

## Master Plan Committee (MPC) – January 24, 2022 – Meeting Minutes

**Webpage:** <https://www.fm.colostate.edu/mpc>

**Location:** Virtual on Microsoft Teams

**Participants:** Tracey Abel, Steve Cottingham, Tim Kemp, Tom Satterly, Jessica Kramer, Julia Innes, Tamara Alexander Johnson, Shelly Carroll, David Hansen, Kristi Buffington, Nick Christensen, Melissa Reynolds, Cody Frye, Tom Biedscheid, Dave Bradford, Alan Rudolph (by phone), Mary Pedersen, Christian Dykson, Lynn Johnson, Maggie Walsh, Mike Rush

**Guests:** Carol Dollard (agenda item 1), Lon Kendall and Zack Kulbeck (agenda item 2)

### Infrastructure Location – Foothills Campus Ground Mounted Solar (Request for Approval) – *David Hansen, Carol Dollard*

1. This project, which is helping to meet carbon neutral goals of CSU, came to MPC about 2 years ago as part of the build-out conversation for an approx. 4-megawatt solar infrastructure facility on CSU properties. (*Note: Reference MPC minutes and presentation from 2/12/2020.*)
  - I. 2022 - Approaching culmination of that buildout.
    - i. Rooftop solar has already been installed on main and south campuses
    - ii. Ground mount installation already added to ARDEC
  - II. Finalizing locations for installation with consideration for proximity to existing infrastructures, including tie-ins to electrical system.
    - i. Due to roof top limitations, seeking approval for alternative sites.
2. 21 sites were included in the original project package. This is financed through a third-party power purchase agreement; the third party owns and operates the sites and CSU pays them back through utility bills.
  - I. For CSU to get the rate we want and for the third party to get the financials they need, CSU needs to make up the kilowatt hours lost from locations that are not viable/cannot happen. The project package got smaller due to constraints such as:
    - i. Learned that most of the metal buildings that we thought we could add solar to were not structurally designed for any extra load, such as at ARDEC and with part of a metal bldg. component at Richardson.
    - ii. Intended to put car canopy in Westfall parking lot, and all along we knew this was the most expensive project in the package, but there has been a 24% increase in steel and other items that has made this project untenable.
  - II. Seeking approval for additional sites for ground mount solar located at foothills campus.
3. Alan Rudolph asks: There is discussion about other types of facilities going on and how has this been integrated with the task force at foothills?
4. David Hansen responds that Facilities Management (FM) brought forward an update to MPC for the Jud Harper Complex in Sept. 2021.
  - I. Part of the conversation about that master plan update was about stakeholder involvement at the Jud Harper Complex and the adjacent CVMBS stakeholders. Conversation facilitated with stakeholders about an approximately 10-year old master plan. Wanted to refresh it based on current thinking, what we know from utilities standpoint and for consideration of

facilities that we knew had potential for coming online soon. Validated the plan with the stakeholders to make sure CSU is holding onto potential bldg. sites for the future build out of the complex, knowing our real estate is not infinite.

- II. The plan shared in today's PowerPoint presentation is that plan.
    - i. The Jud Harper Complex plan of 10 years prior had several sites held for additional facilities in the build out for the complex.
    - ii. Need for additional parking that may need to support folks coming to facility.
  - III. Currently at the JUD Harper Complex at the RIC facility, there is existing ground mounted solar, which has been there since the building was built. It was part of the LEED points associated with the facility at the time.
5. Proposal today is to consider two sites:
- I. First proposed site is an addition to the existing solar array.
    - i. Currently there are two rows of array built with RIC facility in an enclosed area.
    - ii. An additional third of an acre exists that could support expansion of the facility.
    - iii. Proposal to build out the rest of the location with a few more rows of ground mounted solar array in same orientation of what exists today.
  - II. Second proposed site has not been considered prior to this conversation.
    - i. Approximately 1 acre of ground mounted solar proposed (see triangular shaped area in presentation).
    - ii. This site is not represented in the master plan as a potential building site.
    - iii. There are two easements that need to be maintained for access.
      - a. Two-track drive that City of Fort Collins water district has access to for some of their facilities further upslope and outside of our fence
      - b. A large water main on the east side of facility.
  - III. There is rolling topography with a lot of drainage from foothills above. No drainage would be impacted by this; would allow for accommodation of the one acre.
  - IV. There is a small empty storage building, overseen by EHS, that needs to be taken down. EHS has worked with various groups regarding the bldg. Working through the proper process for facility removal.
6. Christian Dykson asks – Is agrivoltaics part of the proposal or something that is being explored for the future?
- I. Carol answers that the ARDEC ground mount that is installed was set up to be compatible with sheep pasture. They didn't look at plant growth underneath because the site didn't have irrigation water nearby. The same would be true of these sites. There is not an intent for plant growth, but if there is an interest, we could ask for the same consideration to design to include sheep. Sheep are compatible with solar as long as the wires are protected. Larger animals are not compatible.
  - II. David Hansen comments that currently there are no outdoor animal holdings within this facility. The plans to the east of this show a secured facility. Intended use of the facility is infectious disease research, so would need to have a conversation around intended use if this is the direction that the stakeholders want to take.
  - III. Carol Dollard adds that we could have conversations later regarding other sites about the compatibility of solar and sheep. The goal currently is to find new sites that will work because the carport canopy at Westfall and some other considered sites were untenable.

7. David Hansen shares that FM may come back to MPC about another potential site on Foothills Campus on the Laporte Ave side of campus. Still engaging stakeholders in conversation and not ready to bring this forward as a proposal at this time.
8. Timeline for current package – contract ends in Dec 2022. More than halfway through project package. Started construction in April 2021. Want to get these proposed locations in the design queue to install in fall 2022.
9. Alan Rudolph asks if any of the 2021 sites considered the I-25/Prospect property.
  - I. Carol answers – No, because according to the rules you can't generate more electricity with solar than the load you have on the site, so it limits that particular site substantially because there is not much of a load out there.
10. Alan Rudolph thinks there is leadership interest in developing that site—for example, as corporate headquarters—and evaluating different sectors of technology application that could be applied there, many of which could be attracted to the introduction of a solar farm for their own purposes or for agrivoltaics.
  - I. Carol Dollard responds that the interest is great once the site is developed, but we can't put a solar array system on a site without a load. The rule is that you can only put a solar system up to 120%. Until something is there, cannot put solar.
11. Alan Rudolph asks about integration of other interest at foothills, one that is being led by a large animal health company in discussion with Tetrad (our private partner in developing facilities on campus) – has there been any cross talk with potential manufacturing sites or other development R + D facilities, which are in discussion with that group?
  - I. David Hansen responds that our standards are written so roof loads would be developed in any building plans that are able to accommodate solar when the facility is in the process of being constructed. The locations in this package need to be built this year rather than consideration for future developments. The hope is that future facilities can accommodate this build out, but they would be under a different solar contractual agreement.
  - II. Carol Dollard explains that this is not CSU's first experience with solar. There are already 6.8 megawatts of solar on campus, financed through a variety of projects. Anticipate new real estate or groups interested in solar in a few years. For this, we are trying to close the package by making the finances work for everyone involved, making up the kilowatts lost from not being able to install the Westfall solar.
12. Alan Rudolph states that CDPGA and state dept of energy have talked about investing in higher education and helping with infrastructure around energy. Has there been any discussion with the state specifically about helping to finance this?
  - I. Not for this project. Carol Dollard, Aaron Fodge, and some others from FM were on a call with the state, including Angie Paccione and Will Toor (Colorado Energy Office); they are interested in a variety of things. FM put some projects in front of them and sent a memo a month ago.
  - II. This project is not being considered as part of that conversation because this is a third-party owned and operated project, which CSU has to pay back with a fixed electric rate over time. The economics of the package relies on us having a certain size.
13. Request for motion
  - I. Confusion on MPC procedurals on who can make a motion expressed by a few of the members. Julia Innes adds in Teams chat: "For info on voting for this committee, MPC quorum

is one more than half the voting members present (or their representative) to vote during a meeting.” (More info can be found <https://www.fm.colostate.edu/mpc>.)

- i. Tom Biedscheid - On behalf of the Vice President for Enrollment and Access
  - ii. Yolanda Bevill - Vice President for University Communications
  - iii. Dave Bradford - Director for Parking and Transportation Services
  - iv. Nick Christensen - Director, CSURF Real Estate Office
  - v. Steve Cottingham - Deputy Director of Athletics
  - vi. Christian Dykson - ASCSU president
  - vii. Cody Frye - Executive Director of Campus Recreation
  - viii. Blanche Hughes - Vice President for Student Affairs
  - ix. Lynn Johnson - Vice President for University Operations
  - x. Nick Lobejko - Managing Director of Development, University Advancement
  - xi. Mary Pedersen - Provost & Executive Vice President
  - xii. Melissa Reynolds - Associate Dean for Research, College of Natural Science
  - xiii. Alan Rudolph - Vice President for Research
  - xiv. Tom Satterly - Associate Vice President for Facilities Management
  - xv. Mari Strombom - Executive Director for Housing and Dining Services
- II. Steve Cottingham motions to approve the suggested site locations as proposed within the Southwest Foothills subarea masterplan for ground mounted solar.
- III. Christian Dykson seconds the motion.
- IV. David asks for a vote and asks if there are concerns.
- i. Alan Rudolph opposes the motion.
  - ii. Mary Pedersen wonders why these would not be considered good sites. Can Alan share his concern?
    - a. Alan Rudolph shares that the research community has spent a lot of time in Foothills Campus master planning, and he can't tell if they have been integrated/involved. It is a commitment of time and resources. He doesn't think the decision has been properly vetted through all the stakeholders. Alan doesn't fully understand the timing or who is paying for this. We are being asked to prioritize things with the university culture and doesn't find the process transparent enough to decide and prioritize through a vote. He is concerns about making the choice without more information.
    - b. Carol Dollard says that one of the reasons the site was chosen on the south end because it is considered a buffer for the neighborhood because there have been interactions about the neighborhood to south regarding noise. Believe that site would not be favorable for future development because of proximity to houses across the fence line. The other site was built as a 50-kilowatt site. It was fenced as a larger site intending to fill it out ten years ago. That is not spoken for in any of the master plan illustrations that have gone through the vetting process discussed in Sept. 2021.
  - iii. Alan Rudolph says that agrivoltaics was brought up earlier. This location is an experimental area. We don't know if growing crops under a solar farm will degrade the array faster than not growing crops or allowing livestock around it, both which have been proposed by the College of Ag and which Alan supports. Yet banking our

utility bills on an experimental scale because there are those who claim it is impractical to scale and it's proffered as the barter between food and energy. We know that when we grow crops for bioethanol and not for food, we create societal tension. This is going on in the background for Alan. Discussing aspects of decisions made about utilities and ideas that are not well formulated enough for him to make a decision.

V. Discussion about next steps.

- i. David Hansen says that he hears Alan expressing a need to better integrate this decision with the Foothills Visioning Taskforce. Fred Haberecht was involved before retiring. David was involved in the taskforce conversations as recently as a week ago and the Jud Harper Master Plan was discussed in those conversations, but solar was not.
- ii. Alan proposes using CST as a process, regarding space and planning. Doesn't remember if the CST drafting group presented their findings at MPC. (*Note: Reference MPC minutes and presentation from 9/27/2021 for Lynn Johnson and Thom Hadley's agenda item on space and facilities planning.*)
- iii. Carol Dollard says FM has done due diligence with discussing this with stakeholders at this site. David Hansen has had many conversations with them, and they have not had interest in these two sites. There is another site that is under further conversation and FM is talking to as many stakeholders as possible to pursue the goals of the university for everyone.
- iv. Nick Christensen comments that CSURF owns the southwest corner of I-25/Prospect for the benefit of CSU. It is CSU's direction for how that will develop. In the future CSURF is willing to consider solar component and integrating that in with the employment uses and services they anticipate having there. They look forward to that future discussion. Nick Christensen asks, as the voting member for CSURF, does this vote need to occur today or can it be on hold while FM connects with Alan Rudolph's team to work through Alan's concerns.
- v. The next meeting of MPC is in one month.
- vi. **Action Item (David Hansen):** Schedule a meeting with Foothills Taskforce and Office of VP for Research to discuss proposed sites, which were not seen as priority sites in the master plan update and are considered to have potential for leverage.
- vii. Christian Dykson asks, since there are no plans for the two sites in the existing master plan, does that mean if the committee does not move forward with the recommendation that these sites for solar, those sites would remain undeveloped?
  - a. David Hansen says there are no programs spoken for these proposed sites, so it would remain open until another proposal comes forward.
- viii. Christian Dykson asks, Of the proposed solar installation, do we know what percentage of the total utility that would fulfill for the site for Foothills Campus?
  - a. Carol Dollard responds that it would be small. For perspective, the 30-acre site on Laporte Ave is tied-in behind the meter and it provides about 25-30% of the solar for the entire Foothills Campus. These two proposed sites are part of a larger package that would add up to over 4 Megawatts. Carol says

they have put almost as much as they have on that 30-acre plot on rooftops and various places on 20 different sites around campus.

- ix. Christian Dykson asks if there is a reason why these two sites were preferred over rooftop installations?
    - a. The current project has 19 rooftops, identified as having new roofs and didn't have a lot of clutter. Already vetted all the roofs. There are not a lot of roof options on Foothills Campus because the science builds tend to have a lot of stuff on the roofs, so they are not conducive to putting solar on them. Roofs are not always an option.
  - x. Christian Dykson asks, Is there a supplemental document that highlights the financials – who is paying total costs, timeline of installation?
    - a. Carol outlines the financials: It is third-party owned and operated for the contract term, which is 25 years. This is like the 30 acres of solar that currently exists at Foothills; it is owned and operated, and we pay them back by agreeing to buy all the electricity they produce. This makes it a very low risk option for the university. At the end of the term, then it reverts back to CSU. We are not at risk for making it operate. For this contract, the price of electricity is fixed for 25 years. The savings overtime for the university is incredible.
  - xi. Christian asks what David and Carol's thoughts are on delaying a vote.
    - a. David Hansen and Carol Dollard say the item can be tabled for a month while they continue further conversation with Alan Rudolph.
  - xii. Melissa Reynolds asks in Teams chat, "if not this site, then what site?"
    - a. David says FM has explored as many rooftops as are viable.
  - xiii. Shelly Carroll asks, does it negate our contract if we can't provide enough sites?
    - a. Carol answers – No, It will just change the electric rate and will make the whole package cost more for the 25 years. It won't kill the project. We've already installed a lot of the solar, but the financial will be less attractive without filling the gap in need for sites.
- VI. Motion is tabled and will proceed with additional conversations working further with Alan's team to answer his concerns.

### Building Location – Foothills Campus: Chiropteran Research Facility (Request for Approval) – *David Hansen, Lon Kendall*

1. Intent is to formally approve the final location that was part of the master plan update. The plan was approved by MPC in Sept. 2021. There was a grant application submitted for NIH at that time. Critical to the location of this facility is its close proximity to CVID. Project was awarded financial approval.
2. CVID (Center for Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases) – mostly study insect vectors. With emerging viruses and diseases, including coronavirus, they are also wanting to use bat models as a vector of emerging diseases.
3. Proposal submitted to and funded by NIH is for the facility to be the bat resource center for the country, primarily designed to set up breeding colonies and to outsource bats to other investigators.

4. Location chosen by CVID because of the vector-borne component and adjacency to BSL3 facilities; the main investigators of bats are housed in CVID. Exploring expanding footprint of this facility to develop another BSL3 suite within it.
5. Alan Rudolph comments that all the financing came from NIH – \$6.8. The original proposal was for \$8. The VPR office is supplementing approx. \$1.2 million dollars to capture original design. If there is additional BSL3 space, Lon says they will work with Alan on that.
6. Christian Dykson asks, are the interior design fixtures set – were they designed by NIH or did CSU have a role in that? Have the different components of the facility been clearly defined by NIH?
  - I. NIH has guidelines for developing animal facilities. Followed those in the proposal. CSU has a say in footprint and how rooms are laid out, but there are criteria from NIH expected to make.
7. Mary Pedersen asks was the importance of the selected location and design because it was next to the other facility?
  - I. Correct. At the time, the budget didn't allow for BSL3 integrated into the facility and they wanted to be near CVID for their BSL3.
8. Christian Dyson asks, is CSU the entity that will own and manage and operate the facility, or is NIH a co-partner in that?
  - I. NIH funds it, but CSU owns and operates it. Committed to operating it for its intent and purpose for 20 years. Alan Rudolph adds - with the intent of allowing other NIH-funded investigators use the facilities. Some responsibility to collaborate or accept contact or grant work from other bat investigators. They don't specifically say that, but we do have to report how the building is used is on annual basis.
9. Request for motion - After this approval, CSU will have to go through the county to construct at foothills campus but requires approval of MPC first.
  - I. Mary Pedersen makes the motion: To approve the suggested building location as proposed within the Southwest Foothills subarea master plan.
  - II. Melissa Reynolds seconds the motion.
  - III. David asks if there are any who are opposed to the motion or any additional questions?
    - i. None.
  - IV. Motion approved for the suggested building location as proposed within the Southwest Foothills subarea master plan.

### Master Plan – 2024 update planning – *David Hansen*

1. Adoption of Timeline
  - I. Master plan is updated every ten years.
  - II. FM would like to advance the timeline toward the 2024 update of the master plan.
2. Master Plan Goals / What the Master Plan Should Do
  - I. Align with the academic master plan and CST.
    - i. FM has never been able to work with these previously, and this is an opportunity to align on a parallel path.
  - II. Incorporate space assessment.
  - III. Align with the research priorities of the university.
  - IV. Critical to understand potential student enrollment.
    - i. What is the right objective growth number for the student body on campus? Is 35,000 still the right number to plan for? CST and academic master plan will help inform that.

- V. Align with future Housing and Dining master plan
  - VI. Determine mode split goals for the university in terms of parking, transportation, and how we invest in access to the campus.
  - VII. Focus on unique qualities of CSU.
    - i. Location situated at foothills of Rocky Mountains
    - ii. Commitment to sustainability efforts
    - iii. Physical attributes of CSU that position us in the market.
3. 2014 Master Plan – what it did well
- I. Parking moved to the perimeter of campus leveraging structures and transit
  - II. Protected open space
  - III. Protected viewshed corridors
  - IV. Defined a pedestrian core of campus
  - V. Defined campus edge setbacks
  - VI. Acknowledged and responded to flood plain constraints in physical design
  - VII. Reinforced the need for a strong relationship with City of Fort Collins
4. How 2014 plan was leveraged
- I. Master Plan committee engaged and effectively guided process and decision making
  - II. Core tenants easily recognized and upheld by decision makers
  - III. Intergovernmental Agreement Stadium siting, neighborhood relations, RP3
  - IV. Nuanced Public engagement
  - V. Greater permeability of campus to the public
  - VI. Successful joint grant applications with City of Fort Collins
5. New since 2014 Master Plan adoption
- I. New Campus Planner role forthcoming and reorganization of support staff
  - II. Courageous Strategic Transformation process
  - III. Academic Master Plan process
  - IV. Impacts of COVID
  - V. Focus on sustainability (AASHE Stars)
  - VI. Focus on inclusion (Inclusive Physical and Virtual Campus Policy, Principles of Community)
  - VII. Focus on engagement/outreach (City Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, Multiple Sub Area Plans)
  - VIII. Focus on affordable/attainable housing for staff and students
  - IX. Foothills Visioning process (Campus Master Plan)
  - X. South Campus Master Plan Update
  - XI. Development of sub area Master Plan for UCA
  - XII. Development of remote campus Master Plans: (ARDEC, Mountain Campus)
  - XIII. University rebranding effort
6. Discussion
- I. Christian asks how deans are engaged in the process? How do we identify aspiration buildings and capacity building to expand programs? By investing in key locations (e.g. Clark, Glover, Engineering), can student capacity increase from 35,000 to 38,000, for example?
    - i. David Hansen responds – The space assessment process is underway. That, with additional processes through the CST, will better inform the decisions about facilities and how we integrate those into the general space planning of the university.

- ii. Shelly Carroll agrees – the three big developments were put on hold because of COVID but planning for that is starting to ramp back up.
- iii. Tim Kemp adds that FM is in the early stages of laying out a potential schedule and this is the first conversation of many that will occur over the next three years, so no conversations with deans as of yet.
- iv. Mary Pedersen has started conversations around strategic enrollment management – will be tied to culmination of academic master planning process (wraps up spring 2022), which will lead into strategic enrollment planning – what number do we want to achieve for student enrollment? where are we heading? Intent is to use academic master plan and collaboratively examine what areas we should we grow and what disciplines. In the next two years, anticipating reaching peak for overall enrollment; catching up with enrollment that declined over last two years.
- v. Lynn Johnson, speaking to the 35,000 student number, says that in 2010 when compiling the CSU 2020 document, worked with FM on what is carrying capacity for students on this campus—looking at where we thought we could accommodate bldgs. and how many beds could provide. That led to belief that this campus has carrying capacity of 35,000. Lynn built complex financial plan working with Steve Hultin (previous FM director); they built in assumption that some classes would be remote. Thought some course content would be remote. Reducing amount of space using. The number was based on standardized square footage of different types of spaces, and students and employees. Not sure if we could grow to 38,000; unless we grew spaces on south campus.
- vi. Alan Rudolph adds that in the enrollment assessment, we would want to include graduate students. There is a focus on that in the CST – that’s another area of expansion of students. GRAs will likely be working on foothills and south campuses. Research is doing something similar with aspirations around growth, much like academic master planning process.
  - a. Mary responds in chat, “Yes we are including graduate students. in the AMP. Thank you Alan.”
- vii. Christian asks in chat, “Lynn or Mari, do we know how much additional capacity will be provided by Meridian Village (and the future renovation of Newsom)?”

## 7. Component plans support the Physical Master Plan

- I. Identified a series of alternative component plans that need to be updated in next round of documentation.
  - i. Transportation plan needs consultant funding to set Mode Split Goal (awarded grant funding)
  - ii. Parking plan needs consultant funding
  - iii. Open space plan in house
  - iv. Stormwater master plan
    - a. Foothills Campus Stormwater plan needs consultant funding
  - v. Utility master plan needs consultant funding
    - a. District energy plan funded
  - vi. Academic Master Plan is the umbrella
  - vii. Courageous Strategic Transformation shares values

- viii. Safety and access plan
    - a. Lighting evaluation in house?
    - b. ADA improvements in house?
  - ix. University space assessment funded
  - x. Acquisition plan in house
  - xi. HDS Master Plan needs consultant funding ~ TBD?
  - xii. City Planning
    - a. West Elizabeth BRT needs construction match funding
    - b. Housing Plan update (affordable/ attainable)
  - xiii. County planning NISP, Glade Reservoir, ARDEC
8. How should the plan be communicated to the campus?
    - I. FM staff led the process and developed plans in house for previous master plans.
    - II. MarComm may be able to develop and deliver a plan to more successfully engage people for true feedback.
  9. Alan Rudolph asks – Who does the current MPC report to and where is the final decision made?
    - I. David Hansen says that MPC recommendations go to Vice President for University Operations.
    - II. Julia Innes adds in Teams chat, “Act as an advisory body to the University through the Vice President for University Operations on the physical development of the total environment of Colorado State University’s campuses by development, revision, and application of the University’s facilities master plan. The Master Plan Committee will offer input on campus growth through strategic input in support of the University Vision and Campus Experience within the campus framework.”
    - III. Lynn Johnson recommends that MPC and Space Committee continue to have recommendations move up to the President’s Operations Committee, as we indicate in our 2018 revision of the [MPC process flowchart](#), and thinks that President McConnell would like that to continue, even if the committee is a little bit different now.
      - i. **Action Item (Julia Innes):** Attach document when sending out meeting materials.
  10. Proposed timeline to advance 2024 update adoption
    - I. Identify sub area plans mentioned earlier. Consultants or other needs may need to help advance those. Make a list of those to bring back to MPC for further committee review. If approved and advanced, would start this fall, component plans would advance for about a year. Adoption by Board of Governors approval and formally submitting to CDHE.
  11. Christian Dykson asks, how granular does the master plan will get by the time it is finished? How can students add their ideas to the master plan and integrate with the process?
    - I. An approach would be brought forward through stakeholder engagement process.
    - II. Could possibly also come through UFAB proposal.
  12. Christian Dykson, does the master plan have a financial strategy tied to it or is it strictly aspirational?
    - I. Historically, it’s more aspirational. The need to integrate those aspirations into a larger document, in terms of a physical master plan that shows potential site or opportunity in a plan is something could potentially integrate.
  13. Anticipated Role of New Campus Planner
    - I. Prior to Campus Planner hire, FM Staff to convene a MP Advisory Team

- i. FM will put together a technical advisory committee involving some stakeholders from MPC. (Suggestions listed on presentation.) Making sure there is a holistic look at those plans, process aligning with CST and academic master plan.
  - ii. Alan Rudolph thinks the technical advisory committee is a good idea. Thinks it should be envisioned around mission areas. There are so many groups meeting on this already. Make sure the advisory group is well represented and diverse, including Advancement and Engagement.
- II. Campus Planner hired – begin onboarding process and get comfortable with the players and plans that are in motion. Eventually begin leadership role of Master Plan Process and Master Plan Committee over time. (Anticipated 8-12 Mos. After hire)

End of meeting