

## Master Plan Committee (MPC) – Minutes

07/08/2020 Virtual on Microsoft Teams

**Participants:** Aaron Fodge, Fred Haberecht, David Bradford, Shelly Carroll, Kristi Buffington, Devan Durand, Tim Kemp, Jan Nerger, Mike Rush, Tom Satterly, Rick Miranda, Nancy Hurt, Maggie Walsh, Julia Innes, Leslie Taylor, Doug Max, Alan Rudolph, Lynn Johnson, David Hansen, Tracey Abel, Ellen Fisher

### 1. WCNR – Open Space Development Guidelines

- A. Planning with consideration of green spaces, view sheds, pedestrian core, to include discussion of preservation of these spaces by setting up development guidelines in master planning documents. Will explore in future MPC meetings.
- B. Today's focus is area north of Natural Resources. Sub areas of this open space/quads, include:
  - I. **Sherwood Forest** east of the Warner College of Natural Resources (WCNR) building.
    - i. Have had past conversations with WCNR around academic uses of Sherwood Forest for outdoor learning. Space currently has outdoor seating area and paths.
  - II. Various areas around Forestry building and to the west side of WCNR building, include some water quality components that help manage stormwater associated with the buildings. Users of these groups sometimes hold alumni events or events with incoming students. There is a need for functional activities in this open quad.
    - i. **Water Plaza** – has interpretive component to studies of water engineering and how CSU is represented in that throughout the state and world.
    - ii. **Wagar Quad** – has a large spreading elm that involves specific planning efforts.
- C. Circulation and access are key to planning efforts.
  - I. Multiple lanes of pedestrian circulation through these areas – try to keep these to the edges and consider how we move through spaces and access buildings.
  - II. Need for emergency and service access points (for example, recycling/trash).
  - III. Service Lane – with redevelopment of the Glover site, PFA may want an access point that works its way all the way to Amy Van Dyken, west of Admin Building. Could be future request from them.
- D. Alan Rudolph comments: if thinking about this planning in area north of WCNR, should we think of other integrated assets across campus if we decided as a group to change what is in the space? For example, the considerable set of water assets out on Foothills.
  - I. Fred Haberecht says we need to think contextually about the value of these open spaces. The Water Plaza and Sherwood Forest have a learning, interpretive function. However, the biggest part of the spaces is that they are non-building spaces and provide relief and outdoor activity for a growing campus. The discussion is less about the specific interpretive or educational value and more about open space in an urbanizing campus.
  - II. The Design Review Committee (DRC) internal consensus is, for instance, that Sherwood Forest is not a space to place a building. Sherwood gains value from the amount of open space we have. Placing a building at corner of Amy Van Dyken and University would significantly diminish the quality of space. Past discussion with MPC about mass and void aspect. With Sherwood forest on one side, then on south side of street there can be more intensive development.
  - III. Recommendations are:

- i. **Sherwood Forest** is not the place for additional buildings. It is a place of use and significance in its own right as an open space on campus and gives context to buildings.
- ii. **Warner College Natural Resources Quad and Water Plaza** space should be a no-build space because of anticipated planned redevelopment of the Glover site. With the potential of 300,000 sq. feet on Glove site, then this remaining open space is a critical asset to making that a desirable, functional asset to campus. Internal evaluation is that we should not be moving into this space significantly.
- iii. **Wagar Quad** – With the exception of the elm tree, this could be a potential redevelopment site over time.
- iv. **NRRL building** – Not the highest best use of this space; seen as a unique redevelopment site for a smaller building.

E. Discussion/Comments on recommendations

- I. Alan Rudolph writes in chat, “The tree should be the centerpiece. What a great natural monument on campus!”
- II. Rick Miranda asks about the lifespan of the tree.
  - i. Fred responds that with care it may have another 50 years on campus.
- III. Lynn asks, “Can you point out on this map where the Exceptional Tree is? Given our current circumstances with respect to the need for space and the plan along the Academic Spine, I concur with the current recommendations. However, I do see that opportunities/needs may present themselves in the future which may change this perspective.”
- IV. Leslie Taylor is receptive to, “the break [Sherwood Forest] provides along that walkway and it's connection to WCNR.”
- V. Regarding the width of the elm’s limbs and canopy, and cabling and cantilevering to the more upright branches, Alan Rudolph asks, “Is it a safety concern?”
  - i. Fred responds that it is a standard arborist approach. We do a safety assessment of all trees on campus, and is not a safety concern.
- VI. Rick Miranda writes in chat, “That tree has been recognized for decades as the most treasured tree on campus” and “As to Sherwood Forest, I’d keep the west half sacrosanct; in a generation we might consider something on the east half which is less used I believe. Development of that east side of Sherwood should be last though; I’d build on the NRRL space and the Wagar courtyard first (although the tree is going to limit that).”
  - i. Fred agrees that the corner facing Amy Van Dyken and University is less used, but the visual aspect of being able to look into the space is also a critical feature of the space—visually and physically being able to access the space.
- VII. Ellen Fisher writes in chat, “I believe Sherwood forest also has some memorial trees/spaces. Should be preserved.”
- VIII. Mike Rush writes in chat, “If NRRL were deconstructed at some point in the future it would change the conversation about the Wagar open space would change ....and indeed the exceptional tree could become the centerpiece of a compelling open space redevelopment.”

- IX. Alan Rudolph writes in chat, “We might want to know how many classes are taught in the forest there or at the water site south of Glover...or other revenue consequences of these decisions.” He adds that the revenue consequences behind the discussion and decisions we might make may be of value to us in some way.
  - X. Rick Miranda writes in chat, “I could see a future development in that NRRL area as an expansion/addition to Wagar, taking down the small NRRL building and inserting a bit into the Wagar courtyard.”
  - XI. Mike Rush adds, “Having codified no build zones would certainly help with campus partner discussions around capital development / capital campaign material production” and asks in chat, “Would the university deconstruct a building to the benefit of additional open space as opposed to redevelopment of new space?”
- F. Need to understand which spaces should be preserved as open space, build to them, and leverage their qualities, and which are available for development over time. **Recommendation that Sherwood Forest and combined Water plaza/Warner Quad space to have a diagrammatic no-build line around them. Wagar and NRRL quads to be designated as a no-build zone with diagrammatic line around them.\* The asterisk indicates that with appropriate justification, the university would be receptive to the redevelopment of this site with the exception of the American elm. The tree is a long-term asset that would need to be preserved with any development.**
- I. **Motion – Lynn Johnson is supportive and makes the motion. Jan Nerger seconds the motion, as does Rick Miranda and Leslie Taylor.**
  - II. **MPC votes for approval of the motion; nobody expresses dissent.**

## 2. Building Expansion Process and Design Review Committee (DRC)

- A. CSU Campus Building Planning and Design Philosophy
  - I. Campus buildings thoughtfully planned and designed with intent to create unified campus that incorporates the principles of universal design.
  - II. The pattern of the CSU campus creates a strong sense of campus identity to visitors and the campus community alike. They feel a sense of community and connection to the outside environment, which creates an experience unique to CSU.
- B. Our Approach to Building Expansions
  - I. Any change in the net square footage of a building, by expanding the useable square footage in some manner needs to meet aesthetics, highest and best use, health/life safety/accessibility.
  - II. Expansion of useable square footage includes but is not limited to just building walls, roofs, decks, building trellises, etc.
- C. Process for approving building expansions
  - I. Process for reviewing and approving such expansions historically has not been clearly defined and needs to be clarified.
  - II. Some past projects approved by the MPC and others by Facilities Management (FM). With limited funds, more campus clients would like to take advantage of existing building space and try to economically expand buildings to allow for more useable square footage.

- III. Currently, DRC reviewing recent requests for building expansions including additional rooftop and building decks.
- IV. Lynn Johnson asks, with the robust process for reviewing and approving projects going forward that involved MPC and Space Committee, does DRC need to be built into that process as well?
  - i. The process flowchart reflects that DRC is a part of this approval process, but some projects are so small that they may be missed in the capital construction design approval form. For example, an exterior modification to a building that is small may fall through the cracks.
- D. DRC reviews and approves planning and design projects
  - I. DRC reviews all projects to ensure new construction and building renovation projects are consistent with the architectural and landscape vocabulary on campus in alignment with CSU aesthetic guidelines including:
    - i. New construction, additions to existing buildings, small support structures, or changes to the exterior massing, sequence or materiality
    - ii. Major campus planning or landscape improvements. Examples also include construction or storage trailer locations or anything that affects circulation of vehicular, pedestrian, and bike access.
    - iii. Renovation projects to historical buildings, both designated and non-designated, to ensure the historical fabric remains intact. Example: Danforth
  - II. Some projects are reviewed by DRC before they proceed to MPC, to be vetted to see if they meet our planning and design guidelines. Capital construction projects are reviewed by DRC throughout course of project.
  - III. Projects reviewed by DRC since 2016 include:
    - i. Exterior building modifications, such as colors of materials of railings, doors, windows; paint color; screening of HVAC on roof; lighting; removal of existing architectural features; utility additions that make a visual impact (such as request for roof hoist to Student Rec Center). Other examples shared in PowerPoint—see presentation.
    - ii. Alan Rudolph comments that some modifications may be dictated by compliance like with USDA inspections. Asks that if brought to MPC, that we don't slow down the process because need to meet with compliance measures.
      - a) Fred provides example of venting of research area in Clark on northside of building that was visible from pedestrian core. That decision would come to DRC, not to MPC. Jessica adds that function as well as aesthetics needs to be considered.
    - iii. For projects reviews, such as the rooftop patio example (see presentation slides 16 & 17), DRC discusses what is the highest best use? Is it accessible to everyone? Is it equitable to all units in building?
- E. Motion needed to approve the DRC reviewing and approving/not approving building expansion proposals. If the client isn't happy with DRC findings, the DRC decision can be appealed to the Master Plan Committee.
  - I. Discussion/Comments regarding motion

- i. Fred Haberecht says there will be projects that go through the capital construction approval process and will naturally come to MPC. However, some projects will not naturally fall into that process, so internally we are recommending that the first step in the process will be DRC, if it isn't already going to the MPC. A department may want FM to render and vision a project before it goes through the form process, and FM doesn't want to be in the situation where a project would get all the way to MPC and then is told it's not an idea that can move forward.
- ii. Lynn Johnson has a huge concern of adding a project like a rooftop patio that doesn't come to MPC and space committee. Need to find a way to capture those projects, to consider how much money goes into those projects; just because a department has the money doesn't mean the project is in best interest of institution to spend those resources.
  - a) Fred suggests motion: any building modification that yields additional sq. footage needs to go through the MPC. Lynn agrees with this, and makes the motion, but there is further discussion.
  - b) Additionally, Fred recommends that modifications with aesthetic and historical implications stay with DRC.
- iii. Tracey Abel adds that there have been situations when the MPC saw an original design, but then the project may have reduced sq. footage. Therefore, changing sq. footage in any way (by adding or reducing) is a consideration, while also being aware of time constraints.
  - a) In MPC project approval process, Fred points out the feedback loop for larger capital construction projects. Once approved for program plan, they come back to MPC in plan verification to indicate if what the MPC approved is what the project actually contains.
- iv. Alan Rudolph writes in chat, "I am struck we are talking about building out space for a campus that is in quarantine and trying over the next 1-2 years to bring back the population we had...the financial allocation to these projects?"
- v. Rick Miranda writes in chat, "I would suggest that the MPC be reserved for changes in building footprints, mainly. If a project doesn't change the footprint of the building, then we can (generally) cede that to the DRC. I might also suggest that changes to exteriors (such as these patios) be put on the MPC as some sort of 'consent item' process." And "Such a Consent Item process would inform the MPC but not seek approval - but would give the MPC a chance to call out a proposal for additional discussion if a member of the MPC has concerns."
- vi. Fred suggests the motion could be: Any changes to building exterior that increases building sq. footage comes to MPC. Other modifications to the building's exterior that do not change the sq. ft, but have a functional or aesthetic implication, would come through DRC, then presented to MPC as a consent item as recommended by staff.
- vii. Jan Nerger prefers footprint rather than sq. footage.
- viii. Rick Miranda could go either way with the intent of the language (footprint vs. sq. footage) and defers to Lynn Johnson's judgement on the level of oversight.

- ix. Alan Rudolph writes in chat, “What about setting a financial limit of what comes our way? E.g. any project of building mods over 100k?”
  - a) Fred Haberecht thinks it holds true sometimes, other times doesn’t.
- x. Fred Haberecht adds, DRC does not believe they should be the ultimate decider of some of these decisions and would like the opportunity to bring some of these decisions to MPC, formalizing it by indicating some kind of threshold.
- xi. Lynn Johnson doesn’t want a department to have authority to change the façade or outside of a building because of how intentionally we work at the character and presentation of CSU. Anything that changes the outside of buildings, in how they will be interpreted and viewed, should have oversight by MPC.
- xii. Jan Nerger is fine with either language.
- xiii. Fred Haberecht thinks sq. footage is a more robust management tool. Suggests motion to say: Any changes in building sq. footage, regardless of purpose, need to be approved by Master Plan Committee. Other changes dealing with building facades from a functional or aesthetic need should be administratively approved by Design Review Committee with that information presented to MPC as consent agenda item.
  - a) Rick Miranda adds that as a consent item, it would then allow MPC members to make it an agenda item if they want it to be.
  - b) Fred adds that some projects are so small, there will be some discretion as to what DRC brings forward, so as to not clog the process.
- xiv. Nancy Hurt writes in chat, “just to clarify - patio additions, whether covered or not, become usable sq. ft?”
  - a) Fred Haberecht believes so. Health and safety are relevant here, and whether they are accessible.
- xv. **Rick Miranda makes the motion, “Any sq. footage addition whether changes footprint or not comes to Master Plan Committee for explicit approval as action item. Any changes in exterior of building, come to Master Plan Committee using consent item mechanism through staff recommendation. If it doesn’t change the exterior or add sq. footage, then it goes to Design Review Committee for approval.”**
  - a) **Jan Nerger seconds the motion by Rick Miranda.**
  - b) **Motion passed; no dissent.**
- xvi. Tracey Abel comments that all capital construction project exterior changes will always go through DRC already.

### 3. Exterior Mobility and Return to School Update – COVID-19 Preparedness Planning 2020/2021

- A. Dave Bradford shared this presentation with the Pandemic Preparedness Team on July 7, 2020. Refer to presentation for specific details of scenario planning.
- B. Vehicle, Bike, and Pedestrian Movement Scenario Planning
  - I. At 50% estimated reduction, primary movement concerns are along north and south of campus and west to east movement along Plum, Hughes Way, and Pitkin.

- II. Will try to move bike traffic to bike trails to free up space on sidewalks for pedestrians.
- III. Horn and other transit and rental options will return.
- IV. Improve hourly parking mobile payment options.
- V. Last month mentioned option of expanding pedestrian movement off sidewalk into street. Probably will not need to use this right away. Will be held as a backup option if needed in future.
- VI. Will review UV wand system with the Pandemic Preparedness Team for cleaning procedures with charter buses and rental vehicles.
- VII. Queueing within Transit Center at Lory Student Center will be limited inside; requesting tents for staging outside; signage may need to happen at bus stops around campus.
- VIII. Realignment of parking (hourly vs permitted spots), such as the option mentioned in the June 2020 MPC meeting, will be held as future step if needed, but will not implement currently. Considering through lens of safety, including possible impacts to intersections.
- IX. Parking hourly pay stations require more contact (queueing and hands touching machine), so will encourage people to use mobile pay app, reducing transaction fee.

C. Comments

- I. Doug Max asks, when contracting to an outside party for charter buses, do they also have to do the social distancing that Parking and Transportation Services is requiring?
  - i. Dave Bradford answers that, yes, they plan to use blue painters' tape to mark off seats. This will have an impact on departments and private entities who want to use the charter buses with an increased cost, but Pandemic Preparedness Team felt it was necessary to protect CSU drivers and passengers.
  - ii. In Athletics, they utilize the buses tremendously. Everyone traveling for Athletics, will be tested for COVID. Doug will bring this up and could submit a request to Pandemic Preparedness Team for exemptions to better clarify procedures in place.