

Master Plan Committee (MPC) Minutes

Wednesday, July 11, 2018, 1:30–3:00 p.m.

Lory Student Center, Room 312

Members: Dave Bradford, Mike Rush, Jan Nerger, Tom Satterly, Lynn Johnson (by phone), Alan Rudolph (for part of agenda item 1), Christa Johnson for Alan Rudolph, Kathleen Henry, Nancy Hurt, Rick Miranda, Mike Ellis for Blanche Hughes, Kim Tobin, Fred Haberecht

Other Participants: Marc Barker, Maggie Walsh, Mike Ellis, Laura Alexander, Kevin Lindsey, Sonia Kreidenweis, David McLean, John Hayes, Mari Strombom, Zachary Vaishampayan (ASCSU), Mark Ritschard, David Hansen, Shelly Carroll, Kristi Buffington, Julia Innes

Glover Area Master Plan

1. Glover is currently 52,000 gross sq. ft., incorporates Engineering, College of Natural Sciences through Physics, some general assignment classrooms, and Telecom.
 - a. Small one story building with smaller second story and lots of roof space. Built for different use than used today. Underserving the university from a space standpoint.
 - i. 33,000 assignable sq. ft. today.
 1. Engineering = 23,000 sq. ft.
 2. Physics = 4,000 sq. ft.
 3. Classrooms = 4,000 sq. ft.
 - ii. Approximately a million dollars needed just for the roof.
 - b. Glover site is 1.7–2 acres.
 - i. Plan to leave the pedestrian connection between Computer Science and the existing Glover.
 - ii. Keep the Water Plaza and the quadrangle.
 - iii. Utility corridor that surrounds the site is important investment.
 - iv. Fire lane in support of the building.
 - v. Building site is central to campus; is a 2–3 minute walk to parking services and considerable bike/pedestrian network.
 - vi. How does potential development relate to floodplain?
 1. Touches in Isotope Drive in area of inundation.
 - c. Today's discussion involves: Should we tear Glover down? What's the potential? Is it in phases? Who gives input to that?
 - i. Take away maintenance burden
 - ii. Scarcity of land, need to maximize its potential
 - iii. What opportunity/benefit is there if we had a new building
2. Alan Rudolph recommends analysis of programmatic use of Glover (classes taught, tuition revenue of programs, what revenue streams are driven by those research programs) to understand the programmatic value of the building, need to first understand the functions in the building.
 - a. Approach it from Return-On-Investment of the facility (maintenance, services)
 - b. Perspective of the cost of a lost opportunity if a redevelopment doesn't maximize it's potential in space on campus where there is a scarcity of good sites.
 - c. Programmatically if we know what programs are going in may build a different building.

3. Potential of the site – five-story building could occur on site, or two towers at six stories at approximately 22,000 sq. ft.
 - a. Does it have the visual carrying capacity? Are there surrounding building impacts?
 - i. John Hayes believes a larger six-story building could have some impact on the plaza, could change the character of that space—for example, if the grove of spruce trees that buffer the Water Plaza were to go away.
 - ii. Mike Ellis wonders if it will minimize the Computer Sciences building? Hard to tell without building articulation.
 - iii. Jan Nerger recommends build as big as you can afford.
 - b. Mike Rush working on renderings to show potential donor with expectation the College of Engineering (COE) could not take the whole 200,000 sq. ft.
4. Facilities went through outreach process, discussed:
 - a. Telecom’s presence on the site is important because they have copper and fiber lines in a large duct bank for all of university. Not 100 percent committed in discussions to keeping duct bank, but it will remain initially. In future, there may be need for it to come back. Perhaps relocate to Engineering. Small Telecom presence will remain.
 - b. People in Glover will need to be relocated in building or elsewhere.
 - c. Synergies, partnering, and entrepreneurship.
 - d. Need more space for larger classrooms.
 - e. Need swing space.
 - i. Shepardson
 - ii. Clark
 - iii. Environmental Health/Physiology
 - f. Ability for COE to grow beyond current footprint in Glover. Scott presidential chairs that need research space.
 - g. Tensions included:
 - i. Should be all about student because of location vs. all about academic programs/research because of location.
 - ii. Good location for disabled student resources of various kinds, enrollment, financial aid, etc.
 - h. Unique site that has attributes, such as proximity, that can’t be duplicated somewhere else.
5. COE presentation (David McLean)
 - a. Growth in last ten years for COE includes:
 - i. Undergrad and grad, and mechanical engineering (more than doubled in last 8 years)—had to decline admission to students because of capacity of facilities.
 - ii. Added new faculty and will continue to add more.
 - iii. Presidential chairs will have cohort of research associates and activities.
 - iv. Seek further opportunity for growth because they are constrained.
 - b. Alumnus has spoken to COE about providing a substantial gift. Donation as foundational gift for replacement of Glover.
 - i. Prime real estate to replace with showcase building.
 - ii. Approximately 10 million deferred maintenance is quite urgent.
 - iii. Strategically co-locate engineering faculty with other faculty engaged in interdisciplinary research.

- iv. Add large capacity specialized classrooms, needed across university.
 - 1. Two general assignment classrooms in Glover currently.
- 6. Modify master plan process to include stakeholder group.
 - a. Want to look at potential of whole site at one time (sub area master plan). There needs to be more input into process. Recommend there would be an advisory committee with building neighbors and direct stakeholders (Dean Mclean, Dean Hayes, Dean Nerger, Dan Bush, Kim Tobin, Alan Rudolph).
 - i. Consider different evaluation criteria to look at it tactically and strategically.
 - ii. Rick Miranda agrees that the strategic viewpoint is necessary. Need to view through 10–20 year framework, but also not get in way of funding opportunities.
 - 1. **ACTION ITEM** – FM to come back to MPC to consider 10- and 20-year window on major redevelopment sites—what their potentials are.
 - iii. Kim Tobin agrees that there needs to be an overall plan ready to go to help when donors come through; donors usually have a connection to what is happening in the building or to the people.
- 7. Motion for approval needed: A) The removal of Glover; B) Construction of building(s) about 200,000 sq. ft.; C) Establishment of Glover redevelopment steering committee; D) WSCOE to proceed with their planning efforts to recapture programmatic space within their footprint and expand their programs in the Glover redevelopment.
 - a. Item D – discussion around concerns with the direction given solely to COE and not specified for other colleges
 - i. There is a donor and need for part of the space, so COE asking to proceed with planning efforts. This is in parallel to (Item C) steering committee looking at the redevelopment as a whole with the many stakeholders. Asking COE to come back to MPC based on programs, current need, and expansion.
 - ii. Lynn has concern for initially committing a certain amount of the space (such as half) in allocation to Engineering. First see what COE wants to put into the space and what space that need would require before committing. Donor providing 25%. General fund will probably have to come up with the rest of the resources.
 - iii. David Mclean agrees that COE will need to justify a certain amount of sq. ft. within the space.
 - iv. Generally, 10–50 percent range for having naming rights of a building. Kim Tobin recommends figuring out what to do with the building for campus first before you can let donor drive the project.
 - v. David Mclean believes it is important to integrate the two needs: 1) the opportunity of the donor who wants to support the needs in this building and to advance Engineering within it 2) balanced with what is the opportunity for the university.
 - vi. Rick Miranda recommends we let Engineering proceed with their planning efforts.
 - b. Jan Nerger motions to remove Glover (Item A).
 - c. Concern that Items C and D are trying to establish two planning committees.
 - i. Item D is more of internal planning and part of the responsibility of COE.
 - ii. Item C is for the steering committee to look across the university needs as a whole and bring back to MPC.

- iii. Is Item D prerequisite information for the steering committee? Is the COE planning subordinate to the steering committee?
 - 1. Trying to navigate parallel paths. While COE is trying to make the case for their needs, the steering committee is looking at the whole university's needs.
 - 2. Trying to institute process for any building coming onto campus to make sure there is prior vetting before any group hires architect or begins a program plan. For larger redevelopment projects, we should have a broader look from subarea and campus plans.
 - 3. Need to come through MPC process with conceptual design, MPC recommendation, space committee recommendation, financing plan in place, facilities' cost validation, president's operation committee, etc. before program plan. Consider what processes are not in place that we need to put in place to make a good decision?
 - 4. Don't want steering committee process to preclude any individual group talking to a donor and proceeding.
- d. **Motion on Items A, B, and C made by Kathleen Henry. Kim Tobin and Christa Johnson second the motion.**
 - i. Rick Miranda recommends that with the establishment of the Glover committee, would also consider 6–8 sites in long term. Make sure what we're doing with Glover is consistent, doesn't block off opportunities.
 - ii. **ACTION ITEM** – Create a 2035 plan, do similar exercise as with 2020 plan. Facilities to facilitate and supply background information to MPC about sq. ft., student to teacher ratio, etc.
- e. **Jan Nerger motions for Item D.**
 - i. Jan Nerger's issue with it is that it is exclusive to COE. The group does want to see more from COE, but there are other groups as well that should have that opportunity with direction from the steering committee. **Recommendation from MPC to modify Item C to give charge to steering committee to reach out appropriately to the other stakeholders, so they can have the same opportunity as COE.**
- f. **All in favor. None opposed.**

Meridian Village

- 1. Consensus from FM, PTS, HDS that ultimate alignment of Meridian Ave. should be option A (shown as red in presentation slide). It preserves maximum amount of existing parking; allows for avoidance of some major utility; is out of floodplain in corner; it's a transit and vehicle corridor and is appropriate to have parking in there, is the highest best use.
- 2. Parking expansion – structure vs. surface parking. Traffic consultant says building a structure will not change level of surface. Could do either.
 - a. Consensus between FM, PTS, HDS to not have structure on this site due to:
 - i. Expense to put it into static parking
 - ii. Aesthetics
 - iii. Is it really needed if there are other opportunities?
 - iv. Long term plan to build Blevins Ct. parking structure

- b. Plan is to maintain and enhance parking at Braiden, utilize some of Aylesworth, and capture parking in other south campus areas, including Summit parking lot.
- 3. FM, PTS, HDS recommend maximizing parking on Hughes Way.
 - a. Currently Hughes Way is one way with diagonal. Propose to make it two way with double-loaded diagonal parking. In lieu of structure, this a net less intrusive action on campus.
 - b. Increased traffic in zone by housing, but it facilitates parking out of campus. Although there is an increase in traffic, the traffic runs parallel to pedestrian/bike traffic, so it's less intrusive than adding something that would cross pedestrian/bike traffic on Hughes Way, at the library, and at Pitkin (both are heavily used).
 - c. Blue in presentation slide will be zoned parking for students.
 - i. To help with parking for Alumni, CASA, Richardson, and for visitors during the day, we are working on a separate project on south side of campus to support such parking needs.
- 4. **Rick Miranda thinks it is a reasonable and low impact decision. Agreement from MPC.**

Adult Learner Veteran Services (ALVS)

- 1. Recommend integrating planning efforts of ALVS and 3rd phase of Lory Student Center (LSC) project.
 - a. Save approximately \$500,000 if can do ALVS expansion at same time as LSC project.
- 2. Currently CSU has 7,000 adult learners and student veterans on campus.
 - a. Tuition from GI bill brought \$22 million into university.
 - b. Students are valuable asset in maturity and experience in classroom, as well as in funding.
- 3. ALVS exists on second floor on north side of LSC. Home base for nontraditional-aged students.
 - a. 4 offices
 - b. 45 current seating capacity.
 - c. 102 unique visitors per day.
 - d. Concerning it's so crowded that people leave when there isn't space for them. Don't know if the students come back.
- 4. Lynn Johnson asks, if ALVS is planning to keep the space they currently have and expanding or giving up the current space? This is to be decided. May flip current space with Grey Rock. TBD.
 - a. There is one program in Occupation Therapy on third floor that does assessments with veterans. Is there a way to combine that space with ALVS? It could move assessment to more centralized location on campus-expansion of the program.
 - b. Blanche Hughes is having conversations with Jeff about that possibility. Lynn will be in contact with Blanche.
- 5. Numbers are climbing for student veterans at CSU. Programming is successful; space is filled and they are out of space.
 - a. Want to keep the population all in one space.
 - b. Would allow them to move over some of other campus partners and student services.
- 6. LSC is at the program plan phase and would like to move forward with ALVS program plan, so it is in step with LSC project.

- a. Motion to incorporate these plans into overall LSC 3rd phase project (pending funding).
Approved by MPC to proceed. No objections.**

Next Meeting: Wednesday, August 8, 1:30–3:00 p.m., Lory Student Center, Room 308–310