

Master Plan Committee Minutes

**Wednesday, Sept 12, 2018, 1:30–3:00 p.m.**

Lory Student Center, Room 308–310

**Members & Ex Officio:** Tom Satterly, Nancy Hurt, Dave Bradford, Jan Nerger, Lynn Johnson, Alan Rudolph, Kathleen Henry, Rick Miranda, Blanche Hughes, Kim Tobin, Leslie Taylor, Tom Milligan, Doug Max

**Other Participants:** Yuval Rosenthal (ASCSU), David Hansen, Shelly Carroll, Kristi Buffington, Julia Innes, Jessica Kramer, Martha Coleman, Aaron Fodge, Gene Ellis, Devan Durand

### **1. Main Campus Building Priorities (David Hansen)**

- a. Asked to consider Glover and Physiology/Environmental Health sites in context to other potential sites on campus that could have similar carrying capacity (approx. 200,000 sq. ft. and 4-5 stories) for development.
- b. Overall campus defining characteristics include:
  - i. Sense of community (e.g. AZ Plaza—with common central area, mixing of people in spaces)
  - ii. Connection to the outdoors through the greater views to the foothills and beyond and the indoor/outdoor relationship to spaces (e.g. Lory Student Center)
  - iii. Authentic to our local environment through CO plant material, detailing of outdoor spaces, and utilization of regional stone on building architecture.
  - iv. Pedestrian green space framework plan: formalizes the master plan through preservation of the Great Green, the Oval, the Quads, the core academic spine with academic buildings around it, the view corridor from within campus, as well as the views from the edges of campus looking in, preservation of the big front lawns, of the flood plain.
  - v. Access and transportation framework plan: preserve center core of campus pushing vehicles and parking to the edges with an internal campus bike loop and transit.
- c. Identified five prioritized sites (not in any particular ranking)
  - i. Facilities Management/GSB Site Redevelopment
  - ii. Glover Site Redevelopment
    1. This site is half the size of the other sites, but has similar carrying capacity in 5–6 story structure.
  - iii. Physiology/Environmental Health Site Redevelopment
  - iv. Clark Site Renovation
  - v. South Campus West of VTH Sites related to approved master plan
- d. Discussion on other sites with need:
  - i. Motorpool Site
    1. Need to expand steam/heat plant, which may be a substantial part of the site.
    2. Fleet could potentially be located somewhere else, but still need a presence for quick reaction maintenance employees.
    3. See the building when driving by Northside of motor pool on Pitkin.
  - ii. Old Alumni House and Neighboring Extension Site
    1. Doesn't carry same sq. footage.
  - iii. Kim Tobin asks what we are doing to make sure other areas look aesthetically appealing even when they are a less than standard carrying (200,000 sq. ft.) site space.
    1. Tom Milligan agrees that it's important to pay special attention to first impressions, such as with sites that are prominent entrances to CSU.

- iv. South College Gym Site
  1. Candidate for being a historical building.
  2. Athletics has had conversation around expanding the track. However, water mitigation needed because entire flood system of campus exits at that point of campus.
  3. Fairly prominent face to the public.
- v. Art building
  1. Size of building footprint is large.
  2. Recommendation to explore this site.
- vi. Monford Quad Site
  1. Rick Miranda thinks it's underutilized as an interaction space. Do we need more vista space or more interaction space? Suggests it could be split into two quads; would lose the vista, but could gain more interaction/community.
  2. Lynn Johnson asks if the Shepardson addition will infringe on that? Not substantially; they would like an entry point off the southwest corner that responds to Monford Quad.
  3. Rick Miranda thinks the Liberal Arts Quad is a good human-scale space.
- vii. Suggestion to look at the next range of opportunities 100k–200k sq. ft.?
  1. Allison
  2. Rockwell

## **2. Great Green Current Planning Initiatives / Geothermal Well Field – Updates (David Hansen, Gene Ellis)**

- a. Just recently completed program plan for geothermal infrastructure project. Forthcoming is RFP process for consultant to take the next step on geothermal project.
- b. Overview of Great Green map in presentation
  - i. Red dash line = Controlled, scheduled, maintained financially by Rec Center
    1. In process of completing contract for updated lighting on the fields for the Rec Center, new poles installed with LED fixtures, as many light upgrades as possible.
    2. Rec Center wants two synthetic fields (fields 10 and 11) – creates fields that can be used for longer seasons and other uses.
  - ii. Blue dash line = Controlled, scheduled, maintained financially by Athletics
    1. Potential reorganization of Athletic Fields with shared accommodations, including restroom and concessions building.
  - iii. Big numbers of people on new section of trail with underpass/Green trail expansion
  - iv. Stormwater detention on fields 1, 2, 3 – Reassessing campus stormwater plan
- c. Geothermal wells would initially service the Moby Complex and get it off the current steam system.
  - i. 500 wells at 450 depth below Rec Fields (Fields 4, 5, 6, and Fields 7, 8, 9). Would work within the confines of the utilities and lighting. Opportunity to restore the turf and the outdated sprinkler system, serving the Moby complex.
  - ii. Worked on plan in 2012 for the 2020 Master Plan. Originally, all buildings were served by steam, but over the next 3–4 years, will focus steam on the central core of campus. There are regulatory limits to how big the plant can get.
    1. Worked together with Housing and Dining Services and the Rec Center; they chose to go on natural gas. The remaining facilities in that area are Moby and Fum McGraw.
    2. Geothermal system would be excellent on fields 4, 5, 6 and could retire the steam system, which is approximately ½ mile of pipe, about 60 years old. It would cost about 19 million dollars in capital replacement to maintain/keep it.

3. The Moby building equipment from the 50s is original; much of it could be replaced and/or modified to get equipment that integrates with the geothermal water.
  4. Approximately 2.1 million dollars will be provided from state controlled maintenance. State Architect's Office is excited to leverage it in this project.
  5. This will save half the utility bill cost. Additionally, it currently costs \$175,000 year to keep the pipe hot—that cost would go away as well.
  6. Helps with many sustainability goals and moves CSU toward a low carbon footprint.
- d. Other institutions that have used geothermal locally and nationwide include:
    - i. Poudre School District
      1. Geothermal on many of their newer school bldgs.
    - ii. The new IKEA store in Denver
    - iii. Colorado Mesa University
      1. Converting whole campus to geothermal, piece-by-piece.
    - iv. Ball State University in Illinois
      1. Retired old coal fire facility and went completely geo thermal.
  - e. Lynn Johnson asks, What does this do for steam capacity on the east side of campus with no longer having to push steam to the west side of campus?
    - i. In the near term, the steam load goes down, but we preserve the plant's capacity and will not need a bigger steam plant. Taking the steam loads off HDS, allowed us to add Biology and Chemistry Research. We'll be able to accommodate Shepardson and any of those potential five story sites considered in the master plan build-out.
    - ii. Although the plant will not get bigger, it will need to be updated.
      1. In 2025, one of three large boilers will need replacement. At that time, will have to decide to keep the existing plant and replace the equipment within it or to move the plant out of the floodplain and replace it all together.
  - f. Once RFP is approved, foresee starting construction next summer and then it will be a 2–3 year window.
  - g. Lynn Johnson asks, What other alternative heating and cooling sources could be used for this and what is the cost trade-off?
    - i. The alternative is a traditional boiler chiller plant. It may be a little less expensive than geothermal, but the utility bills will increase and it requires a building addition to Moby.
  - h. By considering the two field locations (4, 5, 6 and 7, 8, 9) located on the plan, this geothermal project can potentially accommodate Meridian Village if it would like to connect into the system.

### **3. Foothills Campus Permit Parking (David Hansen, Dave Bradford)**

- a. Hosting a series of listening sessions to better understand Foothills stakeholder needs and how each group may implement a parking system on that campus.
- b. There is only a gravel road that connects the two sides of campus (Rampart side / Laporte side). A permanent connecting road would serve the campus through better transportation and bus service.
  - i. Where would the road potentially go?
    1. Come along east side of College Lake, may be higher currently than what we'd want, regrade to similar alignment, bring down slope.
    2. Considerations to proximity to NWRC.
- c. Alan Rudolph asks, What motivated us to have a parking plan first within the Foothills Campus context?

- i. Permit parking could help pay for some infrastructure and maintaining parking lots.
- ii. Parking is substandard out there. This is something we can get started on that currently exists – the reconditioning of existing facilities. There will be a revenue stream associated with it.
- iii. Alan would like to understand it within the larger strategic vision.
- d. Discussion about Christman Field – Rick Miranda asks, is it Christman Field used?
  - i. Yes, even though it's not developed, we heard that it is being used by stakeholders—for example, with drone research.
- e. Asphalt pavement study done in 2016 – 2.5 million dollars of work to do at Foothills Campus.
  - i. Would like to have Foothills Campus parking lots look as good as they do on main campus
- f. Foothills Campus themes we heard at the master plan listening sessions were: identity, connectivity, equity. Need to understand what their parking needs are. For instance, what kind of exposure they have to clients coming into their spaces.
  - i. Can make parking lots safer with lighting.
  - ii. Long-term and short-term maintenance. Complete 3–5 years to standards on main campus.
    - 1. Need to maintain the lots that have had money put into them and rebuild some other lots.
- g. Alan Rudolph adds that a unique feature of Foothills Campus is that it has Biosecurity Level 3. Wants to make sure PTS will coordinate with the biosafety officer.
  - i. Will explore who gets space behind the fence and who doesn't for restricted access areas.
  - ii. Consider hazmat response exercises for the space around the building.
- h. Shelly Carroll asks, Is it going to be a phased amount of money or same pricing as main campus?
  - 1. Don't know what the pricing yet.

#### **4. Campus Wide Inclusivity Standards for Lactation Rooms (Aaron Fodge, Jessica Kramer)**

- a. Inclusivity Committee has been involved in a yearlong process that attempts to remove barriers to access in CSU facilities. The committee has been working on creating design standards for buildings, including new buildings and remodels.
  - i. Plan to integrate these standards into program plan phase when new buildings come online and into remodels when a certain square footage of remodel is met.
  - ii. Consideration for size of space and geographical distribution of locations on campus. Proposing 500 feet is appropriate minimum distance to walk to a lactation facility.
- b. Worked with many stakeholders, including Remodels and Construction Services, to refine these standards and criteria.
  - i. The bulk of where we are missing sites on main campus is in existing buildings. An interior remodel that includes approximately 25% or more of the building square footage, shall include one lactation room if no other lactation room lies within approximately 500 feet. The Inclusivity committee is looking into funding to help put in lactation rooms in older buildings. Feedback from Physical Development Committee is to do this on South Campus and Foothills as well.
  - ii. Once a lactation room (or other inclusive spaces in the standards) is installed, if a building wants to remove a location, they will need to go back through the inclusivity committee to have that approved.
- c. Conversation about unofficial lactation room in the USC Room 307.
  - i. Kristi Buffington confirms she left it out of the request, still listed as an empty room.
  - ii. With retrofitting of spaces, there is more flexibility. For each lactation room, there is a range of cost. The standards don't require all lactation rooms to have a sink because the

committee doesn't want to exclude a place people can be using. There is a list of requirements versus a list of ideal recommendations.

1. For example, the lock is a requirement for safety reasons. The lock fits on a certain type of door, so may have to replace the entire door to install the lock.
- d. Discussion around combining uses of these inclusive spaces for efficiencies.
    - i. Reflection rooms are for all encompassing spiritual/religious experiences; some groups found that reflection rooms are incompatible with sharing lactation room space due to religious beliefs.
    - ii. Some people need space for medical purposes-injection site. That could be combined with lactation rooms.
  - e. A request for approval of the lactation room map and the concept of lactation rooms being made available within approximately 500 feet from one building to another. This is minimum standard that can be provided as an opportunity to employees, students, and visitors. In the future, after a certain number of lactation rooms are established, the 500 foot minimum may be reduced. Additionally, after all standards are presented, would like the MPC to provide support for these inclusivity standards.
    - i. Jan Nerger motions to approve request.
    - ii. Dave Bradford seconds the motion.
    - iii. Approved by the committee; no opposition.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, October 10, 1:30–3:00 p.m., Lory Student Center, Room 308–310