,000 sq. ft. addition. The existing structure is significant historically. In short-term, will leverage the existing building by adding onto it. In long term, it may be redeveloped.
- b. Currently Diversity House accommodates about seven staff. The small conference room fits about twenty people.
 - i. The intent is to expand the seminar and training area from a capacity of 20 to 60–65 with dedicated restrooms.
 - ii. The floor above would have four contiguous offices.
 - iii. The addition is intended to blend with existing residence, but cost effective.
 - iv. Will consider enclosed stair. Want to build a small elevator.

- v. Accommodate lactation room and reflection room.
- c. Challenges of the project
 - i. Would have to take a significant sized elm tree down to accommodate the addition's growth.
 - ii. Also, there is an outside stone patio/fire pit area that would be impacted by the addition and removed.
- d. Lynn has identified resources to move this project along.
- e. There was an active look at the alternatives suggested from the October MPC meeting, such as using a modular on site or finding a space elsewhere.
 - i. The modular was not an efficient option. Not appropriate for this campus long term.
 - ii. Explored co-locating this group with TOD or in the Semester at Sea Building, but it did not pan out.
 - iii. This was the most efficient site with enough merit. The life of the house is questionable, but the cost is less than \$500,000 and is a reasonable return on investment.

Next Master Plan Committee Meeting: July 11, 2018, 1:30–3:00 p.m., LSC Room 312